



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Permanent Council**

PC.DEL/814/05
1 August 2005

ENGLISH only

Slovenian Chairmanship

**2005 ANNUAL SECURITY
REVIEW CONFERENCE**

Vienna, 21 and 22 June 2005

CHAIR'S REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECISION NO. 662: DATES OF THE 2005 ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE.....	2
DECISION NO. 663: AGENDA AND ORGANIZATIONAL MODALITIES OF THE 2005 ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE (2005 ASRC)	3
CHAIRPERSON’S PERCEPTION	10
WORKING SESSION I: PREVENTING AND COMBATING TERRORISM.....	12
WORKING SESSION 2: COMPREHENSIVE SECURITY	16
WORKING SESSION 3: ENHANCING CO-OPERATION AND SYNERGY WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS	23
SIDE EVENT WITH THE MEDITERRANEAN AND ASIAN PARTNERS FOR CO-OPERATION: PROMOTING DIALOGUE AND CO-OPERATION BETWEEN OSCE PARTNERS AND PARTICIPATING STATES IN THE POLITICO-MILITARY DIMENSION: ASSESSMENT AND POSSIBILITIES FOR INCREASED INTERACTION AND IMPLEMENTATION	27
LIST OF PROPOSALS AND SUGGESTIONS	29



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Permanent Council**

PC.DEC/662
3 March 2005

Original: ENGLISH

546th Plenary Meeting
PC Journal No. 546, Agenda item 4

**DECISION No. 662: DATES OF THE 2005 ANNUAL SECURITY
REVIEW CONFERENCE**

The Permanent Council, taking into account the recommendation of the Forum for Security Co-operation,

Decides that the 2005 Annual Security Review Conference will take place in Vienna on 21 and 22 June 2005.



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Permanent Council**

PC.DEC/663
17 March 2005

Original: ENGLISH

548th Plenary Meeting
PC Journal No. 548, Agenda Item 4

**DECISION No. 663
AGENDA AND ORGANIZATIONAL MODALITIES OF THE 2005
ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE (2005 ASRC)**

The Permanent Council, taking into account the recommendation of the Forum for Security Co-operation,

Decides:

To organize the 2005 Annual Security Review Conference (2005 ASRC) in accordance with the agenda and organizational modalities contained in the annexes to this decision.

AGENDA OF THE 2005 ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE (2005 ASRC)

Vienna, 21 and 22 June 2005

Programme

Tuesday, 21 June 2005

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| 10 a.m.–1 p.m. | Opening Session |
| 3–5.45 p.m. | Working Session I: Preventing and combating terrorism |
| 6–7 p.m. | Side event with the Mediterranean and Asian Partners for Co-operation |

Wednesday, 22 June 2005

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| 10 a.m.–1 p.m. | Working Session II: Comprehensive security |
| 3–5.45 p.m. | Working Session III: Enhancing co-operation and synergy with international organizations and institutions |
| 5.45–6 p.m. | Closing Session |

Agenda

Opening Session

(21 June, 10 a.m.–1 p.m.)

The session will provide the opportunity for the participating States and other participants of the Conference to make statements concerning the overall theme of the Conference — the implementation and follow-up to the OSCE Strategy to Address Threats to Security and Stability in the Twenty-First Century (the Strategy). *Inter alia*, these might include the review of the security environment in the OSCE area, the effectiveness of existing tools, and the possible need to develop additional measures to be taken by the participating States and the Organization. The session should make a broad cross-dimensional appraisal of the current security environment to examine new threats and discuss the OSCE track record since the adoption of the Strategy.

The review might in a more general context deal with, *inter alia*, the implementation of the relevant OSCE decisions and commitments in capacity-building for preventing and

combating terrorism, the fight against organized crime, border security and management, strategic changes in the security environment and the improvement of co-operation with other international organizations, while also taking the gender aspect into account.

Working Session I: Preventing and combating terrorism

(21 June, 3–5.45 p.m.)

This session will review the implementation of the OSCE commitments and decisions related to combating terrorism, and will address possible new areas to enhance OSCE counter-terrorism activities, while ensuring the respect of human rights, fundamental freedoms and the rule of law. The review might include addressing the threat of terrorism, its manifestations and conditions that may foster and sustain it. The session might also review options for combating organized crime, strengthening border security and management, and enhancing police activities.

Side event with the Mediterranean and Asian Partners for Co-operation

(21 June, 6–7 p.m.)

This event will further identify and review areas of common interest and concern, and possible ways of intensifying co-operation and the voluntary implementation of OSCE principles and commitments on the basis of Ministerial Council Decision No. 17/04 of 7 December 2004.

Working Session II: Comprehensive security

(22 June, 10 a.m.–1 p.m.)

This session will review the threats and challenges to security and stability in the OSCE area, and responses to them, in particular of a politico-military nature. The session might also cover: strategic changes in the security environment and their influence on military doctrines, implementation of OSCE decisions and activities in the area of early warning, conflict prevention/resolution, crisis management, and post-conflict rehabilitation, the risks stemming from stockpiles of conventional ammunition and SALW, and the particular contributions made by the FSC, and the existing arms control and non-proliferation agreements/treaties and CSBMs.

Working Session III: Enhancing co-operation and synergy with international organizations and institutions

(22 June, 3–5.45 p.m.)

This session will review the interaction of the OSCE with other international organizations and institutions based on the Platform for Co-operative Security and the Strategy, and will focus on ways to further improve co-operation with them. The session will also focus on the implementation of Permanent Council Decision No. 571 on further dialogue and co-operation with the Partners for Co-operation and on exploring the scope for wider sharing of OSCE norms, principles and commitments with others, in particular with adjacent regions.

The session might include the review of the political dialogue, co-ordination and structured co-operation on thematic or regional issues, and the intensification of interaction both at the political and the working level. The session will also look at specific areas of

OSCE activity, such as the fight against terrorism, border security and management, police activities, the suppression of organized crime, while also taking the gender aspect into account.

Closing Session

(22 June, 5.45–6 p.m.)

The Chair will present a first perception on the outcome of the Conference, based on the contributions of the rapporteurs.

ORGANIZATIONAL MODALITIES OF THE 2005 ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE (2005 ASRC)

Vienna, 21 and 22 June 2005

Background

The Porto Meeting of the OSCE Ministerial Council, by adopting Decision No. 3, dated 7 December 2002, established the Annual Security Review Conference (ASRC) to provide a framework for enhancing security dialogue and for reviewing security work undertaken by the OSCE and participating States, to provide an opportunity to exchange views on issues related to arms control and confidence- and security-building, and to promote the exchange of information and co-operation with relevant international and regional organizations and institutions.

Organization

The opening and closing sessions will be chaired by a representative of the Chairman-in-Office. The Secretariat will issue a journal of the Conference.

Each of the working sessions will have one or more designated co-ordinators, and a rapporteur.

Standard OSCE rules of procedure and working methods will be followed, *mutatis mutandis*, at the Conference.

Interpretation into all six working languages of the OSCE will be provided at the opening, working and closing sessions.

A comprehensive report on the Conference will be distributed by the Chairman-in-Office before the summer recess.

The press will be informed by the Press and Public Information Section (PPIS), as appropriate.

Participation

Participating States are encouraged to be represented at a high level, by senior officials responsible for security-related policy in the OSCE area.

The OSCE institutions will participate in the Conference, as will the Secretary General and the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC). The Parliamentary Assembly, the Mediterranean and Asian Partners for Co-operation will be invited to participate.

Other international organizations to be invited are the security-related organizations mentioned in Permanent Council Decision No. 563 of 30 October 2003.

Consideration is to be given to the possibility of inviting security-related scientific institutes, “think tanks” of international standing, and NGOs to send keynote speakers or to be represented as members of national delegations.

General guidelines for participants

The work of the ASRC will be conducted in five sessions. The opening session is intended to provide an opportunity for formal statements to be delivered, to set the stage for the substantive, focused and interactive discussion in the working sessions and the side event. The opening session will include the welcoming remarks by the Chairman-in-Office and the report by the FSC Chair.

The working sessions will concentrate on one topic, introduced by one or more keynote speakers, whose addresses may be followed by a discussion of any number of relevant sub-topics that delegates may wish to raise.

Each of the sessions mentioned in the agenda has been assigned a number of the above-mentioned sub-topics for illustrative purposes. These lists are not exhaustive. To reinforce the effectiveness of security activities across all three dimensions of the OSCE, it is expected that the interfaces of security will be addressed in each of the sessions, and also the question of co-operation with other international organizations, regardless of the session devoted to that particular topic.

To promote interactive discussion, formal statements in the opening session and interventions in the working sessions should be as concise as possible and should not exceed five minutes.

