



Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

Office of the Secretary General
Section for External Co-operation



OSCE-Korea Conference 2001:
“Applicability of OSCE CSBMs
in Northeast Asia”
Seoul, 19-21 March 2001



Consolidated Summary

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
I. General Information.....	3
1. Venue	3
2. Participation.....	3
3. Timetable and Organizational Modalities	3
4. Agenda and Workplan	4
II. Reports by Session Rapporteurs	7
Session 1: OSCE confidence- and security-building measures (CSBMs): concept and history, lessons learnt	7
Session 2: Regional CSBMs	9
Session 3: CSBMs in Northeast Asia	11
Co-Chairmen's Summary.....	14
III. List of Participants	17
IV. List of Documents distributed during the Conference	22
Annex Seating Arrangement.....	23

I. General Information

1. Venue

The Conference, organized by the OSCE and Korea, was held from 19 to 21 March 2001 at the Hotel Shilla, Seoul, Republic of Korea.

2. Participation

- 2.1 Thirty OSCE participating States took part in the Conference.
- 2.2 The Partners for Co-operation, Japan, Korea and Thailand were represented as well as five Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation, Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Morocco and Tunisia.
- 2.3 ARF members – China and Vietnam – participated as guests of the host country.
- 2.4 Representatives of non-governmental organizations were able to attend and contribute to the conference in accordance with the relevant OSCE provisions and practices.

3. Timetable and Organizational Modalities

- 3.1 The Conference began at 9.30 a.m. (opening session) on 20 March 2001 and ended at 6.00 p.m. on 21 March 2001.
- 3.2 The Conference was conducted in three sessions.
- 3.3 The opening and concluding sessions were co-chaired by H.E. Ambassador Choi Young-jin, Deputy Minister for Policy Planning & International Organizations of the Republic of Korea, and by H.E. Ambassador Constantin Ene, Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE.
- 3.4 Each session had a chairman and rapporteur.
- 3.5 The working language was English.
- 3.6 Arrangements for press coverage were made.
- 3.7 Other rules of procedure and working methods of the OSCE were applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the Conference.
- 3.8 The seating arrangement is shown in the Annex.

4. *Agenda and Workplan*

Conference Venue: Dynasty I&II Room, Shilla Hotel

Monday, 19 March 2001

6.30 p.m. Reception hosted by H.E. Mr. Lee Joung-binn, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Republic of Korea (Emerald Room, Shilla Hotel)

Tuesday, 20 March 2001

9.30 a.m. **Opening session**

Co-Chairmen: H.E. Dr. Choi Young-jin, Deputy Minister for Policy Planning and International Organizations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MOFAT), Republic of Korea

H.E. Ambassador Constantin Ene, Representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office

Opening address by:

- H.E. Mr. Lee Joung-binn, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Republic of Korea
- H.E. Ambassador Ján Kubiš, Secretary General of the OSCE

10:15-10:45 a.m. Coffee-break

10.45 a.m. **Session 1: OSCE confidence- and security-building measures (CSBMs)**

Chairman: H.E. Ambassador Márton Krasznai, Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC), OSCE Secretariat

Rapporteur: Dr. Jean-Jacques de Dardel, Head of the Section for Euro-Atlantic Security, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Switzerland

(a) CSBMs: concept and history

Keynote speakers:

1. H.E. Ambassador Bo Lundberg on behalf of Ambassador Nils Daag, Head of the Permanent Delegation of Sweden/EU—"From CSBMs to conflict prevention"
2. Dr. Wilfried Aichinger, Senior Communications Network Officer, CPC, OSCE Secretariat – "A System of CSBMs today"

Discussion

1 p.m. Luncheon hosted by H.E. Mr. Ban Ki-moon, Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Republic of Korea (Dynasty III Room, Shilla Hotel)

3 p.m. **Session 1**

(b) OSCE CSBMs: lessons learnt

Keynote speakers:

