



Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg



Frank Evers

Building Co-operation
between OSCE Field Missions and Partner
Institutions in the Economic and Environmental
Dimension

Working Paper 11



Frank Evers

Building Co-operation
between OSCE Field Missions and Partner Institutions
in the Economic and Environmental Dimension

CORE Working Paper 11

Hamburg 2002

Contents

1.	Objective	5
2.	OSCE Key Positions on International Co-operation within the Economic and Environmental Dimension	6
2.1	The Conceptual Frame ofmaintaining comprehensive security in a common, indivisible and sustainable security space ...providing integrating and catalysing assistance in security matters ...deploying resources of partner organizations for the purpose of security-building ...supporting countries in economic emergency situations and economies in transition ...supporting early warning and conflict prevention	6
2.2	The Bonn Approaches and Their Deficiencies	7
3.	Evolution and Key Deficiencies of the OSCE EED	8
3.1	Gradual Backtrack of the OSCE from Political Mainstreams	8
3.2	One-sidedness of OSCE EED Regional Arrangements	8
3.3	Completion of the OSCE EED's Institutionalization	9
3.4	Shift of OSCE EED Policy Instruments from Conflict Management to Development Co-operation	10
4.	Expectations of Participating States, International and National Partners towards the OSCE EED	11
4.1	National and Group Interests in developing the OSCE as a tool for buffering European security peripheries ... developing the OSCE as a tool for easing European integration ... developing the OSCE as a tool of development assistance ... developing the OSCE as a tool for early warning and conflict management	11
4.2	International Partner Organizations, Their Political Commitments and Interests in Further Co-operation with the OSCE EED	12
4.3	Expectations of the Business World towards the OSCE EED	13
4.4	Non-governmental Expectations towards the OSCE EED	14
4.5	Expectations of the Academic Society towards the OSCE EED	14
4.6	Expectations of Mass Media towards the OSCE EED	14
5.	Key Criteria for Co-operation with International Partner Organizations and National Partners	15

6.	Comparative Advantages of the OSCE EED within European Security-Building	15
7.	Key Problems of OSCE Economic and Environmental Field Activities in Building Co-operative Ties with International Partner Organizations	16
8.	Fields of International Co-operation Targeting Economic and Environmental Security Threats	18
9.	Instruments of OSCE Economic and Environmental Field Activities in Building Co-operative Ties with Partner Organizations	19
10.	Conclusions and Recommendations	20

1. Objective

Findings about OSCE steps towards duplicating the endeavours of various international partner organizations in the field of conflict-related economic and environmental work have been used as a point of departure for this policy paper. Especially from the point of view of OSCE field operations, there is an apparent tendency to try to convert the OSCE into another organization of development co-operation.

The goal of this paper is to contribute to rethinking the evolution of OSCE activities within the economic and environmental dimension (EED). It will be proposed that consideration be given to the conceptual frame of international co-operation and the limited prospects of further developments within the Bonn context. This paper reflects on the general expectations the participating States, international and national partner organizations have towards the OSCE EED. It focuses on the dimension's comparative advantages as well as key problems in and criteria for dividing competencies and labour between international partner organizations. The paper will conclude with examining the idea of strictly reducing OSCE EED endeavours to preventive diplomacy and direct conflict management. It will propose to intensify efforts within these areas. In a way, the paper is meant as response to critical remarks on the lack of consistent strategies and deficiencies in implementation capacities within the OSCE EED.

The paper follows the task of reflecting on the long-term interests of the most influential OSCE participating States and their associations such as the EU, NATO and the CIS (OSCE partner institutions) in OSCE EED activities. More attention should be drawn to balancing the interests of Western-European countries and Russia. On the whole, it will be proposed that discussions about the various collective positions towards the role of the OSCE and its economic and environmental dimension, within the large mosaic of developing European security systems, be started. In the end, the interests of collective and individual participants in European security systems need to be formulated and explicitly considered in OSCE decision-making.

Implicitly, the question that needs to be answered is, why at all, or under which circumstances should the OSCE keep focusing on economic and environmental issues. The answers are found in comprehensive security-building and in the very logic of the international division of labour in security-related matters.

Proposals for developing the OSCE EED, its structures and field operations should illustrate the main approaches towards OSCE on-site co-operation with national and international partner institutions.

2. OSCE Key Positions on International Co-operation within the Economic and Environmental Dimension

OSCE key positions on international co-operation within the economic and environmental dimension are conceptually elaborated. As shown below, they must be applied to the requirements of economic and environmental security-building in specific matters, regions or countries.

2.1 *The Conceptual Frame of...*

Over the last decade, OSCE participating States have arrived at general approaches towards economic and environmental factors of European security-building. Ultimately, the scope for forthcoming OSCE activities has been broadened, particularly by developing co-operative ties with international partner organizations:

1. The Lisbon Declaration on a Common and Comprehensive Security Model for Europe for the Twenty-First Century (Lisbon, 1996);
2. The Common Concept for the Development of Co-operation between Mutually-Reinforcing Institutions (Copenhagen, 1997) and
3. The Charter for European Security and The Platform for Co-operative Security (Istanbul, 1999).

Along with the outcome of the Bonn Conference 1990 (see below), these documents build the conceptual OSCE framework for institutional security co-operation. From the perspective of co-operation in economic and environmental matters, they could be summarized as follows:

... maintaining comprehensive security in a common, indivisible and sustainable security space

The OSCE professes a concept of a common, comprehensive and indivisible security space (Istanbul, 1999). Sustainability and interdependence of economic, environmental and social development are seen as cornerstones of sustainable European security constructions. Corresponding OSCE thinking has been aggregated at manifold events to the OSCE calendar and is accordingly documented on the OSCE website. By nature, the theoretical frame of OSCE economic and environmental security policy follows the *UN Declaration on Environment and Development* of Rio de Janeiro, 1992. The balance of economic, environmental and social development as a precondition for general sustainability is commonplace in contemporary security thinking within the OSCE and its main partner organizations. Therefore, there is no further necessity to maintain any principal discussions on this subject.

... providing integrating and catalysing assistance in security matters

It is understood that it is necessary to offer the OSCE a flexible co-ordinating framework for fostering co-operation through which various organizations can reinforce each other by drawing on their particular strengths. The OSCE participating States are aware of the significance of political and operational coherence, and value the key-integrating role that the OSCE can play (Istanbul, 1999). The OSCE is seen as a regional arrangement under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. It has the special advantage of being a forum for enhancing co-operation and complementarity among international organizations and institutions (Lisbon, 1996). Within this context, the OSCE is acknowledged for its ability to act as a catalyst for co-operation between key international organizations and institutions in the economic and environmental area (Istanbul, 1999).

... deploying resources of partner organizations for the purpose of security-building

Among OSCE participating States, there is an explicit readiness to strengthen co-operation with competent partner organizations on the basis of equality and in the spirit of partnership. Without the intention of creating new hierarchies of organizations or a permanent division of labour among them,

they put emphasis on deploying the institutional resources of international organizations and institutions of which they are members, in support of the OSCE's work (Copenhagen, 1997). This may be one of the central ideas for the further development of the OSCE in general and its EED in particular (see below).

