



Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

Office of the Secretary General
Section for External Co-operation



**2005 OSCE-Korea Conference on new
security threats and a new security
paradigm**
Seoul, 25 and 26 April 2005



Consolidated Summary

Table of Content

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 1 | General information | 3 |
| 1.1 | Venue | 3 |
| 1.2 | Participation | 3 |
| 1.3 | Timetable and Organizational Modalities | 3 |
| 1.4 | Agenda | 4 |
| 2 | Concluding summary by the Co-Chairpersons | 8 |
| 3 | Reports by session rapporteurs | 12 |
| 3.1 | Session One: New Security Threats and Counter-Measures..... | 12 |
| 3.2 | Session Two: The Need for a New Security Paradigm..... | 15 |
| 3.3 | Session Three: A New Security Paradigm in North-East Asia | 19 |
| 4 | List of participants | 24 |
| 5 | List of documents..... | 31 |
| 6 | Seating arrangement..... | 32 |

1 General information

1.1 Venue

The Conference was held from 25 to 26 April 2005, in the International Conference Hall of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MOFAT) of Korea.

1.2 Participation^{*)}

- 1.2.1 Thirty-four OSCE participating States, including Luxembourg/EU and the European Commission took part in the Conference.
- 1.2.2 All the Partners for Co-operation in Asia (Afghanistan, Japan, Korea, Mongolia and Thailand) and four Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation (Algeria, Egypt, Morocco and Tunisia) were represented.
- 1.2.3 The OSCE Secretariat was represented.
- 1.2.4 11 member States of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) participated as observers.
- 1.2.5 The International Committee of the Red Cross was represented.
- 1.2.6 Representatives of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were able to attend and contribute to the Conference in accordance with the relevant OSCE provisions and practices.

1.3 Timetable and Organizational Modalities

- 1.3.1 The Conference began at 9:30 a.m. (opening ceremony) on 25 April 2005 and ended at noon on 26 April 2005.
- 1.3.2 The Conference was conducted in three sessions.
- 1.3.3 The opening and closing sessions were co-chaired by H.E. Ambassador Dr. Boris Frlec, Head of OSCE Task Force, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Slovenia and Mr. Kim Won-Soo, Director-General for Policy Planning, MOFAT, Korea
- 1.3.4 Each session had a moderator and a rapporteur.
- 1.3.5 The working language was English.
- 1.3.6 Arrangements were made for press coverage.
- 1.3.7 Other rules of procedure and working methods of the OSCE were applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the Conference.
- 1.3.8 The seating arrangement is shown in the Annex.

^{*)} See chapter 4 - List of Participants

1.4 Agenda

Sunday, 24 April

19:00-21:30 Preparatory Meeting, Restaurant Danube, Hotel Koreana

* Attendance: Co-Chairmen, all Moderators and Rapporteurs, OSCE Secretariat, MOFAT

Monday, 25 April

09:30-10:00 Opening Session

Co-Chairmen

H.E. Ambassador Dr. Boris Frlec, Head of OSCE Task Force, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Slovenia

H.E. Kim Won-Soo, Director-General for Policy Planning, MOFAT, Korea

Opening Addresses:

- H.E. Mr. Chun Yung-Woo, Deputy Minister for Policy Planning and International Organizations, MOFAT, Korea
- H.E. Mr. Dimitrij Rupel, OSCE Chairman-in-Office, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Slovenia
- H.E. Ambassador Ján Kubiš, Secretary General of the OSCE

10:00-10:15 Coffee Break

10:15-12:15 Session 1: New Security Threats and Counter-Measures

- Types and characteristics of new security threats
- New security threats and the OSCE's strategy to address them

Moderator: Mr. Kenji Shinoda, Deputy Director-General of the European Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan

Rapporteur: Mr. Arturo Perez Martinez, Deputy Head of the Permanent Mission of Spain to the OSCE

Speakers:

- H.E. Dr. Piotr Antoni Switalski, Undersecretary of State, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland
- Dr. Lee Geun, Professor, Graduate School of International Studies (GSIS), Seoul National University, Korea
- Mr. Ruan Zongze, Vice President, China Institute of International Studies, China

- Dr. Oleksandr Pavlyuk, Head of External Co-operation a.i., OSCE Secretariat
- H.E. Ambassador Werner-Helmut Ehrlich, Senior Advisor for Politico-Military Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Austria

Discussants:

- Dr. Lee Seo-hang, Dean of Research, IFANS/MOFAT, Korea
- H.E. Ambassador Christian D. Falkowski, Head of the Delegation of the European Commission to the International Organisations in Vienna

**12:15-13:45 Luncheon Hosted by the OSCE Secretary General
Reception Hall of MOFAT, 18th floor**

14:00-16:00 Session 2: The Need for a New Security Paradigm

- Definition of a new security paradigm
- Interregional security co-operation as an alternative

Moderator: H.E. Ambassador Ivo Petrov, Head of the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Bulgaria to the OSCE, Chairman of the Contact Group with the Asian Partners for Co-operation

Rapporteur: Mr. Wolfram Maas, Deputy Head of the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the OSCE

Speakers:

- H.E. Ambassador Aleksii Härkönen, Head of the Permanent Mission of Finland to the OSCE
- Mr. François Pilot, Counsellor, Politico-Military Affairs, Permanent Mission of Luxemburg to the OSCE / EU
- Dr. Hong Ki-joon, Professor, Graduate Institute of Peace Studies, Kyung Hee University, Korea
- The Honorable Senator Sam Brownback, U.S. – videotaped presentation

Discussants:

- Dr. Kim Sung-han, Professor, IFANS/MOFAT, Korea
- Mr. Sean Woo, Chief of Staff, Helsinki Commission, U.S.

16:00-16:30 Coffee Break

16:30-17:30 Discussion

18:30- 20:00 **Dinner Hosted by H.E Ban Ki-moon, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Republic of Korea**
Grand Ball Room, Seoul Plaza Hotel

Tuesday, 26 April

09:30-11:00 **Session 3: A New Security Paradigm in North-East Asia**

- New security threats in North-East Asia
- The establishment of regional security co-operation in North-East Asia

Moderator: H.E. Ambassador Cho Chang-beom, Ambassador of the Republic of Korea

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

Speakers:

- Dr. Anvar Azimov, Deputy Director, Department of European Co-operation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Russia
- Mr. Thomas Wuchte, Senior Advisor, US Mission to the OSCE, and Dr. Eliot Kang, Senior Adviser, Regional and Strategic Security, Bureau of Arms Control, U.S. Department of State
- Dr. Hajime Izumi, Professor, Shizuoka University, Japan
- H.E. Ambassador Rakhat Aliyev, Head of the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Kazakhstan to the OSCE
- Mr. Jong-Kook Lee, Deputy Director-General, Department for Policy Planning, MOFAT, Korea

Discussant:

- Ms. Suvd Badarch, Director-General, Department of Policy Planning and Evaluation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mongolia

11:00-11:15 **Coffee Break**

11:15-11:45 **Discussion**

11:45- 12:30 Concluding Session

Co-Chairmen

H.E. Ambassador Dr. Boris Frlec, Head of OSCE Task Force, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Slovenia

H.E. Kim Won-Soo, Director-General for Policy Planning, MOFAT, Korea

Rapporteurs' Reports for Sessions 1-3

Chairpersons' Summary

12:30 Adjournment

16:00 Optional Programme (Field Trip to Mt. Kungang)

2 Concluding summary by the Co-Chairpersons

Upon the invitation of the Government of the Republic of Korea and by the decision of the Permanent Council of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) of 16 December 2004, the 2005 OSCE-Korea Conference on ‘New Security Threats and a New Security Paradigm’ was held in Seoul on 25 and 26 April 2005. This event was the OSCE’s second joint conference with Korea, following the 2001 OSCE-Korea Conference on “Applicability of OSCE CSBMs in North-East Asia”, held in Seoul on 19-21 March 2001.