Guidelines for keynote speakers

The contributions of the keynote speakers should set the scene for the discussion in the sessions and stimulate debate among delegations by raising appropriate questions and suggesting potential recommendations based on OSCE realities, and concentrate on the highlights of their contribution in the presentation. They should dedicate part of their speech and/or written contribution to the enhancement of the security dialogue on work undertaken by the OSCE and its participating States.

The maximum available speaking time is 15 minutes per keynote speaker; where there are two keynote speakers in the same session, the total maximum is 25 minutes.

Guidelines for co-ordinators and rapporteurs

The Co-ordinator chairs the session and should facilitate and focus the dialogue among delegations. The Co-ordinator should stimulate the debate by introducing items related to the subject of the opening and working session, as appropriate, in order to broaden or focus the scope of the discussion.

The rapporteur's written report should address issues raised during the respective session, and should cover problem areas, improvements, suggestions made at the session, and other relevant information.

Personal views shall not be advanced.

Guidelines for participation of other international organizations

Other international organizations may participate in all sessions. They are encouraged to focus on Working Session III; their contribution should concentrate on aspects of co-operation with the OSCE.

Guidelines on timing of submitting and distributing written contributions and factual information

By 20 May 2005, the participants of the Conference should inform the OSCE Secretariat of the composition of their delegations to the ASRC in response to information circular regarding organizational aspects of the Conference to be sent out by the OSCE Secretariat.

By 1 June 2005, keynote speakers should submit a written contribution. International organizations are invited to submit factual information on their organisation which would be useful for the participants of the ASRC in writing. It should not be brought to the attention of participants during the Conference.

By 15 June 2005, participating States and other participants of the Conference are invited to submit any written contributions they may have, including those that contain reactions to the keynote speeches.

Written contributions and factual information should be submitted to the CPC who will then distribute them. The information could also include contributions from OSCE institutions and other international organizations, if appropriate.

CHAIRPERSON'S PERCEPTION

Review of the implementation of the OSCE Strategy to Address Threats to Security and Stability in the 21st Century was the central theme of the Annual Security Review Conference 2005. The Conference reviewed the work done in all three dimensions with a particular emphasis on the politico-military dimension.

The Chairman-in-Office stressed in his opening address the OSCE comprehensive approach to security, its role in combating terrorism and the importance of politico-military dimension. The participating States were urged to have a coherent, more coordinated and cross-dimensional approach when dealing with security and implementing the OSCE Strategy. It was acknowledged that the fight against terrorism remains the priority for the OSCE. The participating States were invited to take appropriate measures to continue to support the implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1540, and to continue the work in controlling the spread of small arms and light weapons and managing the stockpiles of conventional ammunition. The participating States were called upon to finalize the Concept on Border Security and Management for the Ljubljana Ministerial Council and to strengthen the OSCE's capabilities for assisting States on border-related activities and policing, as well as to intensify the cooperation with other international organizations in order to avoid duplication and promote synergies for greater coordination and enhancing common understanding in finding solutions.

Chairman of the Forum of the Security Cooperation presented the Forum's activities, particularly stressing the area of non-proliferation in the context of the fight against terrorism and full implementation of the respective politico-military OSCE documents.

In the opening session the OSCE's work done so far was praised. Implementation of politico-military commitments remains central in OSCE's comprehensive confidence security building measures. It was proposed that further enhancing of security should be achieved also by focusing more on human rights and fundamental freedoms, democracy and rule of law. Several delegations called upon OSCE intensification of conflict settlement efforts, including border and human rights monitoring activities and implementation of agreements, as well as all OSCE and other internationally agreed principles and commitments. Some delegations emphasized the importance of women in conflict prevention and crisis management. By urging participating States to focus on UN Resolution 1325 implementation with regard to gender mainstreaming, the delegations expressed the expectations on a certain follow up in Ljubljana Ministerial Council.

In working session on preventing and combating terrorism delegations welcomed the adoption of the Ministerial statement on the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism. While praising the OSCE role in fighting terrorism, leading role of the UN was recognized. In this respect most delegations highly valued the work done by Action against Terrorism Unit. Human rights, humanitarian law, refugee law and rule of law in general were stressed by several delegations as being central in fight against terrorism and ODIHR having an important role in this endeavour.

Delegations agreed on importance of closer international co-operation, including in the legal field. Several delegations have in this respect called for a uniform approach in

dealing with perpetrators. One delegation stressed that terrorism is not linked to a particular religion or region. Many concrete suggestions and proposals aimed at capacity building were tabled.

Working session on comprehensive security touched upon the role of the OSCE and reform needed to better adapt to new security challenges and threats. The concept of comprehensive security of the OSCE as well as its balanced, cross-dimensional approach has been widely reconfirmed and recognised to be a well-suited method of addressing the future challenges in the OSCE area. The reform of the OSCE is considered as a point of departure for a thorough re-assessment of the goals as well as of the means and tools of the OSCE. Nevertheless, the OSCE is not to be necessarily viewed as being in a major crisis, as many substantial and important achievements can be enumerated. In this context, the report by the Panel of Eminent Persons is much awaited.

The OSCE continues to play a key role not only in early warning and conflict prevention, but also in peaceful conflict resolution and post-conflict rehabilitation. As one of the first organizations with experience in the area of civil field activities, the OSCE is well suited to develop further civilian tools for post-conflict rehabilitation by interaction or collaboration with other relevant international organizations/institutions.

It was stressed that the CSBMs have been and will be important instruments for strengthening security and stability in the OSCE area. The role of arms control/soft security tools for preventing and contributing to resolution of conflicts continues to deserve special attention. Beside the CSBMs enshrined in the VD 99, tailor-made regional and sub-regional CSBMs will be necessary, and it will be important to draw upon the many lessons learned in this OSCE field of activity. In order to strengthen and complement the existing acquis of arms control instruments of the OSCE, the adaptation, if necessary, of the relevant instruments may be a possible way forward taking into account the recent reforms of security policies and doctrinal evolutions in the OSCE area.

Working session on enhancing co-operation and synergy with international organizations and institutions focused on the OSCE cooperation with UN, NATO, EU, CoE, CIS and CSTO. Complementarity was stressed as a desirable goal. In achieving this goal each of organizations should know their strengths and comparative advantages. Sub-regional level of cooperation in the spirit of subsidiarity was stressed as important one. Examples of cooperation were presented that might serve as a model as well as specific recommendations were made in that respect. Some delegations have argued for more strategic outlook and more structured cooperation between international organizations.

For a first time ever a joint side event for Mediterranean and Asian Partners for Co-operation was held. It focused on the enhanced cooperation to address the potential spill-over of security threats between adjacent regions, as well as voluntary implementation of OSCE principles and commitments by Partners.

A number of proposals and suggestions were presented by the keynote speakers and the participants during the Conference. It is up to the participating States to take initiative and work further on them. The Chair will be instrumental in these deliberations.

WORKING SESSION I: Preventing and combating terrorism

- Co-ordinator: Ambassador Jivan Tabibian, Permanent Representative of the Republic of Armenia to the OSCE
- Rapporteur: Jörn Beißert, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Germany to the OSCE
- Keynote Speakers: Evelyn Puxley, Acting Senior Coordinator, International Crime and Terrorism, Department of Foreign Affairs, Canada
- Stefano Dambruoso, Counter-Terrorism Judge, Italy
- Major-General Almas Abdylmanov, Deputy Chairman of Chiefs of Joint Staff, Republic of Kazakhstan

In his introduction the Co-ordinator, Ambassador Tabibian, underlined that one had to distinguish between prevention and interdiction of terrorism. Prevention was a much wider concept than interdiction. Prevention was only successful if there were no more people who were willing to undertake terrorist activities. He also distinguished between several levels of activities in the fight against terrorism:

- internal activities of the participating States
- bilateral and multilateral activities of the participating States
- OSCE commitments which engage participating States
- Activities which are actively taken forward by the OSCE, e. g. in the fields of training, assistance and awareness raising
- OSCE activities in order to protect itself from the terrorist threat

The purpose of the session was to take stock of past OSCE activities, to analyze its present actions and to gather recommendations about what the organization ought to be doing in the future.