... supporting countries in economic emergency situations and economies in transition

Market economy and social justice, along with democracy, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, are seen as pillars for building co-operative security throughout Europe (Lisbon, 1996). Another general approach towards the OSCE EED is to consider ways in which to help participating States that request assistance when there are cases of internal breakdown of law and order. It is a common intention to support the integration of economies in transition into the world economy and ensure the rule of law and the development of a transparent and stable legal system in the economic sphere (Istanbul, 1999). In practice, this implies a substantial regional fixation of OSCE EED field activities, that is, at least, *conflicting with the OSCE concepts of equality and indivisibility* of the European security space.

... supporting early warning and conflict prevention

It is common understanding that there are close links between security, democracy and prosperity. Economic liberty, social justice and environmental responsibility are identified as necessary prerequisites for prosperity. Environmental degradation and the depletion of natural resources are seen as security risks. In OSCE key documents, reference is made to the economic dimension's receiving appropriate attention as an element of early warning and conflict prevention (Istanbul, 1999). Nonetheless, the application of this approach to OSCE EED on-site activities is one of the dimension's weak points.

Overall, it is essential to emphasize that, according to OSCE documents, the organization is *not* seen as an institution which is able to manage comprehensive security-building on its own. On the contrary, it is seen as an integral part of a network of mutually complementing national and international players. This is a most essential position for fixing the limits of OSCE EED endeavours in its international communication.

2.2 *The Bonn Approaches and Their Deficiencies*

Meanwhile, the practice of OSCE policy-implementation follows a different path. Particularly, within the economic and environmental dimension, the organization tries to cover an exhaustive spectrum of tasks going far beyond preventive diplomacy and direct conflict-management.

In addition and in some contrast to the spirit of its political declarations, OSCE on-site activities in this field are, as mentioned, exclusively focused on transitional countries. They *do not* cover the whole OSCE area with its various potential and present conflict regions.

The first conceptual roots of this undesirable development can be found in the CSCE heritage of the Helsinki process, which was aimed at a balanced and peaceful co-existence between two competing political camps. Evidently, the 2nd and 3rd basket of the Helsinki Final Act (1975) were taken as the areas that best correspond with previous endeavours to design stable East-West relations. The twelve-year-old Document of the CSCE Conference on Economic Co-operation in Europe (Bonn, 1990) illustrates corresponding convictions. It reverberates the essence of a short period of enthusiasm about quickly substituting social and economic deficiencies in political Eastern Europe. Conceivably, at this point, enduring economic and social instabilities, and deriving acute threats to European security were not seen as main trends of further development. Apparently, economic and social convergence of Europe was simply perceived as a process of the European East joining the European West. The Bonn Document still has a special place in OSCE economic and environmental self-reflection. So far, it is the only framework paper on the future of economic co-operation within the CSCE/OSCE. Elaborated during a time of political change, it operates on key assumptions that have either never been reflected

on or no longer reflect OSCE reality. Areas such as (a) the development and diversification of economic relations, (b) industrial co-operation, in particular, in specific areas of technology, technique and information, or (c) monetary and fiscal matters that should not and cannot be subject to direct OSCE involvement *per se*. These and similar fields are widely covered by OSCE partner organizations, or are handled at bi- and multi-lateral levels. Meanwhile, the Bonn Document has put them on the OSCE agenda. Its pattern of thinking still reasonably influences OSCE policy implementation in the economic and environmental dimension. Intentionally or not, in the economic and environmental dimension, it has led to expanding development assistance and activities in adjoining fields that are increasingly superimposing concerted conflict management. Certainly, this development can also be observed in other OSCE dimensions. Nevertheless, it raises once again questions about the very economic and environmental policy fields of OSCE intervention. It is directly related to OSCE EED co-operation with international partners on central and field levels.

3. Evolution and Key Deficiencies of the OSCE EED

During recent years, the OSCE EED has established itself as an integral part of a now institutionalized organization. It has developed its own structures and staffing. Meanwhile, the international environment of CSCE/OSCE security engagement has been exposed to considerable changes.

3.1 *Gradual Backtrack of the OSCE from Political Mainstreams*

Europe's new political realities have led to an evolving replacement of the former political goals of the CSCE. For more than a decade, the OSCE and its participating States are now on the way to re-defining the organization's place within European security structures, deriving political goals and operational instruments. While legal, economic and social integration have become the most attractive values in and around Western and Central Europe, economic failure, social downswing and regional disintegration have begun to dominate large parts of the peripheries.

European unification processes have been creating enormous political affinity. They embody contemporary central-European security understanding, which is, perhaps, most concisely reflected in the ideas and structures of the European Union. The EU is largely seen as an initiative for political stability, economic growth and social prosperity originating in its own integrative arrangements. Besides, the entire European area pays strong attention to military and other security co-operation within the framework of NATO activities. Both organizations develop immense political gravity throughout Europe. In the international co-operation scene, the CoE, WB, UN and WTO are also attractive counterparts, in particular, to many areas on the European outskirts. The OSCE, in turn, no longer sees itself as the top focus of these developments - a statement that is also true for the OSCE EED and which will have a direct impact on the further positioning of the OSCE EED within the European international division of security endeavours.

3.2 *One-sidedness of OSCE EED Regional Arrangements*

As mentioned, OSCE strategic thinking and, moreover, OSCE policy-implementation puts prevailing emphasis on developments in Eastern Europe. This is somewhat in contrast to CSCE history and OSCE statutory concepts. OSCE field operations are exclusively based in South-Eastern and Eastern Europe. Economic and environmental discussions within the OSCE are usually focused on the problems of transitional countries. At headquarters and field levels, economic and environmental matters are commonly discussed from a strong West-East perspective. However, countries in transition have, admittedly, contributed little to economic and environmental concepts. Conversely, the western par-

ticipating States have also shown little inclination to jointly debate their own, homemade security issues within the OSCE.

Understandably, critics demur the geographically lopsided character of the OSCE's self-perception and operations. In most general terms, herein, *the* conceptual deficiency of the present-day OSCE may be understood. Geographic one-sidedness does not only limit the range of the organization's activities, but may also finally call into question the very necessity of any OSCE involvement in European security efforts.

3.3 *Completion of the OSCE EED's Institutionalization*

The OSCE EED was designed and established in the course of the CSCE's general transformation into the OSCE. The first Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities may be merited with having contributed to concluding the first phase of institutionalizing the OSCE's 2nd basket.

The OSCE CEEA. The institution of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities and his Office were established in 1997. The Office is now staffed with international experts and supported by a network of economic and environmental advisers from the OSCE field missions. By mandate, the OSCE CEEA is beholden to enhance the OSCE's interaction with relevant international organizations. Acting in support of the Chairman-in-Office, the Co-ordinator is mainly charged with strengthening the economic, environmental and social components in the work of the OSCE missions and field operations and broadening contacts with NGOs and the private sector. In contrast to other OSCE representatives, the Co-ordinator is not an independent institution. He works within the Secretariat and is subordinate to the Secretary-General. At least visually, this confines his position to the diplomatic parquet.