The Conference was opened by H.E. Mr. Chun Yung-Woo, Deputy Minister for Policy Planning and International Organizations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Republic of Korea, H.E. Dr. Dimitrij Rupel, OSCE Chairman-in-Office, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Slovenia and H.E. Ambassador Ján Kubiš, Secretary General of the OSCE. The Conference was co-chaired by H.E. Ambassador Dr. Boris Frlec, Head of OSCE Task Force, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Slovenia and H.E. Kim Won-Soo, Director-General for Policy Planning, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Republic of Korea.

Thirty-four OSCE participating States took part, including many representatives from the Vienna-based delegations. Representatives from five Partners for Co-operation in Asia and four Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation also took part. Eleven member States of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) participated in the Conference as observers.

H.E. Kim Won-Soo, Director-General for Policy Planning, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Republic of Korea welcomed all the participants to the Conference. He stated that since the first OSCE-Korea Conference in 2001, many positive economic and political developments had taken place in North-East Asia, such as an increase in inter-regional interdependence and stable relationships among the large powers, which had moved the region toward closer co-operation. However, negative factors such as the possible return of power politics, the rise of nationalism and the legacy of history were preventing the North-East Asian countries from building a future-oriented relationship together. He expressed his hope that the three-decade-old European experience of multilateral security co-operation would provide a valuable lesson to North-East Asian countries on preventing negative elements from overtaking positive development, and towards forming a multilateral security co-operation mechanism in the region.

In his opening address, the Deputy Minister for Policy Planning and International Organizations of the Republic of Korea, H.E. Chun Yung-Woo, noted that North-East Asia, especially the Korean peninsula, currently faced its most dire and intractable challenge to peace and security. He emphasized the importance of building regional institutions for security co-operation in order to deal effectively with these challenges to peace. Korea’s aspiration to become a proactive force in maintaining the strategic stability in North-East Asia as a regional balancer was relevant in this connection. In his conclusion he stressed the importance of a multi-layered security structure in North-East Asia tailored to the nature and scope of the new threats, identifying the OSCE as a good model to emulate.

In his opening address, H.E. Minister Dimitrij Rupel, the OSCE Chairman-in-Office, commenced by paying tribute to Korea for the active role it had played as a Partner for Co-

operation. Noting that this was the second conference jointly held by the OSCE and Korea, and the third gathering held in Seoul overall, he underlined the value placed on relations with the OSCE Asian and Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation, in view of the interdependence of the respective regions. He emphasized the need for international organizations to re-tool themselves to respond to changes in the international agenda dictated by changes brought to the fore by globalization, integration and new security threats. The OSCE had already embarked on this path, starting with the adoption of the OSCE Strategy to Address Threats to Security and stability in the Twenty-First Century. He also pointed out two main security trends, both favouring the OSCE's comprehensive and co-operative approach. The first was that security issues were becoming increasingly complex and interlinked, requiring a holistic approach, and the second was that security was indivisible, requiring effective multi-lateral responses. Co-operation, transparency and a functioning legal infrastructure were crucial elements in confronting today's security challenges. He emphasized that, while the OSCE could not be franchised to other regions, there were still plenty of commonalities to be discussed and experiences to be shared, and said that the OSCE-Korea Conference offered an excellent opportunity to do just that.

In his opening statement, Ambassador Ján Kubiš, Secretary General of the OSCE, highlighted the relevance of the Conference, especially in light of the prominence of new security threats and increasing interdependence on security issues in a globalized world. He pointed out the importance of the regularity of events of this kind and of ensuring appropriate follow-up, so that ideas discussed in previous conferences can be further developed and actually implemented. He also noted with satisfaction that the Conference was highly representative and welcomed the presence of many of OSCE's Partners for Co-operation, both Mediterranean and Asian, as well as many ARF member countries. He further expressed his hope to expand contacts between the OSCE and the ARF.

The work of the Conference was conducted in three sessions: (1) New Security Threats and Counter-Measures; (2) The Need for a New Security Paradigm and (3) A New Security Paradigm in North-East Asia. The three sessions were organized so as to focus on the following sub-themes: first, the characteristics of the new security threats and the OSCE's strategy for addressing them; second, the concept of a new security paradigm and possible ways to tackle new security threats; third a new security paradigm in North-East Asia, with particular emphasis on the prospect of establishing a permanent security dialogue in the region.

A summary of each session is included below in the Rapporteurs' reports.

In their final summary of the Conference, the Co-Chairmen highlighted the following main proposals and suggestions, taking into consideration the discussion offered by the participants:

1. The 2005 OSCE-Korea Conference was instrumental in assessing new security threats and exploring ways of establishing a new security paradigm to address them. The Conference also provided a valuable opportunity to raise the level of interaction between the OSCE and the Asian Partners in a way that could promote better understanding of new security threats that are indivisible in nature, and lead to an exchange of views on how to foster an effective multilateral security dialogue in Asia. As a way of strengthening ties with the OSCE, Asian Partners should consider seconding experts to the OSCE institutions and actively taking part in OSCE field missions and projects.

Interaction between the OSCE and the ARF should also be enhanced as a means to strengthen co-operation between the OSCE and the Asian Partners for Co-operation further.

2. North-East Asia faced a dual challenge. Although the current security environment in the region made such a mechanism premature, there was a clear need to establish an effective multilateral security dialogue to address security threats. Given the nature of the challenge, a gradual and multi-layered approach was recommended: issues that were more susceptible to co-operative solutions should be tackled first, taking as full advantage as possible of such existing multilateral security forums and institutions as the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), the ASEAN Plus Three (ASEAN+3), the Asia-Pacific Economic Co-operation (APEC), the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM), and the NEACD (North-East Asia Co-operation Dialogue), and the CSCAP (Council for Security Co-operation in the Asia-Pacific). In this regard, it was suggested that North-East Asian countries could convene a North-East Asian caucus on the margins of the ARF meetings.
3. Stability in the Korean peninsula was vital for peace and prosperity in North-East Asia. The peaceful resolution of the North Korea nuclear issue was a matter of utmost priority for stability in the peninsula, and was to be addressed at the Six Party Process. Once this issue was resolved, the Process could create a positive momentum towards a more effective multilateral security mechanism in the region. Parallel efforts should be continued to cultivate a culture of dialogue among North-East Asian countries regarding their common security concerns. It was recognized that the NEACD, Track 1.5 security dialogue, in which all the countries concerned participated, provided a useful venue in this regard and needed further development into an inter-governmental Track 1 dialogue.
4. The Republic of Korea could play a proactive role in coping with the dual challenge of North-East Asia and resolving the North Korean nuclear issue. The Republic of Korea was strategically located between the Asian continent and the Pacific Ocean and had a unique experience of accomplishing political democratization and establishing an advanced market economy. Such strategic assets of the Republic of Korea could be utilized in fostering mutual confidence among North-East Asian countries and to create an atmosphere of regional co-operation.
5. Strengthening ties between the OSCE and regional security forums in Asia was an effective way to reinforce a common understanding of the utility of multilateral security co-operation for peace and stability in the respective regions. In this respect the active participation of ARF member countries in the 2005 OSCE-Korea Conference was encouraging. Holding jointly sponsored meetings and the exchange of personnel and visits could be instrumental in expanding the scope of co-operation between the two organizations. Exchanging visits between the ARF and the OSCE Chair on regular basis could also be considered as a way to promote high-level interaction between the OSCE and Asian Partners for Co-operation. With respect to North Korea, it was recommended that the OSCE continue to invite it to its meetings with the Asian Partners wherever appropriate and that it convey the results of the 2005 OSCE-Korea Conference to North Korea.