In her keynote address **Evelyn Puxley**, Acting Senior Coordinator, International Crime and Terrorism, Department of Foreign Affairs, Canada, called for a more strategic and comprehensive approach to counter the threat of international terrorism, a threat that was more decentralised, “at home” throughout the OSCE region, and one which tempted States to undermine the very values we seek to defend. She emphasized that in the fight against terrorism the participating States had to adhere to their commitments under international law, especially in the field of human rights, refugee law and humanitarian law. It was also important that fundamental checks and balances in the democratic systems of the participating States continued to function. Otherwise, States would not be successful in combating terrorism but rather could enable the recruitment of additional terrorists. In particular it was essential to avoid the use of disproportionate force or the denial of fundamental rights such as freedom of expression and peaceful assembly. Ms. Puxley also urged participating States to continue and intensify co-operative action. She commended the OSCE’s Action Against Terrorism Unit (ATU) and encouraged it to pursue its activities in

the fields of enhancing legal co-operation in criminal matters related to terrorism; the ratification and implementation of the twelve Universal Anti-terrorism Conventions and Protocols, container-security capacity building, travel document security, and to address emerging threats such as that posed by the availability of radioactive materials. However, the OSCE should also address the factors that create an environment in which extremism can flourish. With its three-dimensional approach the OSCE was exceptionally well placed to make an important contribution to prevent the development of breeding grounds for terrorism. A commitment by OSCE States and Partners to work to agree this fall the draft Comprehensive Convention on Terrorism would be an important signal to the broader international community.

Major General **Almas Abdylmanov**, Deputy Chairman of Chiefs of Joint Staff, Republic of Kazakhstan, commended the OSCE for its contribution in the fight against terrorism. However, there was a need to further intensify co-operation among participating States. In the fight against terrorism the adherence to international law was of paramount importance. In this context he urged the participating States to ratify and implement the Universal Anti-terrorism Conventions and Protocols as soon as possible. The international community should develop consensus on the definition of terrorism and formulate guidelines on how to strike the right balance between countering terrorism and the protection of human rights. Major General Abdylmanov welcomed the work of the ATU and urged the Forum for Security Co-operation to intensify its efforts. It was important to include the States west of Vienna into OSCE efforts to fight terrorism, even if there were no OSCE presences in them. He also welcomed the proposals of the Secretary-General of the OSCE to re-organize the Secretariat so that all security-related units are regrouped in one department.

Stefano Dambruoso, a Counter-Terrorism Judge from Italy, focussed on shortcomings in the field of international legal co-operation. The differences between legal traditions and legal and investigation practices led to loopholes which perpetrators of terrorist acts could exploit. The sharing of intelligence, in particular, was an area which was especially sensitive and often problematic. He called for further efforts to facilitate international legal co-operation. He also emphasized that in many States bureaucracies were far too slow and cumbersome. Whereas perpetrators were developing efficient networks, States were finding it increasingly more difficult to coordinate the activities of the different authorities involved in the fight against terrorism.

In the discussion the leading role of the United Nations system in the fight against terrorism was recognized. Many delegations emphasized the importance of ratifying and implementing the Universal Anti-terrorism Conventions and Protocols and welcomed the Ministerial Declaration committing the participating States to sign the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism on the first day on which it is open for signature. Several delegations urged the international community to exert more efforts to conclude a universal convention containing a definition of terrorism.

There was general agreement that closer international co-operation, also in the field of legal co-operation, was desirable. In this context several delegations called for a uniform approach of all participating States to deal with perpetrators of terrorist acts. A participating State declared its readiness to provide his experience in the field of international legal co-operation.

Many delegations underlined the importance of adhering to international law, especially human rights, refugee law and humanitarian law. The fight against terrorism should not be used as a pretext to undermine human rights, to harass opposition forces or even to torture suspects or resort to cruel and inhumane punishments. It would be counterproductive to strike a balance between human rights and the need for increased security. On the contrary, the respect for human rights should be at the centre of any strategy for the fight against terrorism. Only through the respect of human rights States could create an environment in which terrorism had no space to develop. The role of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) was indispensable in this regard.

The efforts of the OSCE to prevent and combat terrorism, in particular the activities of the ATU in the fields of the ratification and implementation of the 12 Universal Anti-terrorism Conventions and Protocols, travel documents, legal co-operation and container security, were commended by most delegations.

One delegation put special emphasis on the fact that terrorism could not be equated with one particular religion or region.

The following recommendations were made:

- Regional workshops on the respect of human rights in the fight against terrorism should be held.
- The OSCE and its participating States should continue their efforts aimed at the ratification and implementation of the 12 Universal Anti-terrorism Conventions and Protocols. Participating States should fulfil their OSCE commitments regarding the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism.
- The OSCE should increase its efforts to address the various factors – economic, social, civil and political – which may create conditions in which extremism and terrorism may flourish.
- The OSCE should assist participating States in the implementation of relevant UN Security Council Resolutions.
- Work on Ministerial Council decisions regarding the threat of radioactive sources and on the implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1540 should be pursued.
- The OSCE should work with the UN's 1267 Committee to implement the UN SC Resolution 1267 sanctions regime -- including as regards movement of terrorists and their access to arms -- into its work on border security and policing.
- The OSCE should seek to formalise its endorsement of the Council of Europe's Guidelines on Human Rights and the Fight against Terrorism.
- The OSCE should continue its follow up on the Maastricht Ministerial Council decision on container security.
- OSCE participating States and Partners should work this fall to agree the draft Comprehensive Convention on Terrorism, including a definition of terrorism.
- The OSCE should complete its Border Security and Management Concept by the meeting of the Ministerial Council in Ljubljana.

- Participating States should intensify their efforts to facilitate international legal cooperation. The OSCE could promote the UNODC software package on legal assistance and extradition, including through training.
- The OSCE should undertake a sustained effort in technical assistance allowing participating States to fulfil their commitments related to the fight against terrorism. It could also support the UNODC project on technical assistance on strengthening the legal regime against terrorism.
- The accountability of the participating States for their commitments in the fight against terrorism should be strengthened, e. g. through the provision of annual reports.
- In conformity with OSCE commitments participating States should make available to ODIHR information on legislation regarding the compensation of victims.
- It should be explored, how civil society and mass media in the fight against terrorism could better support States in the fight against terrorism.
- The OSCE should continue to intensify its cooperation with other international organisations active in the fight against terrorism.

WORKING SESSION 2: Comprehensive security

- Co-ordinator: Ambassador Lamberto Zannier, Director, OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre
- Rapporteur: Captain Thomas Schmidt, Switzerland
- Keynote speakers: Ulrich Brandenburg, Deputy Political Director, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Germany
- Ambassador Carlos Pascual, US Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization, Department of State, United States of America
- Colonel Mladen Nakić, Head of Croatian Verification Centre, Croatia

Keynote speeches

In the first keynote speech, **Mr Brandenburg** stated at the beginning that the past year had been a challenging one for the OSCE. This review conference would be the right time to take stock of the security situation in the OSCE area in the year 2005 and to ask just how much progress has been made. He said that the blockage of a key security organization for at least the second year in a row had made the Euro-Atlantic area less secure than it was a year ago. The difficult phase that the OSCE had gone through in recent years had reached the point where all achievements of the past 30 years – achievements reached through consensus and an unparalleled process of cooperation in the field of security policy – were being called into question. The crisis of the OSCE had now reached the point where the organization would be on the verge of irrelevance. All what had been achieved in the past twelve years and during the nearly 20 preceding years within the framework of the CSCE – through consensus and an unparalleled process of cooperation in the field of security policy – had now being called into question. The OSCE operated on the basis of a fundamental consensus of principles and obligations. If this consensus would be watered down, more than just the future of this organization would be in jeopardy. But if the OSCE were to continue to play a role in the cast of larger and wealthier international organizations it should build on its traditional strengths: early warning and conflict prevention, good offices and mediation in smouldering and violent conflicts, advocacy for national minorities (east and west of Vienna), and support in the core areas of democratization and the rule of law as well as arms control and disarmament. For the reform process, particularly in the light of the expected report by the “Panel of the Eminent Persons”, Mr Brandenburg proposed to proceed in three phases, namely:

- Stage 1: Inaugural conference at capital level after the OSCE summer recess. It should task two working groups: Working Group 1 addressing substantive issues of the three dimensions, including elections, while Working Group 2 addressing the issue of structural reforms in the Secretariat, institutions and field missions.
- Stage 2: Draft decisions to be referred to the capitals for consultations. At the same time, follow-up negotiations in the Permanent Council should be held in Vienna if necessary.

Stage 2 should conclude with a final conference – again at capital level – shortly before the beginning of the Ministerial Council meeting.

- Stage 3: Ministerial Council Meeting on 5 and 6 December. It should endorse the draft decisions as the outcome of the recommendations of the "Panel of Eminent Persons" and the follow-up consultation process.