The network of EE advisers. The economic and environmental field advisers cover OSCE EED on-site engagement in the field missions. The high requirements of their professional background, which includes a combination of at least economic, environmental, political, regional and media expertise, complicate the staffing process. In this context, it is necessary to draw attention to the high fluctuation to which the field advisers' network is exposed. It is based on the common mobility principle of OSCE field mission staffing, but has the unwanted side-effect of unsteadiness in political work and the regular loss of highly important personal connections. A practical step towards counterbalancing this deficit and maintaining OSCE EED corporate memory was to include local junior experts into the missions' advisory staff. In this way, they also help maintain contacts to international partner organizations.

The Prague Forum. For ten years, the annual OSCE Economic Forum in Prague has had its established place on the agenda of the European security dialogue on economic and environmental matters. It is publicly the most visible economic and environmental endeavour the OSCE has undertaken. Its two or three annual preparatory seminars have become an instrument for making OSCE economic and environmental discussions an on-going process. They add regional and national aspects to dialogues that take place at the headquarters. The international partner organizations of the OSCE EED have their traditional seats at the Forum.

In theory, the Prague Forum is still focused on giving political stimuli to dialogues on transition to free-market economies and suggesting means of developing free-market systems and economic co-operation. (See OSCE EED website.) At the same time, the contents of discussions and practical approaches have begun to go beyond these conceptual shortcomings. Among other things, the Forum has been used for discussing transparency and good governance in economic matters, economic aspects of security in general and post-conflict rehabilitation in particular, security aspects in the field of the environment and energy developments as well as market economy and the rule of law. The yearly changing topics, along with the permanent rotation of OSCE EED field advisers and a changing list of invited

guests, gives the Forum a discontinuous, event-like character that is far from being a permanent Prague process. NGO participation is regularly financed by voluntary donations from a number of national delegations. These honourable contributions, however, make the corresponding planning a changeable and unpredictable venture with regards to co-ordinating field missions. In a similar way, there is too little permanent follow-up work; there are no instituted media channels for transferring signals from Prague to the public of the participating States, namely the field missions' host countries. Media attendance is usually restrained, and there is little co-operation with regional and international businesses. *The Autumn EED Meeting*. The autumn meeting of the team of the OSCE CEEA with the field mission's economic and environmental advisers became a place of briefing and training. By providing personal contacts, it contributes to developing a common policy understanding within the dimension. Also, it helps to arrive at a common style of work. Its establishment is one of the positive organizational steps in recent years.

The OSCE EE Subcommittee. In December 2001, the OSCE Economic and Environmental Subcommittee was established to provide an ongoing framework for dialogue, generally examine economic and environmental issues, make recommendations to the PC and also to advise on economic and environmental project implementation. The Subcommittee will support the preparatory work for the OSCE Economic Fora. It will hopefully become a receptive connecting link between the CEEA, the field missions and the national delegations. Up to now, its function is still to be explained to the OSCE EED field operations.

The OSCE EED chapter of www.osce.org. A virtual place for obtaining access to the OSCE CEEA and the EED is *www.osce.org/eea*. The site is a widely known part of the well designed OSCE web format. Among its publications, it contains the dimension's newsletter. With its comprehensive content and user-friendly links, it provides good services and is complemented by EED contributions to field missions' websites. Meanwhile, the site is not used as a discussion platform that would be receptive to the needs of OSCE EED field operations.

All in all, it seems as if the phase of the OSCE EED's institutionalization is basically completed. The necessary working structures of the dimension have been established. The further task is to continue developing the operational details of the dimension's work and its co-operation with OSCE EED international partners.

3.4 *Shift of OSCE EED Policy Instruments from Conflict Management to Development Co-operation*

At the time of its establishment, the OSCE and its field operations represented themselves as highly mobile institutions of preventive diplomacy and adjoining conflict management. Nonetheless, expanding *ad hoc* procedures of daily operations have led to a notable shift of activity fields. Along with the enlargement and institutionalization of the EED, development co-operation became a strong element in its field endeavours. The gradual take-over of other international and national organizations' implementation work has been pointed out above. It appears that this is a development that tends to create doubts on various sides with respect to the practicality and advisability of further co-operation with the OSCE EED. Correspondingly, the perhaps restrained expectations of international partner organizations towards the OSCE EED reflect, first of all, the necessity to conceptually divide fields of competence. It seems vital to the EED to think about both *self-limitation* in instruments of security-building and fields of *long-term* and *self-sustainable security co-operation*.

4. Expectations of Participating States, International and National Partners towards the OSCE EED

The OSCE EED is imbedded in the general OSCE legal framework and decision-making process. It is bound by the corresponding mission mandates. It largely depends on host governments' requirements, expectations of national partners and civil society representatives as well as the specific needs of given conflicts and security threats. It also depends on participating States executing their political intentions through the central OSCE institutions, and on the expectations of international partner organizations towards divisions of competence and labour. Hence, it is imperative to discuss these expectations in order to most effectively place the OSCE and its economic and environmental dimension within evolving European security networks.

4.1 National and Group Interests in ...

In its documents, the OSCE sees itself as an organization following the concept of a common security space, free of dividing lines (Istanbul, 1999). In European reality, there are differing and, perhaps incompatible developments in the various regions of the OSCE area that need to be considered.

North America, the EU and EU candidates, South-Eastern European countries, the Višegrad group, the Baltics and the CIS (including Russia and the Eastern European republics, Central Asia and the South Caucasus) represent states, regions and associations that have their own histories, aims and understandings. Apart from common needs in handling global economic and environmental problems, even a rough comparison of different European regions shows that there were neither common starting points, nor *all-European* mainstream developments, not to mention *all-European* economic and environmental policies. Developments in the various parts of Europe spread in different ways. They differ and diverge. Merely within the miscellaneous sub-mainstreams, groups of countries and regions have found and will find overlapping interests.

As an important side note, it is still a deficit of OSCE EED policy-making that it gets too little collective contributions from the big players and their associations. Their particular interests in developing the OSCE within European security networks are a main source for designing perspectives of OSCE EED engagement. *Inter alia*, EU contributions are to be made deriving from a forthcoming Common Foreign and Security Policy. Along with this, audible inputs from the Russian Federation are needed.

... developing the OSCE as a tool for buffering European security peripheries

By a number of participating States, engagement in OSCE economic and environmental matters may be understood as a welcomed tool for stabilizing European peripheries and adhering regions. It may appear as an instrument of stability-export to those outside of the integrating area and be welcomed as a tool for creating an external complement to internal economic growth and social welfare. It may be taken as a means of imbedding inner-European integration into a Europe-friendly, peaceful environment on the outskirts of the continent. In a similar manner, stability-export promises to ensure security feedback back to the centre. To some degree, the OSCE may appear as a sort of buffer institution of an enlarged European security area.

