



**EUROPEAN UNION**

FSC-PC.DEL/38/10

5 July 2010

ENGLISH only

**OSCE Joint FSC-PC No. 46  
Vienna, 5<sup>th</sup> July 2010**

## **EU statement on the Corfu Interim Report**

---

The EU would like to thank the Chairmanship-in-Office for the extensive Interim Report presented. In so doing, we also express our appreciation to all participating States which have contributed to the process so far, through food-for-thought papers and in other ways, and to the contribution of Coordinators, the OSCE Secretariat and other OSCE institutions.

Today, we would like to lay out our views on the Interim Report, and also on how we see the way forward.

Mr Chairman,

Let me start by stressing that the EU fully shares the positive assessment of the Chairman-in-Office about the continued role and importance of the Corfu Process. Let us be clear about the important role that this process has already played, both for setting in motion a broad-ranging and open debate on issues of key importance to all OSCE participating States, but also for re-vitalising the OSCE as an organisation.

In taking this process further, we need to keep in mind our overarching goal, namely to rebuild trust and confidence in order to strengthen the security in and of Europe, writ large. To achieve this, we need to move forward towards a reinforced security community, which would be an OSCE+. This is the point of departure for the EU's considerations on the Interim Report.

Let me now turn to the questions regarding the way forward that the Chairman-in-Office poses in the Interim Report. You ask us to indicate in which areas participating States wish to continue discussion, with the aim of building consensus. In responding to this question, our point of departure is the strong conviction that there is a need to narrow down our priorities. We all know that having more than a very limited number of priorities amounts to having no priorities at all.

The EU believes that there are four areas that need to be prioritised. We have outlined them in a recent paper, which has been distributed to all participating States (PC.DEL/539/10). In this paper, they appear in the context of the proposed Summit. But it is important to stress that they are generic and pertain to the dialogue on Euro-atlantic and Eurasian security as a whole. In taking the Corfu Process further, we want to focus on these four clusters of issues, namely:

- First, strengthening of OSCE capabilities in all three dimensions to promote early warning, conflict prevention and resolution, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation, including in relation to protracted conflicts. As appropriate, updated and new mechanisms. Most important: to strengthen the generic capabilities of the OSCE institutions. As regards the

protracted conflicts, we will consider tangible progress on these a key litmus test of the good will of partners.

- Second, strengthening implementation and better follow-up of OSCE norms, principles and commitments (including updating them as necessary). There should be a particular focus on the human dimension commitments, with the emphasis on human rights and fundamental freedoms, including freedom of the media.
- Third, strengthening the conventional arms control framework, including confidence and security building measures (such as an updated VD 99). Progress on CFE is also of utmost importance.
- And fourth, increased attention to transnational threats in all three OSCE dimensions. We wish to utilise more strategically and displaying more clearly the contribution that the OSCE can give, including in reviewing its Maastricht strategy.

We appreciate the way in which the Interim Report contains these priorities, or elements relating to them, as items for forward action. However, from our perspective, in particular the priorities in the area of human rights and fundamental freedoms still have received too modest a place in the list. This pertains both to the level of ambition and in terms of the hierarchy of deliverables.

Let me stress that we need to focus not only on implementation but also on strengthening commitments. We also would like to see a more explicit reference to the importance of the work of the OSCE institutions in this context.

Mr Chairman,

Let me be clear that the fact that we propose to focus on four priority areas does not mean that we consider that other priorities listed in the Interim Report are not important. The EU is prepared to discuss all proposals which can contribute to strengthening our common security, thus promoting the overarching objective of the Corfu Process.

In particular, we reaffirm the importance that we attach to issues relating to the second dimension, the effectiveness of the OSCE and a stronger OSCE engagement with Afghanistan. Clearly, strengthening OSCE institutions will be important to allow the OSCE to respond to the challenges outlined in our four key priorities. The second dimension plays an important role both in the conflict cycle, and when discussing transnational threats. And transnational threats stemming from Afghanistan are indeed something we must focus on. So there can be no questioning that the EU wishes to address these three issue areas. But we want to do so in the context of, and subsumed to, the main priorities that we have defined for the proposed Summit.

The second question pertains to the issue of methodology and format. Let me start by making one general remark on this. When discussing the way forward, there are two things that we should not lose sight of. One is the strategic vision of a security community toward which we are striving. The other is the imperative of mobilising the sufficient political will to actually achieve this.

In order to do so, we believe that we need to define an integrated action plan, which would set out what we should focus our efforts on in the

months and years to come. Such a plan needs to enjoy broad support, involving both the FSC and PC contexts. We are not willing to refer proposals to decision-making bodies without a clear determination of the priorities and timeline for negotiations and decisions.

Finally, on the last two questions, it would seem reasonable to set ourselves the goal of defining at least the key priorities for the work ahead at the upcoming meeting in Almaty. We believe that the Chair's perception paper on the Almaty meeting, distributed on 24 June, sets this out with clarity. Our Ministers should give us clear guidance on how to take the dialogue forward, through the rest of the year and beyond.

In this, we see the proposed Summit as an integrated part. If we can agree on a sufficiently substantial agenda for a Summit, it can play an important role in terms of furthering the objectives of the Corfu Process and mobilising the political will required to move forward. At the Summit more detailed work programmes could then be agreed on.

The candidate countries TURKEY, CROATIA\*, the FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA\* and ICELAND, the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate countries ALBANIA, BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA, MONTENEGRO and SERBIA, the European Free Trade Association country and member of the European Economic Area NORWAY, as well as ANDORRA, SAN MARINO and GEORGIA align themselves with this statement.

\*Croatia and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia continue to be part of the Stabilisation and Association Process.