



IPI Speaker Series

Moderator:

Warren Hoge

IPI Senior Adviser for External Relations

Speakers:

Lamberto Zannier

Secretary-General of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)

International Peace Institute
777 United Nations Plaza

September 23, 2011

Transcript edited by IPI

Warren Hoge:

Good afternoon. I'm Warren Hoge, IPI Senior Adviser for External Relations. I'm standing in momentarily for our President Terje Rod-Larsen who was called to the UN because of the ongoing debate over the application for Palestinian statehood that has been delivered to Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon today. And indeed Mahmoud Abbas is just finishing or just has finished his address to the General Assembly right now. So I suspect Terje will come back and join us by mid way.

But in his behalf, let me say IPI welcomes you and thanks you for coming here today during this very busy week, not to mention today's lousy weather. It's my pleasure today to introduce Lamberto Zannier, Secretary-General of the Organization for Secured in Cooperation in Europe, commonly referred to as the OSCE.

Ambassador Zannier took up his post only this July 1st. But he's no newcomer to the OSCE since he was the Director of the OSCE's Conflict Prevention Center from 2002 to 2006. Prior to taking up his current position, he was Head of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo, or UNMIK. The 56-nation, three-continent OSCE is a regional arrangement of the United Nations under Chapter Eight of the Charter and specialized in conflict prevention, particularly in the post-Soviet space and the Balkans. Its Secretariat in Vienna is located just five minutes from IPI's Vienna office.

IPI has a close relationship with the OSCE. This year, the institute is supporting Lithuania's Chairmanship of the organization, particularly following up from the Astana Summit in December last year, which provided a new perspective for the Pan-European organization. So Mr. Secretary-General, thank you for coming and

we look forward to your remarks.

Lamberto Zannier:

Thank you very much for your nice introductory words, Warren. And very happy to be here today. I would like to thank IPI and you Warren present the Terje Rod-Larsen for the kind invitation and opportunities given to me today, also the very good cooperation that we have established with IPI. The support that IPI has given to the Lithuanian Chairmanship has been instrumental in helping the organization move ahead in its own internal reflection and contributing, it seems to me, in a very good way to preparing some of the initial decision that we expect to be able to adopt at the Minister meeting in Vilnius in December.

So I would like today to touch on two, three general issues and trying to put them in context of the evolution of the European Security, where the OSCE is today, why is it still a relevant player, what other things we're doing, and what are the key challenges in front of us. So what is, how do we position ourselves in the light of the evolving security challenges?

Let me start by referring to a concept that emerged from the Astana Summit we had last December. At this gathering of Heads of State and government agreed on a number of, I think, important concepts. One of them, a vision of the OSCE as a security community. In fact I will quote the language agreed by them which is a vision of a free democratic, common and indivisible Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian security community rooted and agreed to bring supposed shared commitments and common goals. In this short sentence epitomizes a number of important elements and principles for the OSCE to operate.

First of all, what is a security community itself? It's recognition that the states cannot be secure at the expense of others in the community. It means common principles, common behaviors, shared values, what Helsinki stood for, which remains, if you want the core still set of values, principals which the organization operates.

And I think it should be looked in two different ways. One, what the community does for itself. The community that has developed a number of tools to address internal problems, to address the boundaries of conflicts. The problems related to transition. To address the problem of perceived or existing security imbalances. The other is, which has developed over time, is a community of states that have come together to see how they can best react in addressing external challenges in an increasingly globalized world where there is a need for a common policy towards these new interconnection security problems that emerge from outside. Looking at terrorism, looking at border issues, etc, and having to develop new tools.

Now why the OSCE? And what has the OSCE to offer? One of the issues sometimes I come across in terms of questions that are asked to me when I meet with groups of students for instance, is why do we need the OSCE? We have the European Union; we have NATO, what is the difference today? And the difference is quite visible if you think well. The EU is a group of countries that do share a very strong political agenda, a very strong integration agenda that come together and that want to move in the same direction. NATO, in a similar way, brings together countries that share a vision and an agenda at the defense level.

But the OSCE is broader than all that. In the OSCE you have countries that have different political priorities, different security or defense agendas. It is a larger framework within which countries in fact, with different objectives and different agendas confront each other and try to solve their problems by using this agreed

set of principles, norms and commitments. So it is comprehensive. It addresses this large community. And because the community is large, it encompasses different dimensions. There's a Euro-Atlantic dimension, there's a Eurasian dimension, and there's even now an increasing attention to the Mediterranean perspective. And there are discussions that will refer to that in a minute on what the OSCE can do in relation to developments in that area.