In the Concluding Session, the Co-Chairman, H.E. Dr. Boris Frlec, Head of the OSCE Task Force, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Slovenia, stated that the Conference provided solid ground for an interesting exchange of ideas on the definition of new security

threats and how they manifest themselves in reality. Given the complex and unpredictable nature of new security threats, the international community must be flexible and well-prepared in tackling them, taking a systematic, multi-layered approach. In this regard, the OSCE, as a successful multilateral security organization, could offer valuable instruments and tools in the OSCE area and beyond. Quoting a proverb that even the longest journey starts with a small step, he also emphasized the importance of promoting inter-regional co-operation in small, concrete projects. In conclusion, he encouraged the OSCE and its partner States to enhance co-operation with each other to increase synergies in dealing with new security threats.

The second Co-Chairman, H.E. Kim Won-Soo, Director-General for Policy Planning, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Republic of Korea explained the dual challenge that the North-East Asian region faced. Despite the urgent need to establish a regional security dialogue to address both old and new security threats, the security environment in North-East Asia made such a mechanism premature. One of the ways in which the OSCE could help the North-East Asian countries, he argued, was by providing lessons on how to close the gap between the need and the conditions. In closing, he underlined the importance of the Conference as a venue for rich debate and exchange of views between the OSCE and its Partners for Co-operation on pending security issues. He reaffirmed the Korean Government's commitment to continuing the tradition, and thanked all the participants for their constructive and active participation in the Conference.

The participants thanked the Government of the Republic of Korea and the OSCE for jointly organizing and hosting the Conference, welcoming its successful outcome. The Republic of Korea was especially thanked for the warm hospitality extended to all participants.

3 Reports by session rapporteurs

3.1 Session One: New Security Threats and Counter-Measures

- **Types of new security threats and their characteristics**
- **New security threats and the OSCE's strategy for addressing them**

Report by Arturo Perez Martinez, Deputy Head of the Permanent Mission of Spain to the OSCE

The Moderator, Mr. Kenji Shinoda, Deputy Director-General of the European Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, opened the session by recalling the good discussion that had taken place at the Tokyo Conference the year before, and expressing the hope that the present one would be equally successful in finding a new paradigm in North-East Asia to address the new threats and take effective counter-measures. He considered access to and possible use of WMD as the most serious threat, together with terrorism, organized crime, piracy, infections and pollution. A new concept of security had taken root which required a multi-faceted approach towards identifying, assessing and categorizing the threats. In this sense Europe and North-East Asia both faced the same challenge, namely, how to combat the threats effectively. The moderator requested a useful analysis by the participants and encouraged them to create a good foundation for future discussions.

H.E. Dr. Piotr Antoni Switalski, Undersecretary of State, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland referred to such threats as WMD, migration, natural disasters, illnesses, poverty and exclusion. The concept of security – he also said – was now wider because of the changes that had taken place after the Cold War. We needed to learn to live with change and uncertainty, which were not the same in different parts of the globe. Dynamism of change was a result of the “civilization of knowledge”. The balance of power had a new perspective and national security depended on external factors. Not much prevention was possible (for example: Sept 11). Dr. Switalski concluded that now the security of individuals was more important than that of States, which implied a new paradigm of sovereignty. But it was hard to respond to the threats and we had to open ourselves to change, and live with the dilemma of choice. There were no ready-made solutions and the new international order must be based on values, especially freedom and solidarity, and to conclude, the international institutions and their mechanisms should be characterized by flexibility, rapidity, adaptation, synergies and co-operation if they were to manage the change successfully.

Dr. Lee Geun, Professor at the Graduate School of International Studies (GSIS) of the Seoul National University, Korea spoke about the interdependence of States during the Cold War and the traditional military security threats between the capitalist and socialist camps. Nation States and their borders had consolidated and many new States had appeared in the political arena. The new security environment was not the end of the Cold War era, but that of wars to exterminate another nation State (example: Iraq). There was a correlation between interdependence and peace. But new security threats were proliferating and globalization was a provider and a target. When powerful political-economic coalitions felt threatened by the new threats, they securitized them and addressed them with reinforced institutions that needed to co-operate between themselves.

In North-East Asia the consolidation of Nation-States and borders was not finished and traditional security issues dominated the security agenda (China, Taiwan, and the two Koreas). However, Dr. Lee pointed out the glorification by some history textbooks of conservative elements in Japan's imperialistic history as a new threat that needed to be dealt with seriously, in order to avoid Japan giving out the wrong signals.

Mr. Ruan Zongze, Vice President of the China Institute of International Studies, spoke of multilateralism as an essential element and said that profound changes had taken place after the Cold War and with globalization. New security threats took advantage of free communications, flow of capital and people, everybody was vulnerable, and co-operation was needed; non State actors were playing an increasingly important part, and they damaged relationships among States. To preserve peace one needed to respond to the changes and formulate a new security paradigm: to enhance trust through dialogue and co-operation, collective security and multilateralism; to build a new security community characterized by a win-win concept, again through multilateralism, and to formulate an East Asia regional strategy with the major players (successful examples included APEC, ASEAN, ARF, SCO).

Dr. Oleksandr Pavlyuk, interim Head of External Cooperation of the OSCE Secretariat, also referred to the Sept. 11 attack, pointing out that it had made the OSCE review its priorities and instruments (Bucharest Declaration and Plan of Action, Porto Charter, ASRC and Maastricht Strategy) and identify five types of threats: inter and intra-state conflicts; terrorism and other criminal activities; discrimination and intolerance; economy and environment; and politico-military threats. Two aspects deserved particular attention. First, the Strategy emphasized that the OSCE response would be multidimensional. Secondly, in the Strategy participating States pledged to meet threats to security and stability in the Twenty-First century on the basis of the Organization's concept of common, comprehensive, co-operative and indivisible security. The OSCE's response had been to add to its tool-box a number of new capacities, such as preventing and combating terrorism and trafficking in human beings, policing, border management and security, and combating intolerance and discrimination. The OSCE also co-operated with other Organizations and partner States and acknowledged the potential spillover of security threats between adjacent regions.

H.E. Ambassador Werner-Helmut Ehrlich, Senior Adviser for Politico-Military Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Austria was the last speaker and provoked the audience with many questions and comments aimed at stimulating active participation. He prioritized the threats to security by their effects on the populations and elaborated on terrorism and the Sept. 11 attack from different points of view, coming to interesting conclusions about control of society, the improved situation of political parties, terrorist organizations and civil support, and errors in judgement. President Bush's war on terror had achieved some good results such as the implementation of the 12 UN Conventions, and new resolutions and Conventions. Ambassador Ehrlich carried on by saying that some people were not happy with the results, and pointed out some of the problems inherent in tackling the real question and the need for us to change our points of view. He mentioned Palestine, Chechnya, mass media, WMD and the cases of Iran, Syria and North Korea who felt safer if they maintained a nuclear potential. The need to act in conformity with international law was also mentioned in reference to the new balance of power and the need to coordinate actions with United Nations.

Dr. Lee Seo-hang, Dean of Research, IFANS/MOFAT, Korea was the first discussant to take the floor and focused on the problems involved in the identification of non-conventional security threats and the need to be prepared for new things to come at this uncertain juncture.

Then he asked whether the Europeans felt the threat in North-East Asia as something that directly affected them. One delegate pointed out that there was a different atmosphere in the two areas.

The second discussant, Ambassador Falkowski, referred to the European experience that had led to the establishment of security in Europe based on three requirements, namely self-determination, genuine democracy and regional economic and cultural interdependence between states. This had led in Europe to a level-playing field for smaller and larger countries and had done away with considerations of balance of power. He felt that the existing regional organizations in North-East Asia were not yet sufficiently developed to serve as multilateral mechanisms for confidence-building measures and was interested to have reactions from the audience on how they would see the situation in East Asia, and whether they thought the European experience and ideas could be used there as a precursor for a new security paradigm.

