

**OSCE 2004 Annual Security Review Conference****Session 3: Comprehensive Security, a Strategic Approach** ENGLISH only**Emerging threats and challenges to security and stability in the OSCE area: politico-military dimension**

*by Dr. O. Shamshur, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ukraine*

Mr. Co-ordinator,

I would like to begin by expressing my sincere appreciation to the organizers of the 2004 Annual Security Review Conference for inviting me to share with you some thoughts related to the current security agenda. It is only for the second time that we have met within the Annual Security Review Conference format. However, the Conference has already proved to be an important forum providing opportunity for regular overview of security situation in the OSCE area, as well as defining adequate responses to the emerging challenges posed by the fundamental, structural changes in the European geopolitical landscape and security environment.

The title of this presentation - Emerging threats and challenges to security and stability in the OSCE area: politico-military dimension – is broad enough to cover a wide range of security related problems. I would focus only on several issues having, in our opinion, relevance for ensuring security and stability in Europe within the OSCE context. At the same time, I would like to stress that I have attempted to go beyond a national outlook as to modern security realities in order to promote discussion on the issues of our common concern.

**Increasing complexity and interdependence of security problems.** There is a growing awareness that politico-military aspects are intertwined with other security related issues such as institutional threats (e.g. political instability), economic factors (e.g. failing economy), environmental - natural or man-generated disasters (e.g. threats posed by decaying ammunition). A comprehensive, holistic approach requires that all emerging problems be addressed conjointly as this appears to be the most effective way to succeed in securing international stability. This approach should be also taken into account in developing interstructural relationships within the OSCE. In that respect we should focus on improving co-operation between the Permanent Council and Forum for Security Co-operation, OSCE institutions and its field operations. It would help not only to identify the new threats and make timely assessment of their character

and scope, but, eventually, to narrow drastically the gap between this, initial, and decision making stages.

**Relationship between other collective security structures and OSCE.** Complexity of the modern security phenomena imperatively calls for a new look at the European security architecture, appropriate adaptation of the role, functions and mode of operations of NATO, OSCE and EU, as well as efficient interaction between them aiming at increasing their contribution to the achievement of our common goal of strengthening peace and stability. As far as OSCE is concerned we cannot avoid responding to a number of delicate questions, such as:

What is the OSCE if the OSCE's values coincide with NATO and EU- shared ones, while NATO and EU expansion embraces the OSCE participating States?

How the nature and form of the OSCE debate are being affected by the fact that almost half of the OSCE participating States are members of the EU and NATO, and the EU countries formulate invariably consolidated position on the OSCE issues?

The practical importance of these questions is also determined by the fact that a number of States, including Ukraine, have declared their intention to join in future NATO and the EU.

**The security dialogue.** This is one of the most important issues to be addressed. It is established OSCE practice to maintain sustained exchange of views on the wide range of topics, such as individual and co-operative security, defense planning and military doctrines, including military budgets, interrelation between military organization and civil society, democratic control over armed forces, police and security structures. Nevertheless, we have yet to find the optimum ways to make this dialogue more practical and result-oriented.

In this regard, it might be useful to cast a look at the OSCE documents related to politico-military sphere from the point of view of their actual relevance for defining national security policies, bearing in mind that the principles agreed upon within the OSCE have to be reflected in the national security concepts of the participating States.

**The issue of military budgets.** The OSCE participating States have at their disposal a very valuable instrument, which is an information exchange on military budgets, although this instrument, in our view, is still underused. It is well known that a number of the OSCE countries have recently increased substantially their military expenditures, while others have reduced them. It could be useful — to make an analysis of the structure of those additional funds. This

might help us *inter alia* to identify those security aspects which OSCE participating States consider as the most challenging or, on the contrary, as losing their relevance.