... developing the OSCE as a tool for easing European integration

From other standpoints, participation in OSCE activities may offer an additional chance to join the European integration processes or, at least, to deepen corresponding contacts. These activities promise to provide better access to other major European organizations. In particular, the OSCE EED is expected to be a door-opener to main European economic and environmental institutions.

... developing the OSCE as a tool of development assistance

From the perspective of the European transitional countries, there seems to exist sensible expectations towards the OSCE in its capacity as an organization to support European economic co-operation and development aid. One expects OSCE activities to have a special focus on providing economic integration assistance, supporting reforms, ensuring the rule of law, as well as transparency and legal

stability. One explicitly suggests ensuring a consistent dialogue on *all*-European economic and environmental issues.

... developing the OSCE as a tool for early warning and conflict management

Finally and naturally, OSCE activities are seen as measures of early warning and direct conflict management. To those participating States that are hosts to OSCE field operations, the OSCE and its EED are senior institutions among those organizations that directly or indirectly deal with conflict mediation. The OSCE EED is expected to assist in overcoming the lack of understanding and communication between economic and environmental decision-makers on the various conflict sides. It is requested to help create solution-friendly conditions in related fields and establish links between national, regional and foreign partner institutions.

4.2 International Partner Organizations, Their Political Commitments and Interests in Further Co-operation with the OSCE EED

A glance at statutory documents, mission charters or statements of main international partner organizations of the OSCE EED shows a clear similarity in their political commitments with those of the OSCE. Even their main vocabulary significantly resembles OSCE language.

The EU promotes economic and social progress, the development of freedom, security and justice. *The Council of Europe* engages in protecting human rights, pluralist democracy and the rule of law. It helps to consolidate stability in Europe by backing political, legislative and constitutional reforms.

NATO safeguards freedom and security by political and military means, especially through developing co-operative security structures, peacekeeping activities, arranging crisis management, providing a forum for transatlantic consultations on matters affecting vital security interests, and promoting partnership and co-operation.

The UN generally maintains international peace and security and therefore promotes economic and social advancement of all peoples. In particular, *UNDP* provides a large spectrum of developmental co-operation assistance. *UNHCR* provides support to refugees. *WFP* promotes food security. *UNEP* encourages sustainable development through sound environmental practices, promoting environmental science, information, early warning, emergency response and development of policy instruments. *UNECE*, which is the direct counterpart of the OSCE EED on the UN side, encourages greater economic co-operation. It acts through the instruments of policy analyses, elaboration of conventions, regulations and standards, and the provision of technical assistance. It helps to protect the environment and facilitates trade, industry and enterprise development. Among international financial institutions and economic organizations, the *World Bank* provides development assistance, particularly by promoting social development, good governance and institution-building, poverty reduction and environmental protection. The *IMF* promotes international monetary co-operation, a balanced growth of international trade and high levels of employment. The *IFC* promotes sustainable private sector development and poverty reduction. The *EBRD* fosters transition towards open market-oriented economies, particularly by promoting private and entrepreneurial initiatives. The *WTO* deals with the global rules of trade between countries. It ensures that trade flows as smoothly, predictably and freely as possible. It aims at a more prosperous, peaceful and accountable economic world. The *OECD* assists in ensuring the responsiveness of key economic areas, in particular by means of sectoral monitoring, promoting rules of the economic game, fostering good governance and creating strategic policy-making. The *ILO* engages in elaborating and implementing international labour standards. By promoting these standards as well as fundamental principles and rights at work, it advocates democratic and lawful developments in the labour markets.

Among humanitarian organizations, the *ICRC* has the humanitarian mission to protect the lives of victims of war and internal violence. It directs and co-ordinates international relief activities. It sup-

ports the strengthening of humanitarian law and universal human rights protection. The *IOM* is committed to the principle that humane and orderly migration benefits migrants and society. By helping to react to conflicts and emergencies, it assists governments and civil society in meeting the growing operational challenges of migration management. It understands that migration is increasingly seen as a path to employment, education, freedom and other opportunities. With its international partners, it contributes to prosperity, development and mutual understanding.

In one way or another, all these issues have their established place on the OSCE EED agenda also. They adjoin OSCE EED headquarters' and field activities or affect them. In this sense, the aforementioned international organizations, along with the big number of other international and national financial institutions, organizations of development co-operation and humanitarian aid, as well as human and minority rights defenders, represent natural counterparts for implementing OSCE diplomatic awareness-raising and intermediation work.

On the other hand, they *already* cover fields of financial assistance, development co-operation and other implementation work, which aims at conflict solution and stabilization that pre-defines their institutional interests towards further international division of labour and co-operation. With regard to OSCE endeavours, their expectations are most probably focused on ensuring comprehensive *diplomatic complementation* and backing in their own activities.

To many of the OSCE's international partner organizations, OSCE EED on-site activities may raise the alarming question about the possible long-term effects of *competition* if no conceptual division of competencies in international co-operation is made.

4.3 *Expectations of the Business World towards the OSCE EED*

Commonly, one would think business representatives to be closest partners of the OSCE EED. Nonetheless, particularly in participating States that are at the moment hosting OSCE field operations, expectations of individual businessmen, business circles and their umbrella organizations towards the OSCE EED are usually restrained. This is also the case concerning their parliamentary lobbies and governmental executives. As a more or less prosperous social and political strata, they often benefit from the outcome of inconsistent political and economic reforms as well as political uncertainties. In some cases, conflicts at domestic and regional levels serve as additional justification for limited democratic procedures and other restrictions conflicting with the principles of a state based on the rule of law. In any case, some lasting home-made emergency situations necessarily produce a number of beneficiaries.

Apart from this, there is usually little knowledge about the OSCE, their principles, general political tasks and on-site capabilities. Often, points of contact between a host country's commercial society and OSCE field operations are not identified, since possible prospects or non-prospects of making joint business are usually taken as key criterion for any co-operation. On the contrary, the OSCE is commonly perceived as a purely diplomatic organization without distinguished tools for positively influencing business as such. In contrast to international financial institutes, it has not - and should not have - any substantial financial means for funding businesses. In contrast to international development co-operation organizations, it has neither financial means nor manpower for providing assistance in creating business-friendly legislation and bureaucracy. In comparison with international economic agreements, it has little legal power for channeling national legislative endeavours towards the fulfilment of standards of international business-related law.

Meanwhile, even the initiation of specific political developments supporting business-friendly weather-changes and economic co-operation are normally not expected to be of special advantage to the OSCE EED. To businesses, the merely recommending character of OSCE decisions hardly illustrates a binding will to support economic development.

On the whole, there seems to be little visible interest of Eastern and Western European business circles in utilizing OSCE activities for their own purposes. Conversely, from the perspective of the OSCE EED, there were only insignificant attempts taken to involve businesses in OSCE security campaigns and conflict management. Conceptually, co-operation with business circles was, and still is, a weak point in the OSCE EED working agenda. However, the OSCE EED has capacities in providing political services for doing business. It has the political commitment to utilize businesses for professing economic stability-building. Beyond this, related implementation work is largely covered by international partner organizations.