The ensuing discussion showed that we need to be prepared for all sorts of changes, including security-related ones, that nuclear arms had been less devastating lately than conventional ones; that poverty could be prevented, and that the Euro-centric approach to problems should be put aside when considering Africa or Latin America.

The Moderator thanked all participants and adjourned the session.

3.2 Session Two: Need for a New Security Paradigm

- **Definition of a new security paradigm**
- **Interregional security co-operation as an alternative**

Report by Wolfram Maas, Deputy Head of the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the OSCE

The session's moderator was H.E. Ambassador Ivo Petrov, Head of the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Bulgaria to the OSCE and Chairman of the Contact Group with the Asian Partners for Co-operation. Introducing the presentations he briefly recalled the history of the OSCE. He reminded participants that the OSCE was not established with the clear intention of doing anything, but that it began as a conference, which to a great extent it still was today. He recalled the first 15 years from 1975 to 1990 which were rich in events. The OSCE provided a forum where countries of different socio-economic orders came to common solutions. He recalled how, when at a given point in the 1980s all disarmament negotiations had been interrupted, the CSCE Stockholm Conference of 1984 to 1986 had put the process on the move again. After 1990 and the Paris Charter, the Helsinki Conference of 1992 had laid the basis for assisting countries to manage change, by creating new institutions, new field missions and by strengthening the Secretariat. At that time change might have been considered as a new security threat. In his judgement, OSCE had always responded to the security threats of the time and he saw also in Asia chances that the existence of a framework would lead to an increase in substance.

In his presentation Mr. Kulkumut Singhara Na Ayudhaya, Director-General of the Department of European Affairs of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Thailand cited the ASEAN Regional Forum as an example of a new approach to addressing traditional threats. In this context he stressed the importance of confidence-building measures and preventive diplomacy to help prevent conflicts from turning into crises. Additionally he described Thailand's efforts to address transnational crimes such as terrorism and human trafficking at regional level, particularly through the ARF. In this context he pointed to ASEM's "Interfaith" which aimed to cultivate harmony and tolerance among the different religious faiths.

H.E. Ambassador Aleksii Härkönen, Head of the Permanent Mission of Finland to the OSCE dealt with three questions: whether the focus was on the security of individuals, groups or States; the interrelationship between security and the value system and the question of security and change. Particularly as far as the latter was concerned, he pointed to the OSCE as a highly successful process and organization, which nevertheless regularly encountered the need to reinvent itself and review its priorities.

Starting with the Helsinki Principles in 1975, which were strictly speaking concerned with the behaviour between States, the notion of State sovereignty had undergone a remarkable change; after the Cold War, the OSCE participating States made a series of commitments aimed at increasing the security of groups and individuals. NGOs and various formations of civil society were today not only beneficiaries but also actors of security.

In the 1970s the CSCE had accommodated the security concerns of countries that were based on different political and thus value systems, whereas today all participating States

subscribed to the same value system. Against this development, if the present crisis of the OSCE were linked to differing values, claiming that the OSCE commitments, particularly in the human dimension, were not based on common, but Western values, it would be damaging to the achievements and the future prospects of co-operative and inclusive security. Ambassador Härkönen stressed the dynamic aspects of the OSCE process, including its being instrumental in facilitating political change in Europe and recently in assisting the democratization process in some participating States. Being unable to solve the so-called frozen conflicts, the OSCE proved that it also had a static aspect. While acknowledging the importance of a knowledge of history to understanding the development of international relations, he warned that an overdose of history could be detrimental as it might lead to an extremely static world view in which security was a zero-sum game.

Colonel Francois Pilot, Counsellor for Politico-Military affairs at the Permanent Mission of Luxemburg to the OSCE, started by analysing the meaning of paradigm as the frame in which we are used to thinking and analysing in order to solve a given problem. He enumerated the different sources of threats, inter-State and intra-State conflict, terrorism, organized crime, proliferation of weapons, and non-armed threats posed by poverty, contagious illnesses and environmental degradation. He concluded that there was not really any “new” threat.

Any difference perceived he connected to 9/11. Before 9/11 our security paradigm had been built upon a clear and easy to handle situation: we thought in one dimension, a security dimension. With 9/11, the threat had become asymmetric; terrorism had made a qualitative jump. While still reacting by improving forces in quality and quantity, we added an emphasis on more and better units for international operations. While still building on CSBMs, good neighbourliness and diplomacy, and improving the standard of living to fight non-armed threats, we added national, regional and international initiatives, international co-operation and information-sharing, and agreed to international conventions. But that alone was not enough, we had to add a time dimension to the security dimension pursued in the past. We had to deal with the conditions in which terrorist organizations were able to recruit and win support, which meant providing assistance in human rights and sustainable development. The fight against terrorism was a long-term effort with short-term visible success. It required co-ordination and co-operation on the national, interregional and international levels.

Dr. Hong Ki-joon, Professor at the Graduate Institute of Peace Studies at Kyung Hee University, describing OSCE as a prototype of a co-operative security regime, dealt with the question whether OSCE could be a working model applicable to other regions. He stated that devices for co-operative security within the OSCE had varied with the five phases of the OSCE process: creation, development, transition, transformation and stabilization. Based on the principle of indivisibility of security, the OSCE had created a framework for arms control, which included the CFE Treaty, the Vienna Document, the Code of Conduct, the Treaty on Open Skies, etc. Although North-East Asia, where the shadow of the Cold War was still lingering, in particular in the unstable and insecure Korean peninsula, differed from Europe in terms of security environments, he considers it senseless to discuss the issue of security co-operation in North-East Asia without reference to the experience of the OSCE. Looking at the question on which basis both regions could discuss the issue of interregional security co-operation, he stressed that to make interregional security co-operation more feasible, both regions should share the same threat perceptions. In his analysis, the OSCE’s security regime had varied upon the specific security threats which had emerged in Europe. Drawing on relevant lessons of the OSCE’s experience he particularly suggested exploring bilateral and multilateral CBMs, a certain type of crisis management approach involving the establishment

of hotlines, mechanisms for consultation and co-operation with regard to emergency situations, and instruments of short-term conflict prevention like the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities. To handle North Korean nuclear intentions and motivations, he recommended looking at the need for a regional non-proliferation arrangement in North-East Asia, by which he meant a KEDO-like approach.

In a written and video-taped contribution to the session, the Honourable Senator Sam Brownback of the United States characterized the OSCE as a multilateral, politically binding security arrangement, whose utility and continued relevance was based on the organization's flexibility and innovative responses to security. He regarded specific military commitments to promote transparency as critical stabilizers in Europe. In his view, building confidence through transparency was universally applicable, also in North-East Asia. To give security a comprehensive definition was seen by Senator Brownback as a key contribution by the OSCE. He considered the absence of democratic institutions and the violation of human rights as direct threats to security. Events in Kyrgyzstan, Ukraine, and Georgia, in his view, were reminders of what OSCE was all about and would make all OSCE countries more secure in the long term.

The first discussant, Dr. Kim Sung-han, Professor at the IFANS/MOFAT, Korea, raised questions how to replace old security paradigms with new ones, although Colonel Pilot stressed his view that by simply adding to the old paradigm one would finally arrive at the new one. Consideration of the question under which circumstances state Sovereignty could be denied to foster human security led to the examples of Somalia and Haiti being mentioned. In answer to a question concerning American military reform, Colonel Pilot made it clear that America's efforts to build a faster, lighter and better military did not run counter to his assessment of an improved military in quality and quantity as these developments reflected only qualitative adaptations but not necessary quantitative cuts. No definite answer could be offered to the serious problem on how North Korea's nuclear policy could be prevented from escalating into conflict.