The second keynote speaker, **Ambassador Pascual**, focussed at methods and tools “to stem conflict and manage its aftermath”, which would support the countries and people involved in making choices about their economies, political systems and security arrangements. He reminded that the UN, EU, and a number of OSCE participating States were all considering or already implementing their own structural changes to anticipate and manage conflicts that call for international intervention. The OSCE had clearly demonstrated through its actions the importance and payoffs of sustained focus on preventing conflict and building peace. He shed light on various examples, such as Albania, Croatia, South Serbia, Kosovo and Bosnia-Herzegovina for which the OSCE contributed substantially and sustainably to peace, democracy and stability in this area. The following lessons learned could be drawn from these experiences:

- Before engaging in a massive effort to reconstruct a country’s governing institutions, the international community should establish realistic goals, pragmatic strategies, yet flexible tactics.
- International engagement should support the transition from direct action to building capacity.
- Missions and mandates should be co-ordinated with international partners.
- Most important: “The rule of law is crucial to build trust and the environment for reconciliation.”

The speaker then dealt with examples which could expand OSCE’s capacity among the participating States and foster co-operation with other international partners. He in particular dealt with the Center of Excellence for Stability Police Units (COESPU) in Vicenza, a project hosted by Italy and supported by the United States designed to build on the experience and expertise of the Carabinieri, Gendarmerie and other similar forces in order to develop units in other nations. Forging a partnership with this COESPU, the OSCE could profit and play a stronger role in helping to address a critical shortfall in international peace support capacity. The speaker concluded by stressing that taking such steps toward concerted action, the international community could develop the means to better anticipate, avert, and address conflicts.

In the third keynote entitled “South Eastern Europe – Re-building Stability and Confidence - Croatian Perspective –“, **Colonel Nakić** recalled the Agreement on Sub-Regional Arms Control as a legally binding document signed by the Parties Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia, Serbia and Montenegro (thus named since February 2003), the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Republika Srpska, guided by the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Annex 1-B, Agreement on Regional Stabilisation, Article IV). This important agreement showed clearly that the good practices of bilateral and multilateral co-operation of armed forces representatives in the

region were not only reached through the implementation of VD 99, but also through its ongoing implementation. One of the major tasks accomplished by the implementation of this document was the destruction of 7,368 items of various weapons' categories. Interestingly, the development of Arms Control in the sub-region had started even before combat operations came to an end. The Republic of Croatia became an active participant of the Vienna Document as early as 1994. Concerning APMs, Croatia had destroyed 199,000 pieces since the accession to the Ottawa Convention in 1998. Consistent with this convention's provisions, it retained 7,000 items for its own purposes. The speaker stressed that another aspect of improving regional security in the area of Arms Control was the bilateral agreement between the governments of the Republic of Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (since February 2003 with the state name "Serbia and Montenegro"). On December 10, 2002 the Protocol on Interim Regime along the Southern Border of these two States was signed. Annex VI of the Protocol defined the process of demilitarization of the territory along the state borders and the verification system itself. The process of demilitarization was completed in 2004 with 200 objects destroyed and re-assigned on both sides. He then also highlighted RACVIAC, the Regional Arms Control Verification and Implementation Assistance Center which was established in October 2000 in the framework of the Stability Pact for South East Europe, Working Table III. The project was initiated in the middle of 1999 at the level of bilateral negotiations of representatives of national verification centres of the Republic of Germany and the Republic of Croatia. Today, 21 participating States are involved with its representatives. During almost five years of its existence it has organized important seminars, courses and meetings and thus provided useful assistance in many fields of the military, in particular with regard to arms control in South East Europe. The speaker stated that "Arms Control in SEE should not rely on Dayton Agreement as much as it did. It should more and more rely on agreements at European and regional level. By means of Arms Control, the region should prove that it would not need a special security regime. On the contrary, we should prove that it can be harmlessly integrated into European security system." He concluded by saying that arms control centres should serve as additional tools to provide better mutual understanding and to prevent undesirable consequences on security and stability in general.

Discussion

Beginning the lively discussion, one delegation supported the proposal of Ambassador Pascual in engaging with the co-ordination between the OSCE and COESPU. A closer co-operation between peacekeeping forces and the civilian police would be welcomed particularly in the Western Balkans. In its initial phase the COESPU activities were focused mainly on Africa, while seven countries have already been approached for the first course (Cameroon, India, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Morocco, and Senegal). COESPU would welcome further support and co-operation.

Another delegation was of the view that military field operations should be complemented by non-military, civilian means and tools, reminding that most of EU-led operations are of a civilian nature. The OSCE with its great experience is well placed to deploy civil forces in war torn, transitional countries of the Balkans. Therefore, the co-operation with COESPU should be encouraged. Furthermore the OSCE should focus on the following issues: a) doctrinal work; b) home work (national level); c) networking (co-ordinated approach and synergies).

Another delegation reaffirmed the significance and importance of the comprehensive approach to security and its tools arms control, CSBMs and the adapted CFE Treaty. However, there would not be much reason for being too optimistic as the effects of recent military actions (Afghanistan, Iraq, etc.) have created instability rather than an increase of global security. Potential problems arising by unilateral actions of NATO could be avoided by a ratification of the adapted CFE Treaty. This delegation also warned about possible cataclysms and upheavals in the “Post-Soviet Area” if further measures to strengthening arms control would not be implemented. Global and regional stability could only be achieved if everybody were to subscribe to a “common security platform” of arms control and CSBM, which should be constantly adapted to the new realities. This delegation also stated that the actual VD 99 and CFE Treaty were ill suited to the new challenges. In the past they had been more of a military and strategic nature, nowadays they were rather political and psychological. The adapted CFE Treaty should therefore swiftly be ratified. In the light of the EU- and NATO-enlargement, the perspective of a simplification of the VD 99 in favour of a more rapid reaction should be envisaged. Also the possibility of a harmonization of arms control regimes in the light of a common European security space should be considered.

One delegation shared Mr Brandenburg’s perception of the challenges the OSCE had been facing and the OSCE’s false concentration on institutional and procedural aspects instead of focussing on substantial aspects. Also, very little progress was made with regard to the solution of frozen conflicts (Moldova, Caucasus). The risk that those regions may turn to other organisations for seeking assistance would be imminent. The comparative advantage of the OSCE for conflict related issues would lie in particularly areas: conflict prevention and post-conflict rehabilitation. This delegation said that it awaited with interest the report of the “High Level Panel of Eminent Persons”, not as a supplementary food for thought but as concrete way forward to be implemented without delay.

Mr Brandenburg replied to some aforementioned issues that even if the reform process may be heavily capital-oriented, Vienna should substantially contribute with inputs. No time should be lost anymore. Therefore, the summer recess should be used to accelerate the whole process. Concerning SALW, the OSCE seems to be the leader. But adaptations in the field of brokering as well as a review of the SALW document could seem useful, as well as an extra effort in order to adopt the UN achievements in the field of marking and tracing.

Another delegation agreed with the opinion voiced that no significant progress has been made in relation to unresolved conflicts in the OSCE area. An urgent need would persist to demilitarize and stabilize the political status of the regions concerned. The OSCE would have the capacities and resources for improving the relevant situation. The concept of a comprehensive and indivisible security could not wait any longer to be finally translated into reality.

One delegation stressed the need for developing civilian crisis management instruments, especially in the light of frozen conflicts. The OSCE would be more than ever an adequate forum for conflict resolution. Simultaneously, attention should be given to the implementation and fulfilment of the Istanbul commitments 1999. The OSCE would be needed more than ever as a clearing house for assistance requests and their implementation. VD 99 with its CSBMs continued to promote confidence and predictability. Supplementary CSBMs however should be need-driven only. In the areas of preventing and combating terrorism, non-proliferation and controlling radioactive materials, the OSCE had certainly a major role to play. The broad and comprehensive approach of security of the OSCE through

the promotion of human rights and the rule of law, without omitting environmental and economical aspects, would be valuable and well-suited to address future threats and challenges.

The representative of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly stated, *inter alia*, that parliamentarians, as being “the direct link to our citizens, responsible for adapting national legislations and the collective mediator between the OSCE and the participating States”, should be more involved. Therefore a closer co-operation between the fora of the OSCE and the Parliamentary Assembly would be welcomed.

One delegation underlined the importance of the OSCE being an organization of States with equal rights and duties, also with regard to the full implementation of the commitments, and supported the aforementioned need to be in the service not only of States, but also for the peoples and citizens. It underlined the importance and validity of the comprehensive, indivisible and co-operative security approach of the OSCE. The same delegation asked questions how to address the shortcomings concerning the dysfunctions of the OSCE in matters of agenda-setting, co-operation between relevant working fora, and criteria for deciding when sub-regional/regional arms control measures have fulfilled their function.