4.4 Non-governmental Expectations towards the OSCE EED

In contrast to the limited expectations of commercial actors, non-governmental organizations usually show extreme interest in all kinds of co-operation with the OSCE. To them, the OSCE and their field operations serve as welcomed vehicles for establishing links with their governmental counterparts and regional and international partners, for increasing their own public reputation and popularity, raising matters of interest before a large public, getting access to financial resources from abroad and the know-how of various third-parties. Equally, in fields such as conflict management or general security- and democracy-building, not to mention purely technical issues, they expect the OSCE EED to provide political and operational assistance. On the other hand, they support OSCE field operations by becoming aware of security-relevant signals. Often, they are careful security watchers and sensitive multipliers of OSCE values. Due to common values and similar areas of activities, the OSCE EED and its non-governmental counterparts are designed to complement each other in many ways.

4.5 Expectations of the Academic Society towards the OSCE EED

By its nature, the academic society is usually looking for close co-operation with OSCE headquarters and field operations. It makes comments on general OSCE policies and on-site engagements of OSCE field operations. Directly or through their NGOs, academics regularly take part in events of the OSCE calendar and act, when their turn comes, as multipliers of OSCE values and decisions. National think-tanks are partners for public evaluation of national and international policy-making. Due to their established access to the political top of their countries, they are often able to assist in intermediating in conflict situations. Within their international and regional networks they maintain valuable contacts. They provide senior advice on national developments and are able to influence governmental policy-making. Especially in this capacity, they are valuable partners to OSCE EED field activities.

4.6 Expectations of Mass Media towards the OSCE EED

In awareness-raising and other PR-based intermediation work, media representatives are another group of partners that are naturally associated with the OSCE. Nevertheless, in the particular area of OSCE EED field operations, co-operation problems arise from limited knowledge about OSCE strategies and policy instruments. Journalists often lack the necessary sophisticated expectations towards the OSCE EED. The OSCE staff, in turn, including economic and environmental officers, has shown to have mixed qualifications in the handling of media issues.

5. Key Criteria for Co-operation with International Partner Organizations and National Partners

Preventive diplomacy and political conflict management is the niche of international work the OSCE and its EED are qualified for. This is the area for meeting expectations and co-operation interests of the EED's national and international partners. As shown above, corresponding conceptual homework has been made by the OSCE mainly in Lisbon, Copenhagen and Istanbul. With regard to the OSCE EED, it has now become essential to witness the OSCE's arrival at a pragmatic interpretation of its

comprehensive security understanding and, namely, at an adequate application of economic and environmental field activities. Repeatedly, discussions during recent years (namely at the Economic Fora and their preparatory seminars, but also on the level of international field representations) have brought up requests from international partners to learn more about the OSCE's coming to conclusions on economic and environmental policy instruments. (It is the instruments that shape the policy.) Indeed, it is necessary to clarify whether or not or to what extent the OSCE will have to get involved in activities outside diplomatic conflict management and related security support.

A necessary point of departure for evaluating the practical application of OSCE commitments and ways of co-operating with international and national partners is to define the key criteria for OSCE engagements. Concerning the specific needs of the OSCE EED, these criteria could be defined as follows:

- (a) *Security-relevance* of specific issues on the international economic and environmental agenda of a particular region or country (primary criterion);
- (b) *Utilization of specific activities for the purpose of political awareness-raising* among European, regional and national decision-makers and the general public (with the intended public reverberation to campaigns or projects as a specific criterion);
- (c) *Prospects of the international division of labour* in general, economic and environmental matters and specific issues;
- (d) *Engagement and capacities of OSCE partner organizations* in specific economic and environmental matters and in a particular region or country;
- (e) *Prospects of shifting particular project implementation work* into the hands of international and national partner organizations (self-sustainability of developments and projects);
- (f) *Particular requests* of host governments, non-governmental organizations and other national partners towards the OSCE EED;
- (g) *Utilization of specific activities for improving public reputation and visibility* of national partner organizations and persons of public interest (multipliers).

Of course, these criteria are also applicable to the other dimensions of the OSCE. As a rule of thumb, their idea should be to make use of the comparative advantages of the OSCE EED in (directly or indirectly) influencing security-building and finally transferring the implementation part of OSCE engagements into the hands of national and international partners. This is unquestionably the essence of the Platform of Co-operative Security.

6. Comparative Advantages of the OSCE EED within European Security-Building

The wide range of the OSCE EED's comparative advantages sets commodious realms of the dimension's engagement in European security-building. By making use of the general OSCE infrastructures, the dimension has established the aforementioned institutions and contacts at headquarters' levels and its diplomatic outposts in a number of (potential) conflict regions. With its special advantages, the OSCE EED adds its own values to European security endeavours.

The OSCE consensus principle contributes to the self-sustainability of European security-making. It adds the value of incorporating the entirety of European voices into security dialogues, including the ones that *do not dominate* European decision-making. It transfers individual and collective interests into self-regulating security processes in regard to particular issues or regions.

The legally non-binding character of OSCE decisions adds the value of attracting voluntary contributions to European security-building. Accordingly, OSCE decision-making is compelled to develop its own political attractiveness equally for participating States, conflict sides and other potentially inter-

ested parties. Presumably, this attribute adds another component of self-sustainability to European security developments.

The capacity of being a non-partisan, diplomatic organization gives the OSCE the advantageous reputation of a reliable security provider. The OSCE has added itself as a widely expected and actively involved partner to European conflict intermediation. Especially in conflict situations, it has access to governmental and non-governmental decision-makers on all sides. To OSCE EED national and international partners, this makes the EED a qualified lobbyist and awareness-raiser. In terms of its application to stability-promotion and conflict-management, this is a main advantage of the dimension.

Permanent top-level contacts add the value of continuity to European security dialogues.

Comparatively short communication channels, little bureaucracy and limited financial engagement add the value of mobility to European security processes. Apart from the current seriously expanding administrative procedures, the organization and its EED still have the capacities for quickly channeling political signals from field operations and headquarters to the participating State's foreign offices and vice versa. Within the OSCE, there are short cuts to the top levels. The OSCE is an excellent meeting place for the European diplomacy. It is a podium that is open to European security think-tanks.

The capacity of basically not being a donor or an implementing organization adds the value of being able to provide co-ordination services to international security and development endeavours. Potentially, the OSCE EED stays away considerably from the annual budget discussions on how to finance development co-operation and other implementation work. Consequently, it can enjoy the remarkable situation of not being exposed to periodic project-related evaluations (i.e., financial justifications) of the existence and activities of its headquarters' and field operations. In the long term, this could make the OSCE EED politically less vulnerable to conflicts of interest with national and international partners.

7. Key Problems of OSCE Economic and Environmental Field Activities in Building Co-operative Ties with International Partner Organizations

Despite numerous comparative advantages, OSCE EED field operations are confronted with various problems in building co-operative ties with international partner organizations. Problems start with difficulties in identifying clear-cut economic and environmental security threats and end with defining particular fields of international security co-operation.