The second discussant, Mr. Sean Woo, Chief of Staff, Helsinki Commission, United States, stressed the importance of the Helsinki commitments as core elements of any new security paradigm. He expressed his support for Dr. Hong Ki-joon's assessment of those elements of the OSCE experience which could be considered as applicable in North-East Asia.

H.E. Ambassador Liviu Bota of Romania stressed the importance of the non-proliferation issue for security in North-East Asia. He recalled that as early as 1964 Romania had called for efforts to improve relations between countries with different societal orders. In the same way, as at that time a developed machinery was needed to deal with such problems, it was necessary to build confidence to engage North Korea in a serious discussion.

The discussion briefly touched on the consequences of the "anti-secession-law" recently passed in China, on the responsibility of nuclear states for the problems concerning proliferation issues, on difficulties in getting North Korea to participate in the current Conference or in other regional meetings, on the state of the KEDO process, on the need to pass judgement on terrorist groups group by group and to avoid general panic, on whether isolation may make survival of a certain regime even more likely, and on the question on whether we should disregard our values in order not to antagonize a counterpart who does not share them.

In concluding Ambassador Petrov encouraged partner countries to consider implementing OSCE commitments on a voluntary basis in order to bring partners closer to the OSCE. In this context Asian partners for co-operation were invited to consider organizing a side event for the upcoming HDIM in Warsaw.

3.3 Session Three: New Security Paradigm in North-East Asia

- **New security threats in North-East Asia**
- **The establishment of regional security co-operation in North-East Asia**

Report by Fabrizio Scarpa External Co-operation Officer, OSCE Secretariat

H.E. Ambassador Cho Chang-beom, Ambassador of the Republic of Korea, moderated the third session. In his introduction, he suggested four main points for discussion, as outlined in the annotated agenda: the relevance of the new security paradigm in North-East Asia; the relevance of the OSCE process to the region of North-East Asia; the best approaches to peace and stability on the Korean peninsula; and correlations between the bilateral security arrangements that already exist in North-East Asia and the vision of the Asian countries regarding the establishment of multilateral security co-operation. He expressed the wish to hear a good discussion and some policy recommendations and ideas.

In Session 3, a focused and analytical discussion took place on the relevance of a new security paradigm in North-East Asia. The OSCE process and its lessons and relevance to North-East Asia were discussed, together with the correlation between bilateral security arrangements and multilateral security co-operation in North-East Asia. North Korea's nuclear development programme was also analysed.

The first speaker, Dr. Anvar Azimov, Deputy Director of the European Co-operation Department at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, discussed the need for an effective OSCE contribution to addressing North-East Asia's security challenges. The transitional nature of new security threats meant that no State or organization alone could meet these challenges. This meant that increased co-operation among States was needed, as well as increased cross-regional co-operation and interaction between Europe and Asia. The OSCE's experience as a Euro-Atlantic regional security organization might not be directly applicable to North-East Asia. However, sharing OSCE's basic norms and principles and taking into consideration the specific realities and traditions of North-East Asia should help consolidate the positive trends in this region while at the same time avoiding creating new dividing lines. For example, OSCE could share its experience in regional CSBMs, involving civil society in addition to arms control elements. Furthermore, the ARF might benefit from an exchange of views and ideas with the OSCE's FSC, which could lead to the three-stage establishment of an FSC for North-East Asia. Further proposals for increasing co-operation with the Asian Partners for Co-operation included their active participation in meetings of the PC and FSC and at the ASRC, and a multilateral conference on security and co-operation in the Euro-Atlantic and North-East Asian regions.

In the second joint presentation, Mr. Thomas Wuchte, Senior Advisor at the US Mission to the OSCE, and Dr. Eliot Kang, Senior Adviser, Regional and Strategic Security, Bureau of Arms Control, U.S. Department of State called for more intensified interaction between the OSCE and its Partners for Co-operation, in particular in North-East Asia, to allow the OSCE to share its experiences with the countries of the region. The speakers noted that the OSCE had issued a report the previous November after extensive discussions with its Partners for

Co-operation that provided an exhaustive set of ideas, and the Ministerial in December had asked that OSCE participating States collectively remain seized of this matter. Given the multifaceted security challenge facing North-East Asia, they believed that the OSCE, with its breadth of conflict prevention and confidence-building tools, was potentially a valuable resource and partner for the region. North-East Asia could benefit from intensified exchange with the OSCE to learn about the OSCE's efforts to employ conflict prevention and crisis management tools to counter non-traditional security threats. The time was ripe for more intensified interaction, to allow the OSCE to share its experiences with the countries of the region.

However, given that North-East Asia lacked a regional security forum or even agreement to initiate a consultation mechanism, an effective vehicle to formalize this intensified exchange with the OSCE was lacking. The speakers emphasized that a conference such as the present one did not occur often enough and did not encompass all the relevant regional players. Nonetheless, there might be an opportunity for collaboration between the respective efforts of the OSCE and the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), a forum in which all North-East Asian countries participated, in countering transnational and non-traditional security threats. The 2004 OSCE-Japan Conference was a breakthrough in this regard. That meeting had coincided with the ARF Seminar on Preventive Diplomacy, co-hosted by two OSCE Partners, Japan and Thailand. Members of the Track II communities that followed the OSCE and the ARF had also been present at both meetings to enliven the interchange between the OSCE and the ARF. In the presentation, they called for an Asia Academic network to hold a Track II conference in 2006, affiliated in some way to be determined by the OSCE, allowing an exchange that could act as a catalyst for enhanced co-operative security efforts in the Asia-Pacific and its sub-regions, especially North-East Asia. They also asked whether consideration should be given to the values and goals that had propelled the OSCE process forward. How could the OSCE and the Asian Partners for Co-operation work together in North-East Asia, in the 'spirit of Helsinki,' as well as in the wider Asia-Pacific region? They endorsed the useful suggestion by their Helsinki Commission colleague, Mr. Woo, of the addition of a segment on the OSCE "human dimension" issues at the next Asian Partners meeting, or a separate side-event with the OSCE's Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR).

The third speaker, Prof. Hajime Izumi of the Shizuoka University, Japan analysed the threat posed by the continuation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's nuclear weapons development programme. Statements recently issued by the DPRK's Foreign Ministry confirmed that North Korea had already manufactured nuclear weapons and that it "will take measures to increase the nuclear weapons arsenal". Unfortunately, the DPRK's admission that it had already manufactured some nuclear weapons became more prominent in the eyes of international observers than its announcement that it would continue its nuclear weapons development programme. The programme was likely to concern uranium-based and not plutonium based weapons. These were more easily concealed and miniaturized. Thus, North Korea's programme could be conducted secretly without risk of irritating the international community. There was no way of assessing North Korea's uranium enrichment ability precisely. North Korea would probably refrain from provocative acts, such as performing nuclear tests or launching ballistic missiles, all acts that can immediately be detected. Time was not in the order of those trying to solve the problem. While pressure was being applied on North Korea to prevent its nuclear materials from proliferating to other States and terrorist groups, efforts must be made to avoid passivity and neglect of North Korea's nuclear capability.