On the borders of the OSCE region. The OSCE approach to security is a comprehensive approach as you will know, that stretches across dimensions, the traditional political military dimensional security, economic and developmental one, and the human security. And the approach is an approach that is basically intergovernmental. Because it's an organization in which there is an interaction in governments that look at their own security issues, their own priorities, etc.

But because of this broad agenda, the OSCE is also looking at other levels. It's looking at the security of the individuals, at the dignity of the individual and their fundamental freedoms. Working with individuals improves security within countries and more broadly. And then it's looking also at the other end of the spectrum if you want, at a regional level, and the interaction between the various actors within the region and with the external partners.

The center of this process of looking at responses to the security concerns, there is a continuing process of dialogue. The dialogue is, I think a key engine if you want for the OSCE. It is the tool through which the organization gets a sense of what are the issues that are really important for the countries. What are, where are the priorities? What are the issues what need, we need to focus. It's important because it provides an early warning to the organization. And it has been debated for the organization then, to develop tools to respond to these early signals of warning in a mode that is very much oriented towards conflict prevention.

In my practical activities, I started very early; very recently as you pointed out, I've seen already how the organization works in these areas. I've been involved in opening the new session of the so-called forum for security cooperation which is one of the traditional forums within the OSCE which is a forum led in this period by Kazakhstan. And the Minister of Defense of Kazakhstan was present. There was the Director of the UN office in Geneva who attended bringing in a bit, UN side of security and helping us link with the United Nations in our planning for a program on enhancing our own political military security tools.

I was in Prague to open the economic forum. There is a big discussion there on energy securities, one of the issues that feature prominently on the agenda on many of our countries in Europe, and where there is a discussion about establishing a task force that will focus on the set of issues that the OSCE can best deal with in moving forward on this set of questions. I will be going, as soon as I go back to Vienna, immediately to Warsaw to open the Human Dimension Implementation Meeting which will be the opportunity for us to look at the state of implementation of commitments in the Human Dimension.

But they also have interaction with partners within the organization discussing a little bit their own priorities, their own vision of the organization, but also with external partners. I was in Egypt. I met with the new Secretary-General of the Arab League. And I found him very interested in developing relations with OSCE in a very pragmatic manner, developing also MOU's and trying to structure them at the institutional level, but then looking at how we can interact from the ground.

The OSCE has developed quite an experience in transition and assisting in phases of transition in Europe and Central Asia, very different environment. And every transition process is different. But a number of valuable lessons have been learned in this process. And this kind of lessons can be shared with countries that go through similar processes. And in areas adjacent to the OSCE area, it is even more relevant. So there's something there that can be offered.

But the OSCE also offers itself, a model for other organization. The Arab League, for instance, seems to be looking for a more operational role for itself. So it is also looking at how we, in the OSCE, have gone about these problems. What tools we have developed, what tools could be replicated by other international organizations. So it becomes a little bit of a model on how we operated in our own environment for other regional arrangements, then to consider adjusting to their own situation and to potentially replicate in certain areas. Conflict prevention is very much the center of the activities of the organization.

The organization has evolved a lot from the time of Helsinki. We've come from a phase in which the Cold War security was a zero sum game and the participating states were really having a very, how can I say, an approach based on security gains which would correspond to security losses from the other side. And we moved from that situation to one where we had to deal with authorization, and we had to develop a number of new tools. That's the phase in which we created the institutions, where we created the Secretariat, the Conflict Prevention Center, ODE, the representative of the media, the High Commission for National Minorities, creating tools to help countries implement those basic norms, principles, commitments that they had agreed upon in Helsinki.

In a phase of transition where the OSCE had to also learn how to deal with situations where we had to operate within failed states or deal with conflicts that arose as a consequence of these aggregations of the larger entities such as the Soviet Union or the former Yugoslavia. And then a third phase started, and we can say after the eleventh of September 2001, when we started looking at more global challenges. And terrorists being the first, and then looking at issues such as trafficking human beings, drugs, the security of borders, and developing new tools to address these issues. This changed also the mode of operation within the organization. Because we moved from a situation where there was a continuing confrontation between the various players to a situation where the various players realized that security was no longer necessarily a zero sum game. When developing tools to address terrorism for instance, across the OSCE area, through a shared vision of what needs to be done to assist in developing legislation, developing capacities etc., would in fact increase the security of everybody. And that also created a new dynamic within the organization that was superimposed if you want, on what existed earlier. And this has expanded a lot the agenda of the organization.