Complicated measurability of economic and environmental security threats. As a matter of fact, permanent economic and environmental threats are hardly measurable to political decision-makers. Economic failure, monetary shocks and fiscal collapses, social degradation and environmental catastrophes are often only the visible outcome of long-lasting undesirable developments. They have multitudes of deeply rooted sources. Objectively, this complicates the breakdown of most general security approaches to more specific strategies and on-site activities.

Insufficient translation of general policy approaches into specific EED policy tools. Given a common understanding about the OSCE predominantly focusing on comprehensive conflict management (see Lisbon, Copenhagen, Istanbul), there is still a lack of transferring general policy approaches into specific EED policy tools.

Insufficient expression of collective and individual interests of OSCE participating States towards EED efforts. The OSCE EED as well as the whole organization gets only limited conceptual input from collective and individual OSCE key players. Security efforts in economic and environmental

affairs are so far scarcely based on guiding rules that would reflect the identifiable requirements of OSCE participating States and their associations.

Vague self-understanding of the OSCE EED's role and functions. In the field of economic and environmental matters, the OSCE is now, as before, facing difficulties in coming to a practicable self-understanding of its role and functions. The OSCE EED brings no solutions to economic and environmental problems. It elaborates and provides recommendations on how to overcome these problems. It provides assistance in identifying security threats in related fields. It gives support to self-support. It is challenged to co-ordinate international engagement. In any case, related thinking inside the OSCE (along with expectations from outside the organization) exceeds these realms of OSCE activities. Often, OSCE EED self-understanding and on-site operations aim at directly tackling the roots of security threats.

Swelling competition over co-ordination competencies and financial resources. The gradual taking-over of partner organizations' implementation work by the OSCE and its EED has necessarily lead to reflections about the core and mechanisms of international security co-operation. Especially on field levels, one ponders over justifying the international divide of competencies and labour.

Limited on-site effects of the Platform for Co-operative Security. From the viewpoint of OSCE EED field activities, there is little visible operation of the Platform for Co-operative Security. The intention of OSCE participating States to utilize their memberships in OSCE partner organizations for ensuring individual and collective adherence to the promotion of comprehensive security within the OSCE area (Istanbul, 1999) proves so far to have little effect on (at least) field levels. This is an omission that causes substantial hindrances to designing and implementing international on-site co-operation in economic and environmental security matters.

Little use of established channels linking field operations and partner organizations' headquarters. To OSCE EED field activities, there are only insignificant ways of channeling political signals to decision-makers at partner organizations' headquarters. While corresponding mechanisms are generally established, they are nevertheless not used in a way that would consistently ensure the consideration of OSCE advice on the conditionalities of financial support and other development assistance provided by OSCE partner organizations. In this respect, the Office of the OSCE CEEA or the recently established Economic and Environmental Subcommittee of the Permanent Council have so far barely been used. The OSCE Parliamentary Assembly also plays a rather secondary role here. On the other hand, the co-operating international headquarters have obviously little capacity for monitoring OSCE advisory work.

Limited implementation capacities and human resources. In contrast to many international partner organizations, the OSCE possesses limited implementation capacities and human resources. This comprises its range of policy instruments but is *not a disadvantage* to the OSCE or its EED. In essence, there is no need to boost financial capacities for implementation work. On the contrary, the organization has highly developed competence in providing a platform for negotiating European security issues and elaborating international legislation on security matters. It also has expertise and the most-developed capabilities in diplomatic conflict management that supposes a comparative limitation of means and personnel. A further enlargement of OSCE EED implementation capacities and human resources would rather endanger its long-term involvement in the various fields of international co-operation.

8. Fields of International Co-operation Targeting Economic and Environmental Security Threats

The identification of economic and environmental threats to European security is, of course, a main point of departure for the OSCE EED in dividing international security labour. Many of these threats are a universal problem; others are more typical for transitional countries and conflict areas. In one way or another, issues such as inter-ethnic controversies, inter-confessional disputes, conversation over territorial issues, discussions on competencies in public administration (e.g., within the realms of federalism, regional administration and local self-government), mass unemployment, mass migration, erosion of social security systems or global environmental problems have implications on security talks within the OSCE EED. They include the following categories:

Consequences of armed and other conflicts for economic and environmental developments as well as post-conflict obstacles to economic and environmental recovery;

Non-sustainable developments aggravating long-term economic imbalance and dependency, causing and/or leading to, *inter alia*, regional disparities in economic growth, disproportionate access to natural resources, increasing interdependence in the course of globalization processes, enlarging shadow economic activities and financial vulnerability;

Critical social developments such as social degradation and mass impoverishment, poverty mentality along with social and economic passivity, unemployment and imbalances on national and regional labour markets, especially with respect to national and other minorities, social stratification and polarization, mass migration, perpetual erosion of social security systems, deficiencies in public education systems and disparities in population growth and other imbalanced demographic trends;

Undesirable environmental developments such as growing environmental threats deriving from industrialization (green house effect, ozone depletion etc.) and post-industrial disintegration, uncontrolled use of and increasing competition over the use of limited natural resources (e.g., water, gas, oil and energy sources), cross-border environmental discords, environmental pollution and contamination deriving from military armament and post-conflict environmental hardship;

Political issues directly affecting economic developments such as inconsistent political and cultural orientations, lack of democratic traditions, deficiencies in proficient public administration and local self-government (good governance), weak governmental institutions, public passivity and lack of public participation in governmental matters;

Legal issues directly affecting economic and environmental developments such as lack of legal regulations and/or their implementation, as well as inappropriate transition of international law into national regulations, changeable legal preferences resulting in legal insecurity, limited public awareness of legal issues, and gaps between legal regulations, public life and economic reality.

These and other economic and environmental security threats are the potential fields of co-ordinated international security endeavours. They are categories of the (still developable) political economy of the origin and outbreak of armed and non-armed conflicts. In any case, they do *not necessarily* have to be put on the OSCE EED agenda and be made subject to OSCE work and international co-operation. They have to meet, at least, a minimum of the co-operation criteria that were described above.

9. Instruments of OSCE Economic and Environmental Field Activities in Building Co-operative Ties with Partner Organizations

Largely, the instruments of OSCE economic and environmental field activities are focused on mediatory and advisory functions. They are aimed at influencing public opinion and political decision-making. In preventive diplomacy and direct conflict management, they use means that include political dialogues with representatives from governments and non-governmental organizations, legal and po-

litical advising and public awareness campaigns on national and international levels. The most widespread forms of communication are individual talks, round tables, seminars and media work. Through their regional networks, OSCE EED field operations promote cross-border co-operation. Through background-reporting, they set political accents on international, regional and national dialogues. By developing political analyses of economic and environmental sources of security threats, they may perfectly contribute to early-warning activities. As stated, the working instruments of OSCE EED field activities are increasingly complemented or even replaced by the implementation of various projects. Concerning this, the number of projects and their corresponding budgets are frequently used to assess the political significance and influence of OSCE EED field endeavours.

