



AS (11) RP 1 E  
Original: English

## REPORT

FOR THE GENERAL COMMITTEE ON  
POLITICAL AFFAIRS AND SECURITY

Strengthening the OSCE's Effectiveness and Efficiency –  
A New Start After the Astana Summit

RAPPORTEUR  
Mr. Tonino Picula  
Croatia

BELGRADE, 6 JULY TO 10 JULY 2011

## **REPORT FOR THE GENERAL COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL AFFAIRS AND SECURITY**

**Rapporteur: Mr. Tonino Picula (Croatia)**

Last year, Kazakhstan held the Chairmanship of the OSCE. For the first time, the OSCE was led by a country which was once a part of the former Soviet Union. This in itself was a major development in the Organization's history, as was the fact that Kazakhstan hosted the first OSCE Summit since 1999.

Although the Astana Summit opened a window of opportunity for the renewed commitment to our Organization, its basic problems and challenges remain resistant to good will or true political aims. It would be excellent if a list of these problems could be accompanied by a list of solutions. That would make a significant difference in the region which aspires to create a security community.

The OSCE is the world's most unique security organization, founded on the platform of the Soviet and Western détente in the 1970's in an environment of growing awareness that armed conflict on the European continent would inevitably lead to a highly hazardous global conflict.

With its unique composition and comprehensive security concept as well as its crisis prevention and management capacities, the OSCE still has great potential and a relevant role to play in the region from Vancouver to Vladivostok facing new security challenges. Our Organization is well placed as a forum for discussions on a new European Security Architecture or a common security community. The political commitments made in the Helsinki Final Act and the Charter of Paris as well as in other CSCE/OSCE documents are of great value, and the fact that participating States reconfirmed these at the Astana Summit is crucial. Now is the time yet again to deliver at a more practical level and to promote implementation of our decisions.

Since the founding of the Organization, the security environment has radically changed and improved. As a unique security organization, the OSCE should continue in a more decisive manner with the development of the concept of comprehensive security that can be reached exclusively through dialogue and cooperation among the participating States, and not through hegemony or through a balance of power.

It is evident already that the uneven pace of inclusion and disparities in economic growth and democratic development has led to the emergence of new problems in achieving comprehensive security. The OSCE's goal is to prevent the emergence of new dividing lines and to promote concepts which bring the nations and countries together.

The OSCE's definition of security is broader than the political and military aspects, because the Organization believes that potential causes of instability and insecurity lie also in the disruption of interethnic, economic and ecological relations.

An organization has to confirm its identity through initiating and bonding the activities against the new multidimensional threats to security, not only to European security, but to

the security of a significantly broadened, transcontinental union of 56 States and the neighbouring areas.

The recent financial crisis has confirmed the interdependence of all parts of the world. Although it is not correct to say that there are no local or regional crises any more, these crises are having an increasing impact on the global situation. The crises are less and less connected to isolated incidents, but are more symptomatic of the weaknesses of the global system. Security today is more important because of its social, economic, energy and ecological dimension. For example, in the past three years, unrest caused by food scarcity has broken out in more than 60 countries. The United Nations estimates that the world population could grow from today's seven to over nine billion by 2050. This could increase today's level of demand for food production by 70 per cent.

Global food prices continue to rise. The World Bank's food price index increased by 15 per cent between October 2010 and January 2011, and is only 3 per cent below its 2008 peak. As a result of price increases since June 2010, estimates show that there is a net increase in extreme poverty of about 44 million people in low- and middle-income countries.

In many countries, the global price increase on wheat has been transferred to domestic wheat-related products. For instance, between June 2010 and December 2010, the price of wheat increased by large amounts in Kyrgyzstan (54 per cent), Tajikistan (37 per cent), Azerbaijan (24 per cent) and Afghanistan (19 per cent).

All these forecasts should motivate us for joint action, as their consequences certainly would not spare our area.

The OSCE needs a new strategic approach (that will not be limited to conflict prevention or mediation in conflicts, but) which will also assist participating States in living together in a world with an understanding that having stable, democratic neighbors helps security. The goal should be to create a multilateral and not multipolar space from Vancouver to Vladivostok.

After the end of the current economic crisis, the international order will be much more fragmented with greater potential for conflict. The OSCE must develop its response to this situation: in Astana the participating States have committed themselves to work for the creation of a security community, free of dividing lines and threat of force. This goal is certainly shared by all, but it must be created by ideas and substance. The state of play in the context of the evolving Euro-Asian security landscape confirms both the limits to and absolute need for the OSCE.

But unlike some other security organizations, the OSCE does not have armed forces or means of its own to directly pursue peace. For the most part, the OSCE uses preventive diplomacy. This includes arms control, building trust and confidence between countries, monitoring the state of human rights, observing, organizing and conducting elections, as well as monitoring economic and ecological relations.