Ambassador Pascual and Mr Brandenburg both agreed upon the fact that OSCE should still be considered as a useful and important organisation. The OSCE, as a normative and standard-setting institution had built up significant instruments, structures and realized numerous achievements. One of the many comparative advantages would be the consensual action towards inside. Too much time has been invested for endless discussions about “the future of the OSCE”. Now it would urgently be the time to translate those conclusions into reality. Much expectation lies with the work of the "High Level Panel of Eminent Persons" which will address the past “anarchical” growth of the OSCE.

Ambassador Pascual emphasized that the fulfilment of the Istanbul commitments 1999 was key condition to bring about progress towards ratification of the adapted CFE Treaty. He then identified three essentials of the concept of comprehensive security: a) The future role of arms control, including the issue of the ratification of the adapted CFE Treaty; b) particular attention to upholding the rule of law; c) promoting good governance and strong democratic practices. Furthermore, time would be ripe to co-ordinate the efforts made by the participating States for building up civilian crisis management capabilities in the OSCE. COESPU could be an excellent operational partner.

With regard to a question raised by one delegation, whether regional/sub-regional CSBMs and arms control regimes should be continued in the Balkans, or whether OSCE-wide CSBMs and arms control would be sufficient, Colonel Nakić answered that both levels would complement each other and would therefore be valuable and useful. The example of Prevlaka peninsula showed that local CSBMs as well as the cross-dimensional approach of comprehensive security is a precondition to establish effective border control and to setup the region for economical activities such as tourism after the closure of the UN Mission.

One delegation supported the views of Colonel Nakić on the security in South-Eastern Europe, considering regional CSBMs as an essential tool for stability and confidence in that area (i.e. Prevlaka).

One delegation reminded that despite the apparent deadlock substantial achievements have been accomplished recently by the OSCE. The machinery works well, but needs to be adapted ("skinning of the snake"), including to respond positively to NATO and EU - both enlarged and expanding into typical OSCE activities. Positive developments in security led to a logical shift of emphasis to the Human Dimension which should however not be detrimental to the unique three-dimensional structure of the OSCE. Some rebalancing might therefore be required. The Report of the "High Level Panel on Eminent Persons" will be a useful contribution to this task to which the delegations should add their input before decisions are taken by capitals. The agreement of holding of a military doctrine seminar is very welcome - to adapt the security work of the OSCE to the new security architecture, to new power relations and challenges. The word "Market Democracy", used by Amb. Pascal reminds of the fact that a huge military-industrial complex was always seen as a possible threat to democracy and peace. It requires vigilance - as democracy must not be for sale.

Another delegation deplored the absence of tangible results in the resolution of frozen conflicts in the OSCE area, and emphasized the urgent need to address issues like ethnic-religious extremism and illegal activities. Therefore, concerted efforts should concentrate on fostering norms and principles of the international community within recognized borders of states. The delegation expressed the view that the ASRC 2006 should be more practical, needs-driven, as well as focusing on regional issues instead of being more academic and theoretical like the current one.

One delegation made reference to the notion of "uncontrolled territories" in the Caucasus, denying that there wasn't any "lack of control", but uncertainty and dispute about whom may be authorized to control them. The delegation referred further to the C/OSCE Helsinki Decalogue and criticized the "pick and choose" behaviour of some participating States recalling paragraph 8 of the "Principles" ("Equal rights and self-determination of peoples"). Concerning the reform process of the OSCE, the same delegation argued that too many positions of the participating States appear pre-cooked, thus asphyxiating an open and constructive dialogue as well as pre-empting a consensual decision-shaping and -making. The same delegation identified the actual crisis of legitimacy of the OSCE as the result of a "wobbling pluralist equilibrium". It awaits the results of the "High Panel on Eminent Persons" with a "cautious cynicism".

One delegation agreed with the more optimistic approach voiced by the US Ambassador during the opening session rather than with the view expressed by Mr. Brandenburg. Beside the discussions about the means, there should be one about the ends of the OSCE as well. There should be consensus about the wish and the need to achieve consensus. Therefore all participating States must agree on this principle in order to avoid that the OSCE becomes a block. Moreover, the delegation highlighted the future relevance of CSBM and arms control.

One delegation underlined that the comprehensive approach to security of the OSCE has become an "indispensable tenet in today's deliberations on security". It expected a follow-up to its proposal on "prior notification of major military activities". It expressed its view that the adapted CFE Treaty should come into force without further delay and hoped that circumstances would soon allow the finalization of the ratification process. It stressed the importance of efforts aimed at curbing illicit transfer of SALW, in particular the development of effective export control regimes. It mentioned the destruction of 5,180 SALW on 3 June as well as the construction of an ammunition and mine disposing facility to be completed in

2006. Finally, it referred to the visits it had been organizing on 13 – 17 June in the framework of the VD 99.

Another delegation stressed that the OSCE was still a main player in matters of security. That is why the OSCE should focus its efforts, play to its strengths, improve its resource management and avoid endless and unproductive discussions about its future.

One delegation argued for a more consequent monitoring and implementation as an essential requirement with regard to ongoing work related to paragraphs 10 and 15 of the "OSCE Strategy to Address Threats to Security in the Twenty-First Century". No dilemma should be constructed in respecting all the principles, in particular those fostering human rights as well as the rule of law/international humanitarian law, when combating terrorism. The Code of Conduct (paragraph 7) recalls that the principles of the Helsinki Final Act are all of primary significance and have to be equally and unreservedly applied. Important work has been already done with regard to paragraphs 6, 9 and 19.

Summary

The many deliberations during this working session can be summarized as follows:

The concept of comprehensive security of the OSCE as well as its balanced multi-dimensional approach has been widely reconfirmed and recognised to be a well-suited method of addressing the future challenges in the OSCE area.

The way forward: The reform of the OSCE is considered as a point of departure for a thorough re-assessment of the goals as well as of the means and tools of the OSCE. Nevertheless, according to many the OSCE is not to be necessarily viewed as being in a major crisis, as many substantial and important achievements can be enumerated, and as constructive dialogue is taking place every day among the participating States. On the other hand, it is imperative to move forward in the delicate process of transformation, the re-consideration of priorities and the adaptation to the new challenges and threats to security in the twenty-first century. In this context, the reflections and suggestions of the "High Level Panel of Eminent Persons" are much awaited.

Conflicts: The OSCE continues to play a key role not only in early warning and conflict prevention, but also in peaceful conflict resolution and post-conflict rehabilitation. As one of the first organizations with experience in the area of civil field activities, the OSCE is well suited to develop further civilian tools for post-conflict rehabilitation by interaction or collaboration with other relevant international organizations/institutions, including in particular in the field of promoting adherence to the rule of law.

Arms control, including CSBMs and disarmament: They have been and will be important instruments for strengthening security and stability in the OSCE area. The role of arms control/soft security tools for preventing and contributing to resolution of regional conflicts continue to deserve special attention. Beside the CSBMs enshrined in the VD 99, tailor-made regional and sub-regional CSBMs will be necessary, and it will be important to draw upon the many lessons learned in this OSCE field of activity. In order to strengthen and complement the existing acquis of arms control instruments of the OSCE, the adaptation, if necessary, of the relevant instruments may be a possible way forward taking into account the recent reforms of security policies and doctrinal evolutions in the OSCE area.

WORKING SESSION 3: Enhancing co-operation and synergy with international organizations and institutions

- Co-ordinator: H.E. Ambassador Zef Mazi, Albania
- Rapporteur: Ms. Martina Huber, OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre
- Keynote Speakers: Piotr Switalski, Under Secretary of State, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Poland
- Philippe Carré, Director General for Strategic Affairs, Security and Disarmament, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, France
- Ambassador Alexander Grushko, Director of European Cooperation Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Russian Federation

In his opening remarks, the Co-ordinator, Ambassador Mazi, outlined the dynamic changes that had occurred with respect to co-operation with International Organisations and Institutions (IO/Is) in OSCE area. The session could bring this issue to a higher political level. It could focus on co-operation with partners such as the UN, the EU, NATO, and the Council of Europe (CoE), in fields such as sharing of information at different stages of crisis, mutual support in negotiating processes, sharing of expertise, sharing and division of labour.