**The politico-military aspects of border security** deserve our attention as well. Although we discussed the Border Management in the course of Session 2 it would be appropriate to stress here that the issue of the State border security is of primary importance for every country since it is directly related to State sovereignty and territorial integrity. We believe that OSCE participating States respecting the principle of inviolability of frontiers should refrain from activities in the vicinity of the borders that might cause security concerns of neighbouring States.

**Conflict prevention and crisis management.** There is still a great concern over the lingering conflicts within the OSCE area and their increasing negative influence on stability on the continent. Can the current role and involvement of the OSCE in the settlement of the so called “frozen conflicts” be considered as being an adequate one?

To answer this question it would be important to assess the results of the OSCE activities aimed at their settlement, in general and the efficiency of its specific strategies being applied with this purpose, in particular. The very fact of the existence of the “frozen” conflicts, is that an evidence of the efficiency of the OSCE activities, which prevented them from turning into the “hot” military confrontation phase, or, on the contrary, is that proof of the incapability of the Organization to facilitate their solution?

What is the absolute and relative efficiency of the strategies employed by the OSCE to bring about settlement of the conflicts?

These and other related questions are to be answered.

**The situation around the Transdnestrian conflict** is quite indicative in the context of finding answer to the questions raised above. Earlier this month President V.Voronin of Moldova launched an initiative to elaborate a Stability and Security Pact for Republic of Moldova that should be signed by the European Union, Romania, the Russian Federation, the United States and Ukraine. It has been noticed by a number of experts that proposed document does not envisage any OSCE role in consolidating of stability and security in the region.

In our mind, the **OSCE Mission to Moldova** potential has not been used in full. It could play far more important role in the Transdnestrian settlement. In particular, deserves attention Ambassador W.Hill’s proposal to entrust his Mission with an additional task, namely to monitor the Transdnestrian segment of the Moldovan-Ukrainian border. Transdnestrian leadership, as it is known, agreed to the proposal. Ukraine supports the idea concerning the implementation of

the international border and customs monitoring on the Ukrainian-Moldovan state border, in particular at its Transdniestrian segment, on the Moldovan territory.

We also consider that consultations of mediators, namely of Ukraine, the Russian Federation and the OSCE with the involvement of the USA and EU, aimed at the elaboration of certain common approaches to the settlement of this problem, would facilitate the solution of the Transdniestrian conflict.

In more general terms, we have to reflect upon upgrading and developing the preventive potential of our Organisation. It seems to be useful to establish within the OSCE the mechanism for early warning and preventing conflicts in the region, well adapted to the present conditions. Mechanism which would be triggered automatically if complications that could lead to the conflict emerged. The early warning signals should be transformed directly into appropriate and effective preventive actions.

**Regional and sub-regional confidence- and security-building measures regime** is another important security-related area. Being a traditional sphere of the OSCE's attention does not make the issue of CSBM less important. We have an obligation to ensure full implementation of the agreed measures in order to maintain viability of the existing time-tested regime. In the context of this discussion it will probably be useful to pose the following question: To what extent does incomplete implementation of certain provisions adversely affect the CSBM regime at large? In that respect it should be mentioned that non-compliance with some of the existing obligations diminishes the credibility of the entire CSBM's regime that participating States elaborated in the course of long and complicated negotiations.

**Relationship between new challenges to security and “traditional” CSBMs.** The OSCE Strategy to Address Threats to Security and Stability underlines that attention should be given to potential challenges stemming from the changing character of armed conflicts. This task is being complicated by the “agility” of threats that are evolving, undergoing mutations, and not all of them are predictable. Existing measures, in particular those contained in the Vienna Document 1999, have been playing a crucial role in politico-military sphere. At the same time, it is evident that new threats require new responses. We have to be concerned as to what these new threats are, how to identify them and make necessary addenda to the existing CSBM's toolkit. Thus, we might consider the usefulness of discussion on new confidence and security building measures. The FSC still has on its agenda a number of proposals for changes to the verification regime. In order to promote the discussion on these and other feasible amendments it would be helpful first to analyze, “dissect” emerging threats, and on this basis to elaborate possible responses.