The fourth speaker, Ambassador Rakhat Aliyev, Permanent Representative of Kazakhstan to the OSCE, analysed the question of enhancing co-operation between the OSCE and its Asian Partners as an important element of strengthening Eurasian security. While traditional conflict might no longer be a threat to European security, new threats had come to dominate the common agenda, requiring the collective efforts of all countries in the OSCE and in the North-East Asia regions. The situation in North-East Asia, however, differed from Europe in that political competition for a leadership role persisted among the countries of the region. Traditional concepts of state sovereignty also retained a key role in North-East Asia. Through developments in the framework of the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-Building Measures in Asia (CICA), the legal basis of the Asian security system had been provided with concrete mechanisms. A joint OSCE-CICA forum could be organized to give impetus to a close partnership between the two organizations. With regard to the applicability of the OSCE experience to North-East Asia, several areas could be identified, such as CSBMs, the Best Practices Guide on SALW, the CFE treaty, conflict prevention and mediation in internal and inter-state conflict. Broader use of existing possibilities would give further positive impetus to the OSCE's dialogue with the Asian Partners, examples being participation in ODIHR election observation missions, participation in the internship programmes of the organization and seconding experts to OSCE field operations. Finally, a comprehensive concept for OSCE's outreach activities with both countries and organizations in the region could be elaborated.

The fifth speaker, Mr. Lee Jong-kook, Deputy Director-General for policy planning at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade of the Republic of Korea considered whether a new security paradigm was appropriate to handling security threats dominating North-East Asia. Unlike Europe, which had developed intrusive and effective multilateral co-operation mechanisms, North-East Asia remained wedded to the traditional concept of sovereignty, and multilateralism was yet to be fostered. 9/11 had brought to the fore new risks and a shared understanding that a new paradigm was needed to face them. What was lacking, however, was the consensus on how to meet them. The current security situation was still marked by the threat of nuclear proliferation, controversies over Japanese history textbooks, and competition over natural resources. The concepts of balance of power and deterrence remained the driving force in the region. Fast economic growth, however, worked as an engine of closer intra-regional co-operation. Some progress had been achieved in this respect, through, for instance, the ARF and the ASEAN plus Three, but it remained slow, particularly on security issues. While terrorism had acted as a stimulant for multilateral co-operation, traditional threats remained the dominant concern in the region. Once the problems related to North Korea's nuclear programme were solved, the six-Party process might develop into a broad regional security framework. The complex European security architecture could represent a source of inspiration for a vision of future security co-operation in North-East Asia, especially the OSCE's CBM regime. The United States might play an important role as an engine for multilateralism and the overcoming of persisting rivalries, as it did in Europe after the Second World War. As a middle power, the Republic of Korea could play a balancing role in the region for peace-building and closer co-operation in security and other areas.

During the subsequent debate, speakers reacted to various aspects of the presentations. It was suggested, for example, that the fight against terrorism could be a catalyst for a common interest on which to base a pragmatic programme for multilateralism in North-East Asia, overcoming existing divisions based on persisting ideological and territorial conflicts. Also, it

was suggested that a possible OSCE-ARF meeting should be preceded by meetings at the Track II level. Support was expressed for proposals concerning participation by Asian Partners for Co-operation in ODIHR election observation missions, the seconding of experts to OSCE Missions, and participation in the OSCE's internship programme. With regard to comments linking the OSCE's CSBM regime to a loss of sovereignty, it was pointed out that on the contrary, CSBMs were really a form of protection of sovereignty through co-operation between sovereign States on addressing their security concerns. A proposal for an FSC for North-East Asia was elaborated, and it was pointed out that it would require long negotiations, but at the same time would allow weekly dialogue. Holding meetings of a North-East Asia caucus on the margins of ARF meetings was also suggested. A distinction was made between North Korea's nuclear programme and the situation between India and Pakistan in the 1970s and it was pointed out that discussion on this issue should not cross a certain threshold. The importance of bringing North Korea to a meaningful security dialogue was also emphasized. It was, however, questioned whether North Korea really possessed nuclear weapons. Comments were made concerning the possibility of the Six-Party process developing into a fully-fledged security framework for the region, but concerns were expressed about overloading the agenda at very sensitive times. Difficulties involved in forming a permanent dialogue among the Asian powers were also highlighted. Three major obstacles were identified, 1) lack of commonality of security 2) lack of tradition in resolving common security issues through dialogue, and 3) lack of sense of urgency. It was noted that East Asia was not known for multilateralism but rather historically accustomed to unilateralism under China. Korea's possible role as a regional facilitator of peace and co-operation by fostering mutual confidence among regional powers was also further elaborated.

At the end of the third session, the moderator, Ambassador Cho, highlighted several points made by the participants which he found of particular relevance:

Firstly, there were significant differences between the security environments in Europe and Asia. North-East Asia was faced with a dual challenge, stemming from existing traditional security threats as well as new ones. Although it might be premature to model the OSCE process and experience directly in North-East Asia, the OSCE experience provided a useful lesson for addressing the region's dual challenges. In particular, the OSCE's experience with the CSBM regime could serve as an important reference, *mutatis mutandis*, for building upon multilateral dialogue and mutual trust, bearing in mind the unique situation in North-East Asia.

Secondly, North-East Asia needed to make extra efforts to enhance international co-operation on addressing new security threats, including terrorism, trafficking in human beings and SALW. In that regard, the OSCE Strategy to Address Threats to Security and Stability in the Twenty-First Century could serve as a valuable reference for the region.

Thirdly, patience, sense of urgency and continued negotiations and dialogue were needed in order to bring about a speedy resolution of the North Korean nuclear issue through peaceful and diplomatic means. The on-going peaceful, diplomatic efforts to resume the Six-Party Talks had been stressed and participants would agree that the DPRK should return to the talks without preconditions. Some expectations and hopes had been expressed that, once the issue of North Korea's nuclear weapons had been peacefully resolved, the Six-Party Talks would evolve into a multilateral security forum to address other common security challenges that North-East Asia was facing and would be facing in the future.

Fourthly, both, traditional existing bilateral security arrangements and multilateral security dialogue efforts were highly important. The US still played a crucial role in maintaining peace and stability in North-East Asia. At the same time, middle-power States such as the Republic of Korea could also play a proactive role contributing to the peace and stability and prosperity of the region as a moderator, facilitator and balancer.

Finally, the need for enhanced co-operation between the OSCE and the ARF had been emphasized. To achieve that goal, it had been suggested that a conference of the OSCE and the ARF should be held and that in that context some Track II efforts should be made to hold a Euro Atlantic and North-East Asia meeting to address common issues and common interests. Additionally, the idea of pursuing sub-regional dialogue on the occasion of a region-wide meeting such as the ARF had been suggested.

4 List of participants

Germany

Mr. Wolfram Maas Deputy Head of the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the OSCE
Mr. Ulrike Wolf First Secretary, Political Affairs, German Embassy in Seoul

United States of America

Mr. Paul Jones Deputy Chief of the U.S. Mission to the OSCE
Mr. Thomas Wuchte Senior Adviser, Forum for Security Co-operation, Department of State
Dr. Eliot Kang Senior Adviser, Regional and Strategic Security, Bureau of Arms Control, U.S. Department of State
Mr. Robert Nanz Country Analyst, Office of Korean Affairs, U.S. Department of State
Mr. Sean Woo Chief of Staff, U.S. Helsinki Commission
Ms. Janice Helwig Adviser, U.S. Helsinki Commission, U.S. Mission to the OSCE
Mr. Scott Raphael Feeney North Korea Country Director, Office of the Secretary of Defense
Mr. Sung Yong Kim First Secretary, Political Military Affairs, U.S. Embassy in Seoul

Austria

H.E. Ambassador Werner H. Ehrlich Senior Advisor for Politico-Military Affairs

Belgium/OSCE Troika

H.E. Ambassador Bertrand de Crombrughe Head of the Permanent Mission of Belgium to the OSCE
H.E. Ambassador Victor Wei Ambassador, Embassy of Belgium in Seoul

Bosnia and Herzegovina

Bulgaria/OSCE Troika

H.E. Ambassador Ivo Petrov Head of the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Bulgaria to the OSCE, Chairman of the Contact Group with the Asian Partners for Co-operation
H.E. Ambassador Ivan Naydenov Director, OSCE Directorate, Ministry for Foreign Affairs
Mr. Georgi Todorov Minister Plenipotentiary, Ministry for Foreign Affairs