In co-operating with international partner organizations, OSCE EED field operations maintain regular on-site contacts such as co-ordination meetings, monthly donor meetings and briefings. Commonly under the direction of the Heads of Mission, they contribute to co-ordinating international security efforts and development assistance. They participate in lobbying for the interests of international partner organizations before government and society. Joint awareness campaigns and joint implementation of projects are typical instruments of the international on-site division of labour.

Nonetheless, on field levels, instruments of international co-operation on economic and environmental matters are often of ephemeral nature. They are seriously lacking systematic foundations because of deficits in a regular (institutionalized) cross exchange of information between field operations and headquarters. From the perspective of OSCE EED field activities, there is, as stated, too little corresponding communication with counterparts at partner organizations' headquarters, both directly and via the OSCE CEEA. There are a few effective instruments of channeling political messages to decision-making departments at partner organizations' headquarters. As a result, reverberation of OSCE advice around partner organizations is often restrained.

On the other hand, a basic set of instruments of economic and environmental co-operation with interested partner organizations was suggested by the Common Concept (Copenhagen, 1997) and the Platform for Co-operative Security (Istanbul, 1999). These instruments (should), *inter alia*, include regular contacts, identification of liaison officers or points of contacts, cross-representation at appropriate meetings, joint-needs-assessment missions, secondments of experts from other organizations to the OSCE, development of common projects and field operations as well as joint training efforts. It is proposed that delegations be dispatched from OSCE institutions, with the participation of other international organizations, to provide reform assistance. It has also been suggested that Personal Representatives of the Chairman-in-Office be dispatched for fact-finding or advisory work.

As stressed above, the effective application of these and other instruments requires primarily (a) a clear definition (i.e., limitation) of role and functions of the OSCE EED with a definite emphasis put on preventive diplomacy and conflict management, (b) a clearer indication of the interests of participating States and their associations towards the OSCE and its economic and environmental dimension, and (c) a stronger orientation of central OSCE institutions towards the specific regional and national components of European security-building.

10. Conclusions and Recommendations

Reducing the fields of OSCE EED engagement. It is recommended that a shift be made from the economic and environmental attention of the OSCE back to preventive diplomacy and concerted conflict management. In this respect, the division of competencies and labour between the OSCE EED and its international partner organizations will be both a prerequisite for and an outcome of international co-operation. Mainly, it has to become clear that, within the whole picture of European security-building, the OSCE EED is well equipped for occupying the conflict management niche while adjoining fields such as development assistance, financial support or legal advice are left to international partner or-

ganizations. Reducing the field of its own engagements while enlarging areas and mechanisms of international co-operation will make the OSCE EED more effective and compatible to the endeavours of its partner organizations. This has to be made evident to OSCE participating States and OSCE EED international partner organizations.

Ongoing discussions about whether or not the OSCE EED should deal with technical issues, such as, removing obstacles to national and international business, sustainable use of energy and other resources, limitation of CO₂ emissions, sustainable agriculture and food security, issues of environmental management and research involving genetic manipulation (as repeatedly proposed), will have to focus on these issues' concrete security-relevance in specific regions, countries or conflict situations and, again, on the interests and capacities of international partner organizations. Only these criteria can qualify them for becoming part of the OSCE economic and environmental agenda and on-site engagements.

Intensifying core activities within preventive diplomacy and conflict management. The division of labour between the OSCE EED and its international partner organizations will have to be complemented by a more sophisticated approach to specific EED topics within the field of preventive diplomacy and conflict management. In this respect, further OSCE thinking should be directed at areas such as (a) economic and environmental factors of European security-building, (b) the political economy of conflicts and security threats, (c) ethnic, social and other underlying patterns of economic hardship, environmental degradation and the depletion of natural resources, (d) local, national and regional prospects (comparative advantages) of economic advancement as tools for compensation or removal of conflict sources, or (e) potentialities of cross-border and regional co-operation as well as economic, legal and other international integration as tools for materializing confidence and security-building. Within these and similar areas, it is proposed that the range of OSCE EED endeavours be reduced and then that the remaining core activities, which are believed to have the common denominator of security-relevance, be intensified.

Emphasizing regional and national pillars of the OSCE EED. Taking into account the only *limited universal mechanisms* of economic and environmental conflict management, it has been suggested that discussions about OSCE EED engagement in strict application to specific countries, regions or conflict situations be held. In a more sophisticated way, the regional and national pillars of the OSCE EED will have to be evaluated. This will help to shift from theoretical discussions to practicable applications of preventive diplomacy and conflict management. In general, a pragmatic "regionalization" or "nationalization" of OSCE economic and environmental endeavours would keep the EED's international engagement mobile and also meet the approach of the Platform for Co-operative Security on avoiding permanent (i.e., institutionalized and therefore less mobile) obligations in international co-operation.

In a similar way, discussions on the criteria for the OSCE undertaking economic and environmental initiatives will have to be linked to needed assessments in individual host countries. It is recommended that forms of dividing competencies and labour between international organizations in concise application to host countries' requirements be considered.

For increasing transparency and understanding, it is proposed that detailed explanations of main topics and operational needs of OSCE EED field activities, in the individual host countries and regions, be included in the CEEA working programme and other planning documents of the OSCE EED. This should reflect specific requests of the host countries themselves, proposals of international partner organizations and corresponding signals from the EED field advisers.

Rethinking the Bonn approaches under the perspective of international co-operation. There is obviously a need to rethink wrong assumptions that have been influencing the OSCE EED since the CSCE Conference on Economic Co-operation in Europe (Bonn, 1990). To ensure long-term interests in OSCE operations to all OSCE participating sides, as well as on the side of international partner organizations, it is recommended that one-sided orientations of economic and environmental thinking and activities be conceptually overcome. It is recommended that a return to a wider regional spectrum

of OSCE economic and environmental discussions be made in order to put them back on pan-European grounds. For *common* understanding and developing *common* interests in OSCE EED endeavours, it is probably time to see *Europe as a common space in transition*. Meanwhile, contemporary economic and environmental discussions will have to concentrate on the regional diversity of transition. Recovering the discussion on the Bonn approaches would elevate a joint rethinking of the inventory of security-related economic and environmental matters and policy instruments. This would have direct implications for the subjects of international co-operation in the field missions' host countries.

Positioning the OSCE EED within European security endeavours. In the course of discussing OSCE economic and environmental activities, consideration about the long-term contributions various participating States are able and willing to make is indispensable. Enduring interests in participating in OSCE economic and environmental matters and, last but not least, utilizing the OSCE EED for their own purposes will solidly position the economic and environmental dimension amidst the multitude of European security endeavours.

Promoting regional balance of OSCE EED attention throughout the whole OSCE area. It is conceptually vital, to widen the organization's regional horizons of political attention throughout the whole OSCE area. The limitation of efforts on South-Eastern and Eastern European countries that has defined OSCE operations during recent years might easily curb various national interests in further participating in or contributing to the OSCE at all. OSCE co-operation in general and economic and environmental affairs in particular have to be put on more bi-directional grounds.