To the point that one of the problems we face now is really trying to regroup on some of the core issues. And the point that the agenda becomes too much we pick and choose one, if I can be a bit critical, some of the things that I'm seeing from my perspective. Working on conflict prevention has a cost. I saw that also when I was in the Conflict Prevention Center. The cost for that is the visibility of the organization. Operating conflict prevention requires very often a very low-key approach. It doesn't require resources, but requires a lot of patience and it is very difficult to market the results. It is very difficult even to recognize the results of it.

There are a number of very interesting operations that the OSCE has conducted. I could think of one, and I see some colleagues, some foreign colleagues I see,

that were involved in some of these operations. In for instance, in the Caucasus when he had the border monitoring operation between the Chech and the segment of the Russian border and the Georgian border. And we were monitoring the movement of potential Chechen rebels across the border at the time when Georgia and Russia were accusing each other in that regard. And we could really play a role of mediation that helped really lower the temperature and diffuse a crisis that most likely would have taken place.

Of course it is very difficult to argue after that fact that there would have been a crisis had we not been there and that we had a key role in diffusing it. But that's the nature of the game. And it is important. I was yesterday, at the meeting of the Security Council where there was a discussion about the need of using more of the tools of preventing preventive diplomacy. Because it is cheaper and obviously it saves lives whenever this succeeds. And it is an area where closer interaction between the various actors is essential. The UN and regional organization among themselves. So the advantage of focusing on conflict prevention is that you don't need many resources. And the OSCE is a cheap organization.

Before the OSCE I was in Kosovo leading a UN operation there. When I started in 2008, my budget for that operation in Kosovo was higher than the entire budget of the OSCE today. And if you think the budget of the OSCE today cover the Secretariat, the institutions I mentioned earlier, 17 field operations, some of them, the one in Kosovo is larger than the UN mission I left when I left Kosovo. So there is an impressive difference in a way.

Investing conflict prevention, when one says, "One ounce of prevention saves you," what is it? "A pound in crisis management." It's even more than that probably as we see on some of the complicated conflicts. But certainly it is a good area for the international community to invest in and it is an where we need to look at each others experiences and see how we can maximize the results of preventive diplomacy and conflict prevention activities. It is an area where I myself, coming now from the UN, I intend to engage personally with the United Nations and with the Secretary-General to try to develop as much as possible this interaction and this role between organizations, regional organizations.

And this brings us back to what I was saying earlier also about sharing lessons, sharing not only the tools, but also the lessons with other parts of the world. I found rather prominent on the agenda of the organization, discussion on both on Afghanistan and on North Africa.

On Afghanistan, the OSCE has been involved in the past. There's been a bit of electoral observation. There is a quite active role of, quite active function of training of Customs Officers. We have a border management college in Dushanbe, Tajikistan which is used to train tragic border guards, but also operates regionally and also involves Afghan personnel. We train more than 100 Afghan border guards. We are now restructuring and strengthening this function. But we are also looking at the regional dynamics. And we intend to take full part in the political processes, the Istanbul Conference coming up towards the end of the year, to see how can we better plug into the larger effort by the international community, how we can strengthen the role, the part of the region that is part of the OSCE area, so the Central Asian countries in that, looking at how we can also play to strengthen and to contribute to initiatives such as the Synthroid Initiative, looking at economic development, the area contributing to that. So there already we are monitoring, observing and developing a number of tools to give our own contribution.

In North Africa, where we see the processional transitional beginning, we have certainly accumulated expertise. And most of the countries there are partners of the OSCE so we have dialogue with them. And the context of this dialogue, we discuss possible areas for us to cooperate with them. Of course they're not full member states. So we cannot do that on the basis of the agreed concepts and principals of the OSCE. But certainly the partnership has a meaning in itself. These countries are interested in what we are doing, are observing closely how the OSCE operated in dealing with transition within the OSCE area. They're interested in seeing what are the lessons learned, what are the best practices, but also what capacity we have in terms of assisting them. Capacity building, for instance, started training some Egyptian NGO's in election monitoring. And we think this could be beneficial for the processes that are coming up in Egypt. Parliamentary Assembly is sending a team of Parliamentary observers to Tunisian. A team headed by an Italian parliamentarian who is the Vice President of the assembly to monitor elections there as a contribution also to these processes. So there are now a number of areas where we can contribute them.