The first keynote speaker, **Mr. Switalski**, remarked on the need for international organisations to listen to and consult with member states. He saw three main planes for improving OSCE co-operation with international actors:

1. Political level: The architecture of IO/Is was complicated by three factors: (i) the future of the EU, in particular its foreign, security and defence policies, and continuous enlargement; (ii) the future of NATO, which also was undergoing internal reform; and (iii) the value gap or proximity between the institutionalised Euroatlantic area and Russia, which led to different interpretations of common values.
2. On a conceptual level, the value foundation of IO/Is needed to be revisited and possibilities for division of labour explored. So far, there were few ideas of how to arrange unity of purpose and action.
3. The OSCE should enhance efforts at subsidiarity. Promoting sub regional frameworks, e.g. in the Caucasus and Central Asia, offered a constructive approach to problem-solving. The OSCE should not just aim at projecting stability, but initiate joint activities addressing joint challenges.

Finally, Mr. Switalski pointed out the room for technical improvements of co-operation mechanisms, e.g. common documents containing meaningful contents, mutual liaison offices, joint working groups. The OSCE Secretariat should take the lead in developing a strategy addressing all levels of co-operation (field, missions).

The second keynote speaker, **Mr. Carré**, stressed the need for international organisations to be aware of their specific and distinct characteristics. The concept of mutually reinforcing and interlocking institutions was still relevant. With reforms ongoing, earlier divisions of tasks among organisations were no longer apparent. New institutions had enlarged their membership and activities. This had blurred the profile of the OSCE and led to a crisis of confidence. However, the OSCE succeeded in adapting to the radically changed security situation.

According to him, the originality of OSCE principally lied in the organisation's

1. Broad concept of security and its flexibility.
2. Emphasis on co-operation.
3. Creation of a common, tangible forum where participating States could discuss issues of concern independently of other affiliations.
4. OSCE field presences, which were accepted by the host states.
5. Ability to facilitate sub regional activities. Co-operation within OSCE should be encouraged.

Mr. Carré also pointed to some dangers facing the OSCE in the context of reorientation: The OSCE should not aim at emulating other organisations; this would only further stimulate “forum-shopping”. Much rather, the OSCE should recall its specific background as the organisation was built on a partnership with participating States and its recognition as a regional organisation under Chapter VIII of the UN Charter. Institutions were not interchangeable, nor was there an overall master plan for dividing up tasks. The OSCE should probe its actions on the basis of subsidiarity considering whether it was up to the OSCE to intervene, and, if so, if it should intervene alone, as a leader or as a backing organisation.

Mr. Grushko, the third keynote speaker, highlighted the lack of a single definitive security structure. The OSCE offered a flexible mechanism to develop co-operation, which should take into account the areas of activities by organisations such as the Commonwealth of Independent States and the Shanghai Co-operation Organization.

A specific field where OSCE had its own value was the politico-military dimension. At the same time, arms control measures had to be improved, modernised and account for tendencies and changes in military structures. Furthermore, OSCE efforts to implement Security Council resolution 1540 were crucial.

Other organisations should not be seen as competitors but equal partners. Therefore, the OSCE should engage in joint stocktaking exercises and create a mechanism for coordinating activities. The PC meeting at CoE Summit could set an example for interinstitutional co-operation. The idea of a summit of summits of European organisations and institutions would be a further, harmonic step within this effort.

Discussion

The discussion reflected on some aspects of co-operation and ideas for improvement introduced by the speakers. It was generally hoped that ideas for improvement would feed into the ongoing reform process.

Delegations generally recognised complementarity as the overriding goal of co-operation. Asymmetric capacities created potential for synergies that should be realised in the spirit of partnership, not competition. The OSCE should play to its specific strengths and comparative advantage. This would enable a more comprehensive and rational approach to managing risks. Furthermore, the concern for avoiding duplication should not serve as an excuse for inaction. Overlap was still preferable to “underlap”.

Security sector reform was mentioned as one area of comparative advantage. The OSCE was able to add substantive value to this cross dimensional task, which addressed key elements identified in the OSCE Strategy to Address Threats to Security and Stability in the 21st Century (“Strategy”). Furthermore, the field presences constituted an advantage that made the OSCE an attractive co-operation partner, e.g. concerning SALW and Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition. Where there was no field presence, the OSCE should not try to compete with other organisations.

The Strategy provided strategic direction to OSCE activities and opened new possibilities for co-operation. However, as illustrated by the background document, co-operation still takes place in a piecemeal fashion and should be further strategised, e.g. through the Platform for Security Co-operation.

One delegation cautioned that the convergence in threat perceptions and world views should not be taken simply at face value. This was particularly important in the context of efforts to promote “common values”. Ways of implementing such values should not be left completely to the arbitrariness of states, another delegation stressed.

Most participating States agreed that the modalities for co-operation should be enhanced and further structured. A number of delegations called for a mechanism facilitating meaningful interorganisational relationships. The co-operation group recently established with the CoE was referred to as a model that could be replicated together with the EU, NATO and other organisations in the Eurasian region. A more structured form of co-operation would make the OSCE also a more attractive partner. The ENVSEC initiative illustrated the benefits of a more structured and institutionalised coordination process, and could be applied within other dimensions.

Enhancing liaison and analytical capacity offered opportunities of further institutionalising co-operation. This would imply revising the organisational structure of the OSCE, possibly along the suggestions made by former Secretary-General Jan Kubis.

One delegation raised the OSCE’s lacking legal capacity as factor limiting co-operation.

As threats to security often originated from beyond the OSCE area, the need to co-operate with partners and regional organisations was recognised. The interest of the African Union in OSCE politico-military expertise as well as co-operation with ATU was mentioned explicitly. In order to inform participating States better on activities conducted by partners, the idea of a newsletter was launched.

One delegation stressed that international co-operation had greatest impact if it was well focused, coordinated and considerate of the perspective of the host country. Subsidiarity

needed to be increased for the sake of sustainability and genuine co-operation. Coordination should extend to IO/Is as well as different sectors of society. While similarly remarking on the own institutional interest of international actors, another delegation concluded that, should the OSCE wish to compete in a turf war with other organisations, it had to share in the political process of defining and constructing its role and services.

Various examples and practical experiences of co-operation were mentioned in the discussion, highlighting the importance of OSCE field missions: in Kosovo, concerning border management, CSBMs and sub regional agreements, joint monitoring of sanctions and arms control in South Eastern Europe, complementary expert collaboration on SALW and Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition, war crime trial monitoring etc. Reflections on these and other experiences might usefully enable co-operation in other fields and regions.

A number of international partner organisations (UN CTC, CIS, UNODC, NATO) outlined the scope of their co-operation with OSCE, and pointed out specific areas requiring further, strengthened co-operation.

Reacting to the debate, Mr. Switalski emphasised the usefulness of the OSCE as a forum for developing new forms of co-operation on a thematic basis. The OSCE had become a strong organisation due to its solid documents, serious efforts of implementing them, and fora for interesting discussions. Therefore, the OSCE should not fence itself off, but be open to co-operation. According to Mr. Grushko, the globalisation of risks required a response from all organisations. It was up to the participating States to ensure effective coordination. While the aspiration of security and peace was a widely recognised value, means to approach this value may differ.

**SIDE EVENT WITH THE MEDITERRANEAN AND ASIAN PARTNERS
FOR CO-OPERATION: Promoting dialogue and co-operation between
OSCE Partners and participating States in the politico-military dimension:
Assessment and possibilities for increased interaction and implementation**

Coordinators: Ambassador Bertrand De Crombrugghe, Permanent Representative of
Belgium to the OSCE

Ambassador Ivo Petrov, Permanent Representative of the Republic of
Bulgaria to the OSCE,

Rapporteur: Fabrizio Scarpa, External Co-operation Officer, OSCE Secretariat

On 22 June 2005, a side event with OSCE's Partners for Co-operation took place in the margins of the OSCE Annual Security Review Conference. The meeting was chaired by Ambassador Bertrand de Crombrugghe and Ambassador Ivo Petrov, Chairmen of the Contact Group with the Mediterranean and Asian Partners respectively.

In his welcome address, the Chairman of the Mediterranean Contact Group, Ambassador De Crombrugghe called the side event an important new step in the co-operation between the OSCE and its Partner States. For the first time, a side event for the OSCE's Partners for Co-operation was held in the context of the OSCE's ASRC. It was also the first joint event with the Asian and Mediterranean Partners. Referring to some proposals for discussion contained in a joint background paper distributed by Bulgaria and Belgium (PC.DEL/577/05), the Chairman listed some areas where co-operation could be intensified.

The Chairman of the Asian Contact Group, Ambassador Petrov, also underscored that it was the first Joint APC-MPC side event at the ASRC. He looked forward to a debate on the basis of tools such as the Vienna Document, the Härkönen Report, the UN Security Council Decision 1373 and PC Decision No. 617 on Further Measures to Suppress Terrorist Financing.