**Sub-regional co-operation** is an important element of the new European security environment. One of the goals of such co-operation is to contribute to the security throughout the continent. The regular overview by the CPC of the complementary CSBMs concluded by the participating States in this sphere is a very useful tool to monitor the situation. We would encourage the Conflict Prevention Centre to continue this work. According to the data prepared by the CPC, today 20 OSCE countries are the State Parties to 25 bilateral and multilateral agreements on complementary CSBMs. Increased confidence and security in the areas adjacent to the States borders is the most important result of the implementation of these agreements. As to the correlation between sub-regional co-operation and responses to the new threats and challenges, experience gained from implementation of sub-regional agreements convincingly speaks in their favour, in particular when it comes to border security and military activities in the vicinity of the borders.

Naval CSBMs are not an exception. The positive dynamics of co-operation between six littoral Black Sea states under the Document on Confidence- and Security Building Measures in the Naval Field in the Black Sea is considerably contributing to the process of sustaining stability and security in the region, as well as in the entire OSCE area.

**The Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe and the Treaty on Open Skies** remain among the most effective tools in promoting security and stability. Although the threat connected with the use of conventional forces in interstate relations has diminished considerably and changed in nature, the CFE Treaty continues to be instrumental in maintaining and strengthening confidence throughout the Europe. At the same time, the well-known situation with ratification of the Agreement on adaptation of this Treaty puts a question mark as to the future of the entire regime of control over conventional armaments and forces.

CFE Treaty does not have direct links with the OSCE activity and obligations. Nevertheless, the potential abatement of one of the most powerful arms control regimes can not be left outside the OSCE agenda. This might also lead to the creation of new dividing lines within European geopolitical landscape.

Speaking about the **Treaty on Open Skies** it should be stated that multinational regime of aerial surveillance becomes increasingly operational with each observation flight making its valuable contribution to promoting openness and transparency. It is a welcomed fact that the number of participating States to this Treaty continues to grow. Open Skies regime has a potential ability to contribute to other sectors of security, in particular, by enhancing the effectiveness of environmental projects, responding to the threat of natural and man-made disasters.

This fact itself proves the mentioned above necessity to deal with the threats interdimensionally.

**The problem of small arms and light weapons (SALW).** Unauthorized spread and use of SALW continue to be of great concern for the OSCE countries. A number of important steps have been taken to respond to this challenge. The most recent of them is the adoption of the FSC Decision on principles for export control of man-portable air defence systems (MANPADS). The work continues also on a number of other initiatives, in particular, on OSCE principles to control brokering in SALW, on standard elements of end-user certificate and verification procedures for SALW export. We believe that this important work has to be continued.

**And finally, the problem of conventional ammunition.** The threat posed by dangerous stocks of ammunition and explosives is the issue that requires urgent attention and joint efforts of the international community. Recent dramatic events in my country showed that this problem does not allow for any further delay. The OSCE has at its disposal a relevant legal instrument that is the Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition. This Document contains mechanisms and regulations for consolidated international efforts. It is important for the OSCE States to ensure its full implementation.

In that respect let me mention that Ukraine was the first country that submitted the request for assistance in coping with its enormous stockpiles of surplus and outdated ammunition, having thus initiated the mechanism envisaged in the mentioned OSCE Document.

Today the work is underway in Ukraine and Vienna aimed to elaborate approaches and practical steps to initiate specific projects in this sphere. I would like to welcome a number of the OSCE delegations for the interest and support in advancing Ukrainian request. We are looking forward to stepping up joint efforts in this direction.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate the crucial importance of the politico-military issues for the new security environment in Europe. Only some of them have been analyzed in this intervention. It has probably raised more questions than given answers. However, even such a concise review shows the significance of the work OSCE is doing for European security. At the same time, there is hardly any space for complacency. We still have a number of difficult and pressing problems in our hands. They call for timely and efficient action on the part of this Organisation.

Thank you.