Perhaps also there we should move in a direction that also creates a better framework and a more agreed framework for us to intervene. There are some really encourage us to really think in terms of looking at the Mediterranean dimension of the OSCE, which is the dimension that goes back to the Helsinki charter. In terms of a possible subset of norms, or a framework within which we can operate, they could be closely attached to the OSCE and could serve as a vehicle also to propagate some of the key of the OSCE in this area. Recognizing a principle, once again was discussed and agreed in Astana, which is a principle of security in North Africa being inexplicably linked as Heads of State put it, with the security of Europe.

So as we continue to operate as a regional organization, adapting ourselves, developing new tools, we are also looking at how to develop our own relationship with the external side of the organization. Because we do perceive the challenges of the security problems in the area outside of the organization, can affect also, the security of our own member states. So this is the new, if you want, the new horizons that are opening up. And some of the themes that will be discussed at our ministerial meeting and venues at the end of the year. Looking at this in terms of general introduction and then perhaps we can discuss some of the points.

Hoge:

Thank you very much. That was a broad and comprehensive look at an extraordinarily broad and comprehensive set of concerns and interests and a budget that is not as broad as the agenda is, as you pointed out. I think I'm going to invite you to come sit here. And we're going to open it up to questions. But I have a few questions of my own beforehand. One of them, you mentioned sort of early on, Nagorno-Karabakh, and that puts me in mind of Transnistria. And since my background is being a daily journalist, I'd like to ask you about things that are happening right now. And there was a meeting yesterday in Moscow, it was a meeting about the so-called 5+2 talks, and interestingly one of the five is the OSCE. Otherwise it is countries and territories. And the two is the EU and the US. But I wanted to ask you what the outcome of that meeting was. This is a meeting aimed at resuming the 5+2 talks. Did it succeed and can this advance the cause of settlement in that area?

Zannier:

Sure. This was a relatively recent breakthrough we saw. There was a meeting on confidence building measures on Transnistria in Germany, in Bad Reichenhall a few weeks ago. That meeting created an opportunity for a direct engagement

between the Moldovan Prime Minister and the Transnistrian President Smirnov. And the result of that was an agreement to meet in Moscow to discuss the way forward on the negotiation. There were all some of the players there, our Chairmanship, and there were the mission for the OSCE, but also the Russians and the Germans was very important.

And as a result, this meeting took place informally in, but in this format in Moscow on the 22nd. And the agreement is that the organizations will resume. That in itself is a very important political indication as well. Because these negotiations were suspended since 2006 I think. So it is a resumption of the process that was in itself frozen. There are some very concrete issues on the agenda which progress, if there is the political wheel that could take place. And that would be a basis for movement or it's evolution of the issue of the time. But I think that's good news. What we'll see is positive and there is hope that we are seeing real progress toward solving one of the protracting conflicts in the OSCE.

Hoge: Okay. Secretary-General, you mentioned, I mentioned in my introduction and you mentioned in your talk, your time in Kosovo. Obviously that's a situation we pay a lot of attention to here in the UN community. Can you tell us a bit about how you see the situation in Kosovo now, how it will evolve the next few years, and also what the UN's continuing role there will be.

Zannier: In Kosovo?

Hoge: Yes.

Zannier: The Kosovo issue is first of all, a political one. It's a matter of recognition of Kosovo as member of the international community or lack thereof. Kosovo is being recognized by an increasingly large number of member states of the United Nations. But still it's not recognized by Serbia and by a number of other important members of the Security Council and the international community. So the international community is still divided. What is really significant in this is the lack of understanding between Kosovo and Serbia on some very fundamental issues revolving around the status of Kosovo. So what is needed is an understanding on this point and an understanding between Kosovo and Serbia which will then allow also the international community to move on the Kosovo issue. This process of dialogue is continuing through a negotiation that is now mediated by the European Union. I think it has to be the European Union that forms control because the European perspective for Serbia, and over time for Kosovo, is key in this process. But in the meantime, this is not something the Europeans can do alone. There is a need for a larger presence. There is a need for a presence of the United Nations. Because resolution 1244 is valid. And the presence of a UN mission guarantees the continued implementation of the resolution as agreed by the Security Council. Until that changes, the UN must remain involved to guarantee a status of international legality.