In the ensuing discussion, several Partners for Co-operation briefed the audience on their national endeavors in the fight against terrorism. There was a commonly shared interest in enhancing co-operation in the fight against terrorism. A comprehensive approach was favored by all the countries that took the floor. Several concrete proposals were made for the promotion of the dialogue and co-operation between the OSCE Partners and the participating States in the politico-military dimension:

- Several Partners expressed their interest in enhancing the co-operation between the OSCE and the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF). Sharing experience and expertise would be useful in order to cope not only with the new threats of the politico-military dimension such as terrorism, small arms and light weapons, but also with those of the human dimension, such as trafficking in human beings.
- On the same issue of combating terrorism, one Partner State suggested organizing an expert workshop or joint OSCE-UNODC meeting in one of the Mediterranean Partner States.

- Expanding ATU's Inventory of Capacity Building Programs related to Anti-Terrorism by including the Capacity Building Programs undertaken in the individual Partner States was suggested as a useful measure.
- Another instrument in the fight against terrorism could be the establishment of closer contacts between the national committees or focal points dealing with terrorism in the OSCE participating States and the OSCE Partner States.
- One Partner suggested that Partners for Co-operation should be invited more frequently to the meetings of the Forum for Security Co-operation.
- One Partner pleaded for closer co-operation in police and border management training.

After the statements of the Partner States, three participating States took the floor. One delegation expressed satisfaction at the growing dynamism of the dialogue between the OSCE and its Partner States. The delegation referred to the report on the implementation of PC.DEC/571 as a flexible tool for more concrete proposals for enhancing the co-operation. It was convinced that many of today's security threats and challenges were shared and that they would bring the OSCE and its Partners together rather than divide them. The delegation invited all the Partners to the commemoration of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act in 1975, and announced the publication of a booklet compiling OSCE commitments in the three dimensions.

Another participating State expressed satisfaction by the consensus, among the Partners, on the importance of anti-terrorism, but reminded participants of the need for an approach that balances the combat of terrorism against respect for human rights. He supported the idea of a joint seminar on anti-terrorism.

The idea of adding some addenda to the "OSCE Strategy to Address Threats to Security and Stability in the 21st Century" was explored by another delegation. The APCs and the MPCs could customize the OSCE Strategy into their own set of interests and concerns. The OSCE participating States should open up all their resources that could help the Partners in this effort.

In his concluding remarks Amb. de Crombrughe highlighted the general consensus expressed by participants on the relevance of OSCE's comprehensive approach to security and on the fight against terrorism as a main issue of concern for the OSCE and its Partners alike, in that it affects values of democracy and needs a systematic and robust response. Implementation of international norms had also been highlighted. He also noted the consensus on the need to enhance co-operation with other regional organizations, in particular the ARF. Belgium would look into means of supporting implementation of the proposals made by participants. In his concluding remarks Amb. Petrov noted that the fact that almost all Partner States had taken the floor was an encouraging sign. He noted the consensus on the need to enhance co-operation between the OSCE and the ARF, and suggested the next OSCE conference in Asia could be held back-to-back with an ARF event, as was done at the 2003 OSCE-Japan Conference. He also expressed support for the proposal to hold a joint OSCE-UNODC event in the Mediterranean region. Finally, he invited all Partners to sign the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism, as recommended in MC.DD/2/05.

List of Proposals and Suggestions

No.	Task/reference
OPENING SESSION	
1.	Continue the work in non-proliferation and support the implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1540, e.g. by producing a draft for a decision on how the OSCE could contribute to supporting the implementation of resolution 1540.
2.	Continue the work in controlling the spread of SALW.
3.	Implement the documents on SALW and Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition.
4.	Finalize the Concept on Border Security and Management for the Ljubljana Ministerial Council and strengthen the OSCE's capabilities for assisting States on border-related activities and policing.
5.	Proactively follow up on the OSCE Gender Action Plan.
6.	Support local women's peace initiatives and processes for conflict resolution, and involve women in all the implementation mechanisms of peace agreements.
7.	Support the provision of appropriate gender-sensitive training for participants in peace-related operations.
8.	Encourage the appointment of more women to decision-making positions in the OSCE and peace-building missions, and set a goal for achieving gender balance in international missions, drawing on national rosters of qualified women.
9.	Stimulate efforts to improve women's turnout at elections by supporting the campaigns run by women's organisations and by highlighting the situation of women in public debate and the media.
10.	Intensify settlement efforts in implementing the agreement on a phased demilitarization of the conflict zone in South Ossetia, and conduct the meeting of high level representatives of the parties to the conflict as it was agreed at the JCC meeting.
11.	Activate efforts in effectively monitoring the human rights situation in the region of Abkhazia through the joint UN/OSCE Sokhumi Office and opening its branch in Gali District.
12.	Increase efforts to establish peace and cooperation between Armenian and Azerbaijani communities in the Nagorno-Karabakh region.
13.	Replace the existing peacekeeping forces with a multinational stabilization mission under an OSCE mandate, which include civil and military observers tasked to ensure peace and stability in the region, to stimulate and facilitate the settlement process.
PREVENTING AND COMBATING TERRORISM	
14.	Continue to address the issue of respect for human rights in the fight against terrorism.
15.	ODIHR to hold regional workshops on the respect of human rights in the fight against terrorism.
16.	Continue efforts aimed at the ratification and implementation of the 12 Universal Anti-terrorism Conventions and Protocols. Participating States should fulfil their OSCE commitments regarding the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism.
17.	Increase efforts to address the various factors – economic, social, civil and political – which may create conditions in which extremism and terrorism may flourish. In particular, the OSCE should continue to address intolerance and extremism.

18.	Assist participating States in the implementation of relevant UN Security Council Resolutions.
19.	Agree the draft Comprehensive Convention on Terrorism, including a definition of terrorism.
20.	Work on Ministerial Council decisions regarding the threat of radioactive sources and on the implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1540.
21.	Work with the UN's 1267 Committee to implement the UN SC Resolution 1267 sanctions regime - including as regards movement of terrorists and their access to arms - into its work on border security and policing.
22.	Continue to follow up on the Maastricht Ministerial Council decision on container security. ATU could broaden related work to include other aspects of infrastructure protection, e.g. covering the energy sector.
23.	Complete the Border Security and Management Concept by the meeting of the Ministerial Council in Ljubljana.
24.	Participating States should facilitate international legal co-operation. The OSCE could promote the UNODC software package on legal assistance and extradition, including through training.
25.	Undertake a sustained effort in technical assistance allowing participating States to fulfil their commitments related to the fight against terrorism. The OSCE could also support the UNODC project on technical assistance on strengthening the legal regime against terrorism.
26.	Travel Document Security: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organize regional/national workshops immediately to provide relevant authorities with the necessary expert recommendations in order to achieve full implementation of the Maastricht Ministerial commitment to comply with the ICAO minimum security standards. - ATU to follow up with the respective participating States to ensure the timely implementation of the expert recommendations and to respond to any needs for additional assistance. - Continue the work relating to the commitment to report lost and stolen travel documents to the Interpol Automated Search Facility/Stolen Passports Database.
27.	Include in the Bucharest and Bishkek plans of action to combat terrorism, the strengthening of the border and customs infrastructure, stepping up the control of migration and joint measures to combat illicit drug trafficking.
28.	Create an open-ended OSCE Permanent Council Working Group on Borders as a political framework for co-operation by the OSCE participating States and a possibility of regularly discussing topical questions connected with the security and openness of borders on a basis of equality.
29.	Elaborate a clear and well defined set of principles serving as a guideline for countries confronted with situations of force majeure and for their preventive anti-terrorist policies.
30.	Implement a set of measures to facilitate scientific co-operation in the investigation and analysis of crimes committed using computer technologies and also in the effective exchange of experience, legislation and methodologies for ensuring the security of information of the intelligence services of participating States.
31.	Involve the Counter-Terrorism Network within the OSCE in the implementation of the system for the exchange of information on military matters <i>through participation</i> in co-ordination, the conduct of seminars and training courses and the exchange of