Canada

Mr. Michael Blackmore First Secretary, Embassy of Canada, Seoul
Mr. Philip Cordier Second Secretary, Embassy of Canada, Tokyo

Spain

Mr. Arturo Perez Deputy Head of Mission of Spain to the OSCE
Mr. F. Javier Isturiz Deputy Chief of Mission of Spain in Seoul

- Mr. Gonzalo Fernandez Curbera Defense, Military, Naval and Air Force
Counsellor, Embassy of Spain in Seoul
- Finland**
H.E. Ambassador Aleksi Härkönen Head of the Permanent Mission of Finland to
the OSCE
- France**
H.E. Ambassador François Descoueyte Head of Delegation, Embassy of France in
Seoul
Mr. Daniel Le Gargasson Counsellor, Deputy Head of Mission,
Embassy of France in Seoul
Mr. Vincent-Guillaume Poupeau Counsellor, Embassy of France in Seoul
Mr. Loïe Frouart Defense Attaché, Embassy of France in Seoul
- United Kingdom**
Ms. Judith Gough Political Counsellor, British Embassy in
Seoul
- Greece**
H.E. Ambassador Charalampos Director of OSCE-CoE Directorate, Ministry
Christopoulos for Foreign Affairs of Greece
H.E. Ambassador Constantin Drakakis Head of Mission, Embassy of Greece in Seoul
Ms. Pothiti Pappas Deputy Head of Mission, Embassy of Greece
in Seoul
- Hungary**
H.E. Ambassador István Torzsa Ambassador of the Republic of Hungary to
Korea
Mr. János Kovács Counsellor, Deputy Chief of Mission,
Embassy of the Republic of Hungary to Korea
- Ireland**
H.E. Ambassador Brendan Moran Head of the Permanent Mission of Ireland to
the OSCE
- Italy**
Mr. Antonello De Riu Counsellor and Deputy Head of Mission,
Embassy of Italy in Seoul
Mr. Giovanni Savoldelli Pedrocchi Military Attaché, Head of the Office
- Kazakhstan**
H.E. Ambassador Rakhat Aliyev Head of the Permanent Delegation of the
Republic of Kazakhstan to the OSCE
H.E. Ambassador Darkhan Berdaliyev Ambassador of Kazakhstan to Korea, Seoul
Mr. Sergey Savelyev Head of Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Vyacheslav Denissenko Counsellor, Permanent Delegation of the
Republic of Kazakhstan to the OSCE
Mr. Zeinolla Kalymbetov 2nd Secretary, Embassy of Kazakhstan in
Seoul
- Lithuania**
H.E. Ambassador Dainius Ginutis Voveris Ambassador at Large

Luxembourg / EU Presidency

Mr. François Pilot
Permanent Representation of the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg to the OSCE, Counsellor, Arms Control/Disarmament Affairs

European Commission

H.E. Ambassador Christian Falkowski
Head of the Delegation of the European Commission to the International Organisations in Vienna

Norway

Ms. Pia Kjellås
Intern, Royal Norwegian Embassy in Seoul

Uzbekistan

Ms. Asal Abbasova
1st Secretary, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Uzbekistan

Netherlands

Mr. Hendrik E.C. Koets
Deputy Head of Mission, The Royal Netherlands Embassy in Seoul

Poland

H.E. Dr. Piotr Świtalski
Undersecretary of State, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Poland
H.E. Ambassador Tadeusz Chomicki
Ambassador of the Republic of Poland to the Republic of Korea
Mr. Marek Szczygiel
First Counsellor, Deputy Head of Mission
Ms. Urszula Raznowiecka
Counsellor, Embassy of Poland to the Republic of Korea

Portugal

H.E. Ambassador Carlos Frota
Ambassador, Embassy of Portugal in Seoul
Ms. Maria Ermelinda Arede
1st Secretary, Embassy of Portugal in Seoul

Romania

H.E. Ambassador Liviu Aurelian Bota
Head of the Permanent Mission of Romania to the OSCE

Russian Federation

Dr. Anwar Azimov
Deputy Director, Department of European Co-operation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Holy See

Msgr. Stefano De Paulis
Counsellor of the Apostolic Nunciature in Korea

Serbia and Montenegro

Mr. Vladan Soskic
Counsellor, Embassy of the Serbia and Montenegro

Slovakia

H.E. Ambassador Pavel Hrmol
Ambassador of the Slovak Republic to Korea, Seoul
Mr. Juraj Petruška
First Secretary, Embassy of the Slovak Republic in Seoul

Slovenia/OSCE Chairmanship

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| H.E. Dimitrij Rupel | Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Slovenia, Chairman-in-Office |
| H.E. Ambassador Boris Frlec | Head of the OSCE Task Force, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Slovenia |
| H.E. Ambassador Robert Basej | Ambassador of the Republic of Slovenia to Korea |
| Mr. Matej Marn | Head of the Minister's Cabinet, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Slovenia |
| Ms. Miriam Teresa Možgan | Minister-Counsellor, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Slovenia |
| Ms. Anita Pipan | Minister-Counsellor, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Slovenia |
| Mr. Bernard Šrajner | Counsellor, Embassy of the Republic of Slovenia to Korea |
| Ms. Urška Ajdišek | Attaché, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Slovenia |

Sweden

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| H.E. Ambassador Harald Sanoberg | Ambassador, Embassy of Sweden in Seoul |
| Ms. Sophie Olsson | First Secretary, Embassy of Sweden in Seoul |
| Ms. Anna Johansson | Intern, Embassy of Sweden in Seoul |

Switzerland

| | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| H.E. Ambassador Christian Hauswirth | Swiss Embassy in Seoul |
| Mr. Roland Viotti | Counsellor, Swiss Embassy in Seoul |

Czech Republic

| | |
|------------------|----------------------------------|
| Mr. Tomas Vostry | Deputy Head, Czech Embassy Seoul |
|------------------|----------------------------------|

Turkey

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Mr. Serhan Yigit | Deputy Head of Mission, Embassy of Turkey in Seoul |
|------------------|--|

PARTNERS FOR CO-OPERATION

Afghanistan

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| H.E. Ambassador Nabil Malek-Asghar | Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Embassy of Islamic Republic of Afghanistan in Seoul |
|------------------------------------|---|

Japan

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Mr. Kenji Shinoda | Deputy Director-General of the European Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan |
| Mr. Yoshihiro Iseri | Deputy Director of the European Policy Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan |
| Dr. Hajime Izumi | Professor, Shizuoka University, Japan |
| Mr. Hirofumi Morishita | 2 nd Secretary, Political Affairs, Embassy of Japan in Seoul |

Korea

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| H.E. Ambassador Cho Chang-beom | Ambassador of the Republic of Korea |
| H.E. Chun Yung-woo | Deputy Minister for Policy Planning and International Organizations, MOFAT |