And the OSCE is operating under the fold of this resolution still as a pillar of the UN, looking at very concrete issues on the ground. Looking at the needs of the communities and working with the people to avoid any crisis of large proportions. What we are seeing in the north now is a very specific subset of problems. And that's really related to the effort by the Kosovo institutions to reach out in an area which is predominantly Serb dominated and there is resistance to that. And the way forward is obviously through dialogue and association, not through force. But unfortunately, there is a mix of the two, and over time forces apply, the reactions are violent, and this will prove a crisis.

Hoge: Does something like the recent arrest of Ratko Mladić have an effect on that process?

Zannier: Indirectly, yes. In the sense that it helps Serbia move closer to the European Union. And the more obstacles are removed on the part of Serbia towards the European Union, the better chance, I think, the international community. The Europeans have also to make progress on the Kosovo issue.

Warrant Hoge: Well I'd like to turn this over to questions from the floor. And we'll start with Derek. Derek Solomon, please identify yourself.

Derek Solomon: Derek Solomon, Columbia University. I wonder whether the OSCE actually acts as the conscience of its member states? Not all members of OSCE take human rights, press freedom, human security equally serious. Say in Russia for example, where you may ask are they always living up to Helsinki standards. Now I wonder where the OSCE, as it's tasked to either quietly or even more publicly raise eyebrows when the behavior of some of its member states crosses the Helsinki lines?

Hoge: I think I'll let you answer that now okay?

Zannier: Yes now, you could portray it like that. At the end of the day, the member states are the ones who develop these principals, these norms, these benchmarks if you want. And it's up to them also to define their own behavior. That's why there is this style up in the organization. It gets pretty lively at times on, including on issues of this nature. So it is part of the process.

And now there is a big discussion, as you may have seen on the observation of the elections in Russia. That's also part of that process. The fact that those commitments are there gives an opportunity, gives leverage to the international community to part of the international and regional community wants to see progress in that area, to push for more.

And the notion is a bit that we mentioned early, the security goes beyond arms control or hard security. It really, human security is very much part of that. And so there is a wide spread perception within the organization that the way one country deals with human rights and fundamental freedoms within its own fold, does have a repercussion externally also on the others. And so that's part of the dynamics of the organization. That because the organization has also links with the civil society, this also creates repercussions outside the governmental process which is positive. And something I've said myself, after taking office, is that we need to relink better to the civil society. We need the support of the civil society for the activities we carry out. And it is good to have a group of friends outside that assist us and encourage us. But one is also to take into account the need not to be over selective. The agenda of the organization and the approach to security is a very comprehensive one as I point out earlier. So human rights is one part of the equation and you need to look at all aspects of that.

Pim Valdre: Thank you. Pim Valdre from IPI. You mention at the outset of your presentation that you've struck up a dialogue with the new Secretary-General of the Arab League, al-Arabi, on whether the OSCE offers a model for the Arab nations in terms of security corporation and conflict prevention. My question would be do you sense that there's a greater appetite among Arab nations right now in the wake of the Arab spring, for such a new regional security corporation mechanism in the region? And my second question would be, there are elections coming up in Krygyzstan on the 30th of October and we heard as late as this morning from

the Foreign Minister of Krygyzstan that they are starting to prepare for what that could mean in terms of interethnic violence or election related violence. I'd like to know what the OSCE is doing on that front. Thank you.

Zannier:

Well on the first point, I found a lot to be very interested in looking at how we operate in some of our procedures and those at establishing closer links with us as I said. I really don't want to comment on issues that really are relevant, are not directly relevant for my organization, but my feeling is that there are different views in the Arab world on what the role could be for their own regional set-ups. But what I saw is that the Arabs seem to have the ambition of wanting to strengthen the role of the Arab League. Whether it's getting enough backing from his own constituency on that, it's really an issue I wouldn't want to comment on that. But as I say, he seems to be ambitious and to want to do more, and to want to have more tools to intervene in a cooperative way, looking a little bit at the OSCE, how the OSCE does it. Its own way, in its own area.

On Krygyzstan, yes I met President al-Arabi yesterday. I will be traveling to Krygyzstan in a couple of week's time before the elections to look at the situation. I think it's important for the international community to pass clear messages in this phase. It is an important phase of transition for Krygystan, it's important they get it right, and they make an effort to do that. I was very encouraged from what I've heard from the President. But I have to say, we need really to stay very committed. It is important that we have a good observation of the election, that we give a sense that the international community is there and is really helping and assisting in this process. But we need also to work with the security structures. We have in the OSCE; we have a pretty large program which is called a Community Security Initiative, a program of training but more importantly mentoring the police in its own activities. Because the way the police acts or reacts especially with the minority communities may be critical in terms of maintaining the degree of stability in a phase, as we all know, phase of transition aren't always the most sensitive or delicate ones. So that's where we need to be prepared and we need to be ready to give a hand.