	expert opinions.
32.	Create the position of a counter-terrorist officer (expert in the analysis of counter-terrorist activities), in each field mission and also to connect all these field missions to the Counter-Terrorist Network.
33.	Consider the need for transforming and strengthening the counter-terrorist presence of the OSCE in countries to the west of Vienna in which there are no field missions or OSCE centres.
34.	Participation by States in the Organization's counter-terrorism work should be on a regular and mandatory basis.
35.	The accountability of the participating States for their commitments in the fight against terrorism should be strengthened, e. g. through the provision of annual reports.
36.	Participating States should make available to ODIHR information on legislation regarding the compensation of victims.
37.	Explore how civil society and mass media in the fight against terrorism can better support States in the fight against terrorism.
38.	Intensify cooperation with other international organisations active in the fight against terrorism.
39.	Contribute to the creation of a high level co-ordination of anti-terrorist activities by individual countries and by international and regional organizations at the global level under the aegis of the United Nations Security Council and its Counter-Terrorism Committee.
40.	Increase co-operation between the "Centre of Excellence-Defence against Terrorism" and the OSCE.
41.	The ammunition and mine disposing facility is open to all participating States.
42.	Systematic and unrelenting efforts are needed to meet the existing obligations in the area of suppression of the financing of terrorism.
43.	Participating States to consider engaging with the "Center of Excellence-Defence Against Terrorism" in Ankara
44.	Seek to formalise endorsement of the Council of Europe's Guidelines on Human Rights and the Fight against Terrorism.
	COMPREHENSIVE SECURITY
45.	Launch a political consultation process following the report of the "Panel of Eminent Persons", culminating in the Ljubljana Ministerial Council (see suggested three-stage proposal).
46.	Form a partnership with the Centre of Excellence for Stability Police Units (COESPU), established by the G-8 and European countries, to help address the international deficit in trained personnel who can assist in rule of law efforts in post-conflict environments.
47.	Make more effective use of the mechanism of the rapid expert assistance and cooperation team, REACT, or the roster of experts built within the implementation of the OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons.
48.	Focus on the following fields of work in improving the mechanism of engagement of the civilian aspect of crisis management and post conflict reconstruction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Further develop concept for civilian crisis management. - On national level build the capacity of generating, training and sending civilian experts including police to crisis management operations. - Seek ways of a coordinated approach and building synergies among individual Euro-Atlantic security organizations in order to ensure rapid and effective action.

49.	Arms control in SEE should more and more rely on agreements at European and regional level.
50.	Arms Control Centres should serve as additional tools for governments to promote global international military cooperation in order to develop and improve highest possible level of security.
51.	Publicly portray arms control as a national security factor, also through the media.
52.	Improve efforts at solving “frozen conflicts” particularly by benefiting from synergies and cooperation with other international actors. The full implementation of 1999 Istanbul commitment would highly contribute to the resolution of conflicts in Georgia and Moldova.
53.	Reinforce the profile as a “clearing house” for request of assistance concerning the challenges caused by the excessive stocks of SALW and conventional ammunition.
54.	Any supplementary CSBMs should be need driven and serve the purpose of building confidence.
55.	The Azerbaijan PfP Trust Fund requires more financial support.
56.	Contribute to raising awareness on environmental aspects of military activities and serving as a catalyst for cooperation and assistance.
57.	Offer good offices in facilitating compliance with international law concerning the issues of countering terrorism, non proliferation or increasing safety and security of radioactive sources.
58.	Fully support the role of OSCE in promoting human security, politically and financially.
59.	Intensify concerted efforts in resolving unsettled conflicts on the basis of norms and principles of international law by reintegrating uncontrolled territories into the states which they are part of and ensuring that various ethnic groups live together in peace within internationally recognized borders of the states.
60.	Devote more attention during the ASRC to regional issues and specific cases on the ground.
	ENHANCING CO-OPERATION AND SYNERGY WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS
61.	Revisit the value foundation of IO/Is and explore possibilities for division of labour.
62.	Initiate joint activities addressing joint challenges in the spirit of subsidiarity.
63.	Take the lead in developing a strategy addressing all levels of co-operation, involving e.g. mutual liaison offices, joint working groups, meaningful common documents, etc.
64.	Enhance liaison and analytical capacity to further institutionalize co-operation.
65.	Co-operate with partners and regional organisations.
66.	Launch a newsletter in order to inform participating States better on activities conducted by partners.
67.	Co-operation of institutions should go beyond routine and emphasise concerted action in the field, as well as other recommendations made by Warsaw Reflection Group Towards Complementarity of European Institutions.
68.	Revisit the foundation of the concept of interlocking institutions, i.e. the idea of Europe whole and free based on common values. The OSCE should foster common values and not just serve as a platform for reconciling two different sets of values.
69.	Organise back-to-back summits around a central political theme as a first step in establishing a pragmatic and flexible system of cooperation and consultation.
70.	Support the concept of subsidiarity, e.g. in regions of the Black Sea, the Caspian Sea and Central Asia, as well as within Europe.
71.	Devote more resources to the shaping of the interface between Europe and adjacent areas.

72.	Take into account efforts of CIS, CSTO and Shanghai Co-operation Organization in Central Asia.
73.	Put in place a European Summit as a starting point for better coordinated efforts.
74.	Adapt arms control system to changes in the politico-military situation in Europe and throughout the world as well as trends in military organisation. A collective conceptual understanding should be generated of how to modernise pan-European arms control and CSBM regimes.
75.	Jointly take stock of overlapping areas in order to determine the optimal modus operandi and to create a flexible framework for coordination.
76.	Harmonise military policy, e.g. FSC to facilitate strategic guidelines for IOs to counter new threats.
77.	Use the OSCE's potential to enhance the implementation of Security Council resolution 1540.
78.	Elaborate a minimum standard set of legislative and law-enforcement measures necessary for the gradual transfer to the standards established by the resolution.
79.	Elaborate a document analysing contemporary practices in such areas as export and border control and controls on the financing of illicit trafficking in WMD-related technologies and materials.
80.	Organise a regional seminar on the resolution with a view to elaborating a co-ordinated position by the OSCE participating States with regard to the prospects for its implementation (taking into account Committee 1540's two-year mandate), and prepare a draft of a new United Nations Security Council resolution in this regard.
81.	Co-operate with other regional organizations to assist their members with the implementation of the resolution.
82.	Send an OSCE representative before the members of Committee 1540 to outline the Organization's potential contribution to the practical implementation of the resolution's provisions.
83.	Designate an OSCE contact point for co-operation with Committee 1540.
84.	All participating States should support the idea initiated by the delegation of France for the joint preparation with Russia of a ministerial statement on the International Convention on the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism.
85.	Participating States to support the IAEA's efforts and also to accede to and implement the IAEA Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources.
86.	SG role should be reinforced as to facilitate coherence.
87.	Facilitate sub regional co-operation.
88.	Establish a mechanism that consolidates co-operation in a more permanent and regulated form, e.g. along the lines of the Coordination Group between OSCE and CoE established during the Norwegian CoE chairmanship.
89.	Focus on OSCE comparative strengths, such as security sector reform, possibly drawing on expertise of the Norwegian Crisis Response Pool.
90.	Identify areas of co-operation and interaction with partner countries and neighbouring states.
91.	Support multi-institutional co-operation on border management in OSCE regions also beyond SEE.
92.	Consolidate knowledge and capabilities to fight terrorism and organised crime.
93.	Support coordination also among different sectors of society.
94.	Identify comparative advantages.
95.	Increase ownership of assistance.
96.	Establish a clear scheme for co-operation with IOs avoiding hierarchy, e.g. in form of an unofficial consultation mechanism.
97.	Encourage Mediterranean and Asian Partners for Co-operation to voluntarily

	implement OSCE documents.
98.	Streamline OSCE committee structure.
99.	Interact more closely with NATO, especially regarding SALW and conventional ammunition disposal.
100.	Review level of implementation of recommendations made during the ASRC.
101.	Improve coherence of OSCE action, e.g. by strengthening SG role.
102.	Further institutionalise co-operation with IOs, e.g. through mutual liaison offices at HQs.
103.	Seek initiative and not shy away from taking the lead in areas of strength.
	SIDE EVENT
104.	Enhance co-operation with partners in a comprehensive effort to fight terrorism.
105.	Enhance the co-operation between the OSCE and the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), e.g. sharing experience and expertise, holding an OSCE conference in Asia back-to-back with an ARF event.
106.	Organise an expert workshop or joint OSCE-UNODC meeting in one of the Mediterranean Partner States.
107.	Expand ATU's Inventory of Capacity Building Programs related to Anti-Terrorism by including the Capacity Building Programs undertaken in the individual Partner.
108.	Establish closer contacts between the national committees or focal points dealing with terrorism in the OSCE participating States and the OSCE Partner States
109.	Partners for Co-operation should be invited more frequently to the meetings of the Forum for Security.
110.	Co-operate more closely in police and border management training.
111.	Support PC in customizing the "OSCE Strategy to Address Threats to Security and Stability in the 21st Century" to their own set of interests and concerns.
112.	Partners to sign the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism, as recommended in MC.DD/2/05.
113.	OSCE to claim a lead role in assistance efforts only in cases where a mission is on the ground.