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Mr. Kim Won-soo | Director-General for Policy Planning, MOFAT |
| Mr. Lee Jong-kook | Deputy Director-General for Policy Planning, MOFAT |
| Mr. Kang Jeong-sik | Director, Security Policy Division, MOFAT |
| Mr. Shin Sung-chul | Deputy Director, Security Policy Division, MOFAT |
| Mr. Kang Byong-jo | Security Policy Division, MOFAT |
| Mr. Kang Yoo-sik | Security Policy Division, MOFAT |
| Ms. Chon Eui-jin | Security Policy Division, MOFAT |
| Mr. Shin Min-chul | Security Policy Division, MOFAT |
| Dr. Lee Geun | Professor, Graduate School of International Studies(GSIS), Seoul National University, Korea |
| Dr. Lee Seo-hang | Dean of Research, IFANS/MOFAT, Korea |
| Dr. Hong Ki-joon | Professor, Graduate Institute of Peace Studies, Kyung Hee University, Korea |
| Dr. Kim Sung-han | Professor, IFANS/MOFAT, Korea |
| Dr. Lho Kyong-soo | Professor, Graduate School of Public Administration, Seoul National University, Korea |
| Col. Park Chung-seok | Director, Multilateral Security Affairs Division, MND |
| Liet. Cho Hee-dae | Deputy Director, Multilateral Security Affairs Division, MND |
| Ms. Cho Kyung Ja | Multilateral Security Affairs Division, MND |
| Dr. Chung Eun-sook | Senior Research Fellow, Sejong Institute |
| Dr. Ahn Yin-Hay | Professor, Korea University |

Mongolia

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Ms. Suvd Badarch | Director-General, Department of Policy Planning and Evaluation, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Mongolia |
|------------------|--|

Thailand

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Mr Kulkumut Singhara Na Ayudhaya | Director-General, Department of European Affairs, Ministry for Foreign Affairs |
| Mr Arthayudh Srisamoot | Director of Division I, Department of European Affairs, Ministry for Foreign Affairs |
| Ms. Prangtip Kongridhisuksakorn | Third Secretary, Department of ASEAN Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs |
| Ms. Laksanavadee Kaewkramol | Attaché, European Affairs Department, Ministry for Foreign Affairs |

MEDITERRANEAN PARTNERS FOR CO-OPERATION

Algeria

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| H.E. Ambassador Abdelmoun' aam Ahriz | Ambassador of Algeria to the Republic of Korea |
|--------------------------------------|---|

Egypt

Mr. Hamdy Shaaban
Second Secretary, Embassy of Egypt, Seoul

Morocco

H.E. Ambassador Jaafar Alj Hakim
Ambassador Extraordinary and
Plenipotentiary, Embassy of the Kingdom of
Morocco in Seoul

Mr. Hassane Alaoui Mostefi
First Secretary, Embassy of the Kingdom of
Morocco in Seoul

Tunisia

H.E. Ambassador Othman Jerandi
Ambassador of Tunisia to Korea

Mr. Ben Rabej Abdeljelil
Counsellor, Embassy of Tunisia to Korean

ARF MEMBER STATES

Australia

Dr. Lachlan Strahan
Counsellor (Political), Australian Embassy in
Seoul

Ms. Sian Ferguson
Second Secretary, Australian Embassy in
Seoul

Dr. Rachelle Allen
Third Secretary Political, Australian Embassy
in Seoul

Cambodia

Mr. Lamatin Cheam
Minister-Counsellor, Royal Embassy of
Cambodia in Seoul

India

Mr. Anup Singh
Counsellor, Embassy of India in Seoul

Indonesia

Ms. Yuli Mumpuni
Director for American and European Intra-
Regional Co-operation, Directorate General of
American and European Affairs, Department
of Foreign Affairs

Mr. Alfred T. Palembang
Director for South American Affairs,
Directorate General of American and
European Affairs, Department of Foreign
Affairs

Brig. Gen. Djoko Sutrisno
Director for International Co-operation,
Directorate General of Defense Strategy,
Department of Defense

Mr. Agustinus Sumartono
Counsellor

Mr. Agus Badrul Jamal

Lao People's Democratic Republic

H.E. Ambassador Thongsavad Paseuth
Ambassador of the Lao People's Democratic
Republic to Korea

Mr. Songkane Luangmunintrhone
Director, Political and Security Co-operation
Division, Asian Department, Ministry for
Foreign Affairs, Laos

Malaysia

Mr. Raja Saifful Ridzuwan
Second Secretary, Embassy of Malaysia in
Seoul

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Mr. Zulkifli Adnan | Undersecretary, Policy Planning Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs |
| Mr. Ezuwan Hassan | Assistant Secretary, Policy Planning Division Ministry of Foreign Affairs |

New Zealand

| | |
|---------------------|------------------|
| Ms. Shee-Jeong Park | Second Secretary |
|---------------------|------------------|

People's Republic of China

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Mr. Ruan Zongze | Vice President, China Institute of International Studies (CIIS) |
| Mr. Izming Zhang | Deputy Director, European Department, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of China |
| Ms. Jing Wang | Staff, Asian Department, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of China |

Philippines

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| H.E. Ambassador Aladin G. Villacorte | Ambassador of the Republic of the Philippines to Korea |
|--------------------------------------|---|

Union of Myanmar

| | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| H.E. Ambassador U Nay Win | Ambassador of the Union of Myanmar |
| Col. San Lin | Military Attaché |

Vietnam

| | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|
| Mr. Van Cu Le | Embassy of Vietnam in Seoul, Korea |
|---------------|------------------------------------|

OSCE Secretariat

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| H.E. Ambassador Ján Kubiš | Secretary General |
| Dr. Oleksandr Pavlyuk | Head of External Co-operation a.i. |
| Mr. Fabrizio Scarpa | External Co-operation Officer |
| Ms. Aldona Szymanski | Senior External Co-operation Assistant |

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

International Committee of the Red Cross

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Mr. Denis Allistone | Head of ICRC Regional Delegation for East Asia |
|---------------------|---|

5 List of documents

| Number | Author | Document |
|--------|--|---------------------------|
| 001 | OSCE Secretariat | Annotated agenda |
| 002 | OSCE Secretariat | List of participants |
| 003 | H.E. Ambassador Yung-woo Chun, Deputy Minister for Policy Planning and International Organizations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Korea | Opening address |
| 004 | H.E. Dr. Dimitrij Rupel, OSCE Chairman-in-Office | Opening address |
| 005 | H.E. Ambassador Ján Kubiš, Secretary General of the OSCE | Opening address |
| 006 | H.E. Mr. Piotr Switalski, Ph.D., Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland | Presentation |
| 007 | Mr. Geun Lee, Graduate School of International Studies, Seoul National University | Presentation |
| 008 | Dr. Oleksandr Pavlyuk, Head of External Co-operation a.i., OSCE Secretariat | Statement |
| 009 | Turkish Delegation | Remarks |
| 010 | Mr. Kulkumut Singhara Na Ayudhaya, Director General, Department of European Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Thailand | Abstract and presentation |
| 011 | Cancelled | |
| 012 | Dr. Hong Ki-joon, Professor, Graduate Institute of Peace Studies, Kyung Hee University | Presentation |
| 013 | Mr. Ruan Zongze, Vice President and Senior Research Fellow, China Institute of International Studies | Presentation |
| 014 | H.E. Ambassador Aleksii Härkönen, Finland | Abstract and intervention |
| 015 | H.E. Ambassador Ivan Naydenov, Director of the OSCE Directorate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Bulgaria | Statement |
| 016 | Dr. Eliot Kang, Senior Adviser, Regional and Strategic Security, Bureau of Arms Control, U.S. Department of State Mr. Thomas Wuchte, Senior Adviser, Forum for Security Co-operation, Department of State, U.S.A. | Abstract and presentation |
| 017 | Senator Sam Brownback, Chairman, U.S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe | Statement |
| 018 | Dr. A. Azimov, Russian Federation | Address |
| 019 | Mr. François Pilot, Luxembourg / EU | PowerPoint presentation |
| 020 | H.E. Ambassador Nabil Malek-Asghar, Afghanistan | Statement |
| 021 | H.E. Ambassador Rakhat Aliyev, Kazakhstan | Statement |
| 022 | Mr. Hajime Izumi, University of Shizuoka, Japan | Statement |
| 023 | Permanent Mission of Spain to the OSCE | Statement |
| 024 | Mr. Lee Jong-kook, Deputy Director-General for policy planning, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Korea | Presentation |