Hoge:

Secretary-General, you mentioned in your comment you were contrasting the OSCE with NATO and the EU. And your point was that NATO and the EU is, they have shared visions, they're communities of a certain sameness, and that the EU, 56 countries, three continents, had widely varying priorities with in your mix. And yet I think I understand correctly, you reach decision by consensus, yes? I guess my question is, sometimes that kind of diversity can lead to gridlock as easy as it can lead to big decision. How do you avoid that?

Zannier:

That has been a debate that comes and goes with the OSCE around the base of consensus. You know some of the big players do have influence, if you mention EU for instance, I consider the EU as a player in the organization at this point, but the OSCE is more than just the US, the EU, Russia, Turkey, it's also a large number of countries that have maybe an association agreements with one or the other, part of other structures, whether it's NATO, whether it's CIS, or the CST, or it's a, but they have very strong national agendas. And they struggle to find a forum where they can really make their voice heard in the same way as they can in the OSCE, because say with EU they are external partners and they have a different kind of relationship, in the OSCE with a rule of consensus they can block a decision because the decision is affecting something that they consider as an important security concern for them.

And in a sense, this is important. It, first of all it gives a sense of empowerment to everybody. It's not the organization of a group of countries; it's an organization of

each of its members. And this encourages them to participate more, to be more active, but also to make use of the organization. If you get freed of the consensus rule, or limited somehow, at the end of the day, the ones who might lose are the smaller countries. So in a way, I do think that even though this is so frustrating, because decision making even to the point of the Secretary-General if you have seen that, was really complicated. But at the end of the day, you reach a decision that everybody's behind it. And it's not a decision by a group, it's a decision that involves absolutely everybody. And then you have a sound basis on which you always, you can proceed.

Hoge:

Please.

Daniel Prins:

Yes, thank you. Daniel Prins. I'm at the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs. Thank you. And I'd like to take the topic big further what was just come out. You nicely described how the EU and NATO have common purposes, which, reading the newspapers nowadays, you may sort of put a question mark here or there. But I see your point. And of course OSCE is more like the UN where very, very different views come together and discuss. So yes, I see that. The context of the Arab spring that you very rightly refer to, I was wondering how those diverse views in the OSCE may be influenced by this development that we've seen earlier this year in the southern part or to the south of the OSCE. And if you would, say that this may even lead to a new sense of common purpose. In other words, is the OSCE still mainly looking inwards towards its diverse views, or will countries within the organization actually see a common purpose of what's happening to their south? Thank you.

Zannier:

Well this is very much what we're working on now. To verify this. As I said, there's been in the last ten years a different mode of operation of the organization, being addressing challenges that affect everybody in more or less the same way. And so in developing common policies, common tools, etc. And this is similar in a way. But it remains to be seen to what extent if the OSCE is to assist the country, South Africa for instance, when it, the country of course to be interested and to request for assistance. And that's already a first issue that needs to be verified. We're engaging with them. There is interesting principle. But then how far are they willing to go? I think in every transition process, national ownership is important and showing respect for this is equally important from every external partner. And I think we're doing pretty well on that level.

But the second part is making sure that the constituency is, has the same vision and shares the goal. And with OSCE being so broad, obviously you can imagine there are a number of countries that are very keen to intervene and do a lot. And there are others that may be as likely, more inclined to look in other directions. So it's a matter of once again, having an agenda that reflects the views of the community as such. It takes into account of those that see this as an immediate priority, but also takes into account the priorities of others. They take the Central Asia states, who look at another set of challenges, and therefore covers both. Because this doesn't mean that you have one excludes the other. And so we need to find those balances in the overall agenda of the organization as we move forward. That's part of the challenges were in front of us.

Walter Kemp:

I'm Walter Kemp and I'm with IPI. I used to be with OSCE. I was struck by what you were saying. Because it strikes me that there's quite a paradox. On the one hand, the reason why it's now possible to talk to Mediterranean partners for the first time in 35 years is that they have a willingness to take on some of the OSCE commitments. And yet, this year is the 20th anniversary of the Moscow Document, which said that commitments related to the human dimensions of the

OSCE are not the sole prerogative of the state concern, but of the responsibility of all participating states. Which was revolutionary. It was 15 years ahead of our 2P and was the basis for what a lot of the OSCE did the following 20 years.