Many would say that the OSCE is in a crisis: In transitioning from a conference to an organization, the OSCE has struggled to find its place in the context of other international organizations such as NATO, Council of Europe and the UN. In addition to this, the

Organization has been unable to reach consensus on important decisions, which has seriously hampered its ability to take action on important matters particularly on conflict resolution. The failure to extend the mandate of the OSCE Missions in Georgia in 2008-2009 and now most recently in Belarus, due to the use of the one-country veto, is one of the recent proofs of this problem. In addition, the late adoption of a decision to introduce a civil police mechanism in Kyrgyzstan is proof that improvements and reforms are still needed.

The suspension of the implementation of the CFE Treaty, the unresolved protracted conflicts and 2008 war in Georgia are some examples and a reminder of the challenges that the OSCE has to deal with within its security dimension. So are new threats like terrorism, threats of ecological disasters and insecure border areas, such as those with Afghanistan. Each of these issues is problematic on its own, but the inter-linkage between them complicates matters enormously and affects the overall ability of our Organization to act.

To be more precise the crisis of the OSCE is first and foremost political. It is clear that structural reforms will not solve the main political problems that only participating States can address. The Organization's capacity is only as strong as the collective political will of its 56 participating States. However, structural reforms could help promote willingness and overcome stalemates where they are most needed.

The informal discussions in the so-called Corfu Process served the OSCE well, and many very good ideas were presented. It is important to continue this dialogue under the direct political leadership of the actual Chairmanship with the assistance of the Secretariat and political backing of the Troika. Lithuania deserves our support and appreciation for the work it is launching until the Vilnius Ministerial Conference. The OSCE made political progress; it is now important to keep the momentum going and not close this window of opportunity without fully benefitting from it.

Dialogue should continue in the following areas:

The OSCE needs to strengthen its activities in the field of security; however, this cannot be done at the expense of the human dimension or to the detriment of basic OSCE values and principles. Human rights need to be like the force of gravity; they have to be valid universally in every corner of the globe.

The comprehensive security concept is the main strength of the OSCE, and it should make better use of this. The OSCE could benefit from offering to share its values and experience beyond the OSCE area to neighbouring areas that influence security in the OSCE area. Security in the OSCE area is indivisibly linked to the stability and security of the neighbouring regions: Afghanistan, Middle East, and South Mediterranean. The OSCE should remain prepared to consider invitations to contribute as appropriate to the development of security and democracy, particularly in Partners for Co-operation and neighboring States, and in special case outside the OSCE area. The recent expression of interest by Tunisia and Egypt is an encouraging sign. This should be done while reinforcing the OSCE's strategic cooperation with the EU, NATO, and the UN.

Besides the OSCE there are many other international organizations dealing with global cooperation, and they often duplicate each other's work. It would be productive to examine

how to eliminate overlap, and enhance co-ordination, because duplication often creates confusion, delay and enormous waste.

The security dimension should be expanded by further elaborating the Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security, increasing the role of the Forum for Security Co-operation and updating the Vienna Document.

Although the CFE Treaty negotiations take place outside of the OSCE, arms control issues remain vital for the Organization. A new impetus is needed in the ongoing negotiations on a framework for future negotiations in order to strengthen and modernize the conventional arms control regime in Europe.

The OSCE can claim a lead role in addressing issues within the four phases of the 'conflict cycle': early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation. In this field, all political efforts should be made within the OSCE to settle the unresolved conflicts in Nagorno Karabakh, as well as in Moldova and Georgia. The leaders of the countries directly involved in these conflicts have a special responsibility in the respective peace processes, but they clearly need continuous support and assistance from the international community; the OSCE is the place for this. The OSCE PA also has a role to play through Working Groups and Special Representatives in keeping these conflicts high on the agenda, fostering dialogue and their resolution. Each of the protracted conflicts deserves our full engagement, but especially worrying are increased tensions around the Nagorno Karabakh.

With regard to the structural questions within the OSCE:

The role of the OSCE Secretary General should be strengthened. The Secretary General should be able to speak for the Organization and to make policy pronouncements, as well as appropriate criticisms when OSCE commitments are not observed. In this respect, a political figure would be best suited for the post of Secretary General.

The OSCE should improve its rapid reaction capability to be able to live up to its mandate in situations, like the recent crisis in Kyrgyzstan.

The OSCE should improve its ability to make timely decisions through adjusting its decision-making procedure. The consensus rules need to be modified at least for decisions related to personnel, budget and administration.

The budget must be adopted in a timely fashion every year, and in addition, a multi-year financial plan would help the OSCE pursue longer term strategies.

Transparency and accountability can be improved by requiring that a country which blocks or holds up consensus must do so openly and be prepared to defend their position publicly.

The OSCE Parliamentary Assembly should play a more active role and be better utilized by the governmental branch. Our mutual relations and co-operation should be reinforced in a period ahead of us, benefiting also from new appointments in key positions of the Secretariat.

In conclusion, it would be good if in the future the OSCE's area of activity could be rephrased from the popular saying of "East and West of Vienna" into "Before and After Astana." However, the true confirmation of the value of this modification can only be provided by the power of our vision and the efficiency of its implementation in the forthcoming period.