Arriving at collective statements concerning the OSCE EED. In regard to OSCE participating States and their various associations, it is recommended that collective positions towards the OSCE EED be found. For the purpose of developing the OSCE as an instrument of European security-building, this is primarily a challenge to Europe's big players in their capacity as members of the EU, UN, NATO and the CIS. This challenge is also closely linked with the further elaboration of the European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy.

Supporting main international organizations and associations. Limited interaction with European, regional, sub-regional and cross-border initiatives curbs the effectiveness of OSCE economic and environmental engagements. Consequently, a main concern at OSCE headquarters should be the arrangement of corresponding co-operation. At headquarters and field levels, the OSCE EED should arrive at mechanisms of politically supporting the main international partner organizations. Conversely, OSCE EED activities ought to be open to individual (national) and collective (institutional) participation. Following the Platform approach, this is needed to enhance mutually complementing and reinforcing ties.

Considering OSCE EED advice by international partner organizations. It is recommended that mechanisms for considering political OSCE advice on the conditionalities of financial support and other development assistance, provided by OSCE partner organizations, be established. Once again, this is mainly a challenge to key players who are involved in international partner organizations. As a practical step, it is recommended that existing OSCE units be utilized or that OSCE observers from OSCE partner organizations, for the purpose of translating OSCE EED country advice into financial and other development assistance measures, be assigned.

Developing OSCE EED institutions with respect to international co-operation. With special respect to international co-operation, it is recommended that OSCE EED institutions be developed in the following ways:

Developing the Platform for Co-operative Security. Developing the Platform for Co-operative Security will have to be understood as establishing a headquarters' format for conceptually dividing competencies and international labour in relation to given security matters in specific countries and regions. As intended, the Platform will have to be used for addressing particular needs in assisting participating States. The interests of concerned participating States and international partner organizations will have to find consideration in the various forms of particular OSCE EED involvement. To OSCE

EED field activities, this means supporting communication between their respective national and international partner organizations and OSCE headquarters. For this purpose, the economic and environmental advisers will have to become more engaged in corresponding procedures.

Steadying the Prague Forum process. It is recommended that the Prague Forum be given a more process-like character. Among other things, one should think about continually maintaining discussions on specific regional and national issues. This would also require the frequent return to earlier invitees and contributors. In this context, a steadying of the financing procedures of the Prague Forum is needed for ensuring a long-term planning of non-governmental participation. Moreover, it seems advisable to conduct consecutive follow-ups of Economic Fora discussions. Depending on particular issues and interests, this could be equally possible on headquarters, regional or national levels. Depending on specific cases, it will be worth following up Prague dialogues under the direct involvement of OSCE partners and partner organizations. Finally, special attention must be paid to increasing and utilizing the media attendance from field mission host countries.

Utilizing the Economic and Environmental Subcommittee. It is recommended that the Economic and Environmental Subcommittee be utilized for establishing links between OSCE EED field operations and international partner organizations. Likewise, the Subcommittee could become a place for involving national OSCE EED partners (such as business, governmental, non-governmental, academic and media representatives) in relevant decision-making.

Upgrading the OSCE CEEA. It is proposed that consideration be given to an institutional upgrading of the OSCE CEEA. To separate the Co-ordinator from the OSCE Secretariat and make him an independent institution comparable with the OSCE HCNM or the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media would strengthen his voice within and outside the organization. This seems particularly important with respect to his co-operation with international partner organizations. It would also make him politically more autonomous and should not necessarily lead to additional staffing and financing.

Improving the OSCE EED media appearance. Especially in view of the awareness-raising role of the OSCE EED, it is necessary to improve the media appearance of the EED's field operations. The OSCE operates within a media world. The visibility of its economic and environmental activities on national levels has to be made a main goal of OSCE EED work. Public perception is a decisive factor of OSCE effectiveness. Among the group of OSCE EED field advisers, professionalism in media work has to be improved. Media skills must become one of the advisers' employment criteria. Special media training could be included into the *Autumn EED meetings*. With regard to dialogue on field levels, special websites could be installed for public disputes on national and cross-border economic and environmental issues - in essence an "*OSCE EED Dialogue on ...*" site. Media work is also an area for developing co-operative ties with international partner organizations.

Steadying OSCE EED staffing procedures. It is recommended that OSCE EED staffing procedures be stabilized. Governments that are seconding their economic and environmental experts to OSCE field operations are asked to stick to the specific selection criteria of the OSCE EED. Providing training and other preparation of incoming EED advisers would be supportive. In general terms, this has already become a regular procedure. Meanwhile, the preparation of EED field advisers goes beyond the realms of common induction courses and could be a task for diplomatic academies, national training centres or similar institutions of international partner organizations. Furthermore, it would be advisable for the CEEA Office to maintain a *REACT*-based pool of experts on specific regions and topics, especially under the consideration that the OSCE is not a career institution. It is also recommended that secondary use of the know-how of retired CEEA and former advisers be made.

Involving efforts of national OSCE EED partners into international field co-operation. With special respect to co-operation on national levels, it is recommended that the OSCE EED develop endeavours in the following directions:

The involvement of business efforts. Political efforts of business circles and their umbrella organizations have to be integrated into OSCE EED endeavours. Their involvement in OSCE activities could be taken as indicator of successfully representing EED policy. For operations in individual host countries, it is recommended that contact between sides involved in business-related cross-border and re-

gional rapprochement be supported and that emphasis be placed on the security-relevance of these activities. Contacts have to be promoted between business circles and international partner organizations with regard to business-related issues.

On the other hand, it is worth learning about international and national business circles being willing and able to contribute to OSCE EED endeavours. Beyond political issues, there could be financial and other fields of joint interests and mutual complementation. The arrival at forms of mutually binding co-operation-like event sponsoring or project granting is conceivable.

Involving non-governmental, academic and media efforts. At the level of field operations, one should think about widening and institutionalizing working contacts and consultations with non-governmental organizations. Regular links between OSCE EED field officers and the CEEA could be utilized for channeling non-governmental signals to international partner organizations. It would not be complicated but nonetheless an effective awareness-raising step to issue at www.osce.org/eea a *List of Non-governmental Partners of the OSCE EED* that have recommended themselves by fruitfully and reliably co-operating with the dimension and international partner organizations. Likewise, its purpose would be to highlight good experience in co-operating with national representatives of the academic society and mass media.

In conclusion, it should be emphasized anew that comprising the range of OSCE EED activities to preventive diplomacy and direct conflict management, dividing labour with partners and leaving the implementation part of comprehensive security-building and development co-operation to qualified international partner organizations will most probably lead to fruitful international co-operation on economic and environmental matters. Also, a regional balance of conceptual work and on-site endeavours throughout the whole OSCE area has to be considered. This will help to overcome the OSCE EED's key deficit of so far being barely utilized as an institution of early warning and conflict prevention.