But this year, unless I'm mistaken, there's no anniversary of the Moscow Document. And I think this is perhaps because some states, including the country where Moscow is, are not so keen on that sentence. So are you perhaps concerned at the same time that the OSCE is an inspiration for Mediterranean countries, there's the possibility of a little bit of roll back within the organization demonstrated by the fact that there's no anniversary of the Moscow Document?

Zannier:

Well I'm not sure how many anniversaries of our documents we have within the organization. Even though I agree with you that Moscow Document was certainly a very important one. There may be some that consider that diversifying might attract the attention from certain area. There has also been some evolution internally. And what we find, for instance, is that there is more interesting developing an agenda and a corporation in area where there is that clearly joint interest. And say cyberterrorists now, is one of the things in which we're starting to look as a possible role for the organization. Because the membership is interesting. And the discussion is what can we exactly do? We need to model out who is working on these issues, what is being done, what can we, how well can we strengthen this within the organization etc.? These discussions go forward more easily in a certain way.

And when you go back to the Moscow sort of, Moscow Document approach, you find yourself in a political discussion as to the extent to which one country, and that goes back to the dialogue issue that we were saying earlier, that we have principals, commitments, we have mechanisms to address that. To address implementation. There is the Human Dimension Implementation Meeting in Warsaw, the one I mentioned earlier that will start next week. We have a network of bilateral contacts and other kinds of initiatives where these issues are taken up very seriously. They're debated in a way that maybe is not as visible, even though sometimes you hear echoes of those discussions in the media. But the fact the document is there, the commitments are there, the principals are there, gives an opportunity for countries to say what is happening in your area is of concern to me. Gives a right to the others to have that discussion. Whether you're successful or not, that is another matter. But what is important is to have a possibility to have the debate.

Hoge:

Well, as I see no more hands, I think I'm going to wrap it up with a question of my own. Were you about – I'm sorry. Very good please.

Male:

I thought that probably it's time for someone from this forum to ask question.

Hoge:

Could you identify yourself please?

Male:

I'm from the Departmental Representative of the Bulgarian Mission. So I wanted to ask question of more general nature to the Secretary-General. Say the topic is sensitive information. Probably so see already time to think about upgrade of the role of the OSCE Secretary-General. And if a dramatic upgrade is not possible, a radical enhancing is not possible, then perhaps some small steps could be taken. And Mr. Kemp mentioned the University, but we're going to have an adversity in four years. So perhaps by 2015, perhaps the role of the OSCE could be increased in terms of political influence. And small steps, for example, simple increase of the two of office, or following the integration between the UN Secretary-General and the rotating President of the Security Council, I mean

these things perhaps could be explored. So Mr. Secretary-General, what are your views about that?

Zannier:

Already in the process of appointment of the Secretary-General the issue of the role of the Secretary-General was very much present. And there was debate. And the debate was about also the figure and what kind of profile should have the real candidate for the post of Secretary-General. And you have seen the results of that discussion. But what remain in the fact that there was a strong support within the membership for a Secretary-General that interprets his function in a more political manner. And that's what I'm trying to do myself, I started. I'm traveling, I have meetings at the political level, I travel always with a representative of the chairmanship, so I'm not perceived as not being in line with the chairmanship, which gives the political guidance to the organization. But is support the chair and I help the organization having a higher provide, and the more present in a way.

One of the problems with the system of chairmanship that we have in the OSCE is that you have some chairmanships that have very well equipped, very strong, that don't need much support. And in that case, the Secretary-General wouldn't necessarily have to step back and be, to play more the role of the Chief Administrative Officer and then managing the organization, and ensuring implementation of the decisions. But with other chairmanships there is more space for a more political role. And if it's interpreted in a transparent way, this seems to me to be perfectly acceptable.

There is another issue that may come up over time. And that is we want to keep things the way they are, or do we want to move towards a larger reform? And you can overlook all the time, but the balance between the chairmanship and the Secretary-General in a structural manner, but yeah, that could be the topic for a big decision in whenever, four years time or further down the line. But I think there is a recognition of a need to have more, some more continuity in the measure of the organization and those in the, it's beyond the management, it's the leadership of the organization. Making sure that they strategically they're priorities remain there, and they don't change with every chairmanship. So a strong Secretary-General is also a guarantee of continuity in the work of the organization. I think it's also the principle supported by many because of that.

Hoge:

Please.

Resul Şahinol:

Thank you very much. Resul Şahinol, Turkish Mission Legal Counsel. First of all, I would like to extend my warm welcome to the Secretary-General here. We would like to see him more often here and to develop a corporation which you oversee in the UN. I think it's important.

As to my question, I wonder how OSCE is adapting itself to the new Secretary challenges, specifically if I have to mention one that's terrorism. You have also mentioned in your presentation as well. Do you think that OSCE is efficiently dealing with this issue in this area? Thank you.

Zannier:

Issue of terrorism you mean?

Resul Şahinol:

Yes.

Zannier:

Well I would say about ten years ago the OSCE has created a unit in its fold of dealing with anti-terrorism issues. I think the starting point for the OSCE has been looking at the UN, the UN conventions, and the ability of its member states

to implement it. So assisting them in passing legislation, adapting the legislation to reflect the contents of the conventions, and then developing the tools to implement them. And there is obviously, the rules are very different situation across the membership of the organization. This lead to a number of projects that were directed toward the weaker countries. In a way, it's the usual principle; a chain is as strong as its weakest link. So really strengthening the weaker links in the chain and making sure that the organization is really, and this is an area where I think the interaction with the UN continues to be very close. Now the agenda is expanding.

And as I said, now that I, issues like cyber-security that are now coming up, we need to look into. What I'm doing, and what I'm doing absolutely in this budget, is something that I'm going back to Vienna to announce more formally and I hope I will get the support from the participating states, I'm also restructuring the Secretariat now to be able to deal more efficiently with some of these issues that we put under the heading of transnational threats. And we have a number of units in the Secretariat that deal with policing and strengthening police forces, this anti-terrorism unit, we have a unit that deals with borders, border management and security, and we classed them together so that we look at the various challenges and the various problems from different perspectives. And we operate in parallel and an integrated manner to provide more efficient assistance to member states. So that's part of the reform I'm already proposing the context of the budget and would like to see how member states react to that.

Hoge:

Seeing no more hands, I have a final question of my own. And Secretary-General, it's pretty much a conversational question. And it's more about the UN than it is about the OSCE. And it arises out of a personal experience. The personal experience was I was asked this morning to give an interview on WNYC, which happens to be the station I listen to all day. It's the public radio station in New York. And since I spent most of my life asking other people for interviews, I can't very well say no. And after I said yes, they then told me who my interviewer would be. My interviewer was Andy Barowitz, who some of you may know is America's most successful political satirist. And those of you who live in this city, or this country in particular, know how very easy it is for Americans to make fun of the United Nations. So I don't know what I got into, I don't know if I survived. If I did survive, we'll probably put it on the website. If you don't see it on the website, I didn't survive.

But here's the question I wanted to ask you, and it is really conversational, one of the arguments I made about the value of this week was, it isn't the theatrics of a Chavez or a Qaddafi, or indeed an Obama appearing and making a speech, it's much more what goes on on the sidelines, behind the scenes. And I made the point that for diplomats, and for UN officials in particular, they are able to see 20, 25, 30 people from that many countries in informal settings which they can get quite a bit of work done and it also spares them making 20, 25, or 30 trips to other capitals. Am I right about that? I wanted to ask you, how has it been for you here this week? Have you accomplished things? Have you bumped into people you otherwise would not have seen?

Zannier:

By all means. That was the key reason for me to be here. And yeah.

Hoge:

So far I'm looking good huh?

Zannier:

So far looking good. And the meetings with the Secretary-General of the OIC, the Organization of Islamic Conference. I had meetings with a number of foreign ministers from our own member states. And to give an example, we had a

problem with one of the member states because to implement a project we needed some initial action from the government. I met with the minister and he said, "I fully understand." The following day they called me from Vienna, they said, "It's signed. We're moving." So it is, for me, easy also to having everybody here to talk to people in a way that allows us to make progress quickly. But also it is important for me to check what is the temperature of some of the strategic issues. Having a bit of a brainstorming with the ministers or other keen developers on some of the issues we're discussing now. To see how they view them, how they, and it brings me out of the Vienna set-up. Where I more or less know what everybody says. But I find a different platform for mostly for me to launch the messages and then to see if they take root. And give also my sights, my perception of where things are. So I think it's important. And it's certainly, for me, it's important also as an opportunity to raise the profile of the organization.

Hoge:

It's been very valuable for us to have you here. It seems to me from what you just said you'll be back here again next year. And if you come back here next year, please come back to IPI. Thank you very much.