1. H.E. Ambassador Reinhard Bettzuege, Head of the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany – “The Role of the OSCE on the way to German Re-unification – a European Example”
2. Mr. Oh Joon, Deputy Director-General for Policy Planning, MOFAT, Republic of Korea – “Lessons from OSCE CSBMs: an Asian perspective”
3. H.E. Ambassador Guido Lenzi, Head of the Permanent Mission of Italy – “The effectiveness of CSBMs in conflict prevention and in crisis management”

Discussion

4.30-5.00p.m. Coffee-break

5.00 p.m. **Session 2: Regional CSBMs**

Chairman: H.E. Ambassador Hervé Ladsous, Head of the Permanent Representation of France

Rapporteur: Dr. Wilfried Aichinger, Senior Communications Network Officer, CPC, OSCE Secretariat

(a) Regional CSBMs in the OSCE

Keynote speakers:

1. H.E. Ambassador Márton Krasznai, Director, CPC – “Post Cold War and post-conflict CSBMs in Central and Eastern Europe” (Open Skies – Romania and Hungary, cross border CSBMs in Central Europe, and Art II/Annex I-B of the Dayton Peace Agreement)
2. Mr. Ivan Soltanovski, Senior Counsellor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Russian Federation – “CSBMs in South Eastern Europe”

(b) CSBMs in other areas

Ms. Suchitra Hiranprueck, Director-General for ASEAN Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Thailand – “CSBMs in Southeast Asia”

Discussion

6.30 p.m. Reception hosted by H.E. Ambassador Ján Kubiš, Secretary General of the OSCE (Emerald Room, Shilla Hotel)

Wednesday, 21 March 2001

9.30 a.m. **Session 3: CSBMs in Northeast Asia**

Chairman: H.E. Dr. Choi Young-jin, Deputy Minister for Policy Planning and International Organizations, MOFAT, Republic of Korea

Rapporteur: Dr. Hong Ki-joon, Research Professor, Graduate School of Pan-Pacific International Studies, Kyung Hee University, Republic of Korea

(a) Which CSBMs for Northeast Asia?

Keynote speakers:

1. Dr. Barry K. Gills, University of Newcastle, UK
2. Dr. Jian Xu, Associate Prof., China Institute of International Studies
3. Mr. Takahiro Shinyo, Deputy Director-General European Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs – "CBMs in North East Asia: Japan's view".

Discussion

1 p.m. Luncheon hosted by H.E. Mr. Mircea Dan Geoană, Chairman-in-Office, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Romania (Dynasty III Room, Shilla Hotel)

3 p.m. **(b) Which CSBMs for the Korean peninsula?**

Keynote speakers :

1. Mr. Scott Snyder, Senior Representative, the Asia Foundation-Korea
2. Dr. Lho Kyongsoo, Professor of International Politics, Graduate School of Public Administration, Seoul National University, Republic of Korea

Discussion

5 p.m. Concluding session

Co-Chairmen: H.E. Ambassador Constantin Ene, Representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office

H.E. Dr. Choi Young-jin, Deputy Minister for Policy Planning and International Organizations, MOFAT, Republic of Korea

- Address by H.E. Mr. Mircea Dan Geoană, Chairman-in-Office, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Romania

Concluding remarks by the Co-Chairmen

Rapporteurs' reports

Chairmen's summary

II. Reports by Session Rapporteurs

Session 1: OSCE confidence- and security-building measures (CSBMs): concept and history, lessons learnt

Report by Dr Jean-Jacques de Dardel, Switzerland

Session 1 was devoted to a historical overview of CSBMs, which led to a lively discussion of characteristics of the OSCE process that could be of relevance to North East Asia. Five keynote speakers addressed the issues raised by the pragmatic evolution of CSBMs in Europe since the onset of the Helsinki process in 1972. Detailed accounts of the evolving system of CSBMs and its effectiveness in conflict prevention and crisis management were completed by a review of the role of CSBMs on the way to German Re-unification. The Asian perspective was penetratingly brought to bear as lessons were drawn from fundamental aspects of the European experience and its applicability to the North East Asian region.

In the ensuing discussion, it was stressed that the OSCE did not invent new methods as much as it enacted principles already agreed to in the UN Charter. Inasmuch as it refers to these basic terms of reference, the OSCE process is applicable to other parts of the world. This assertion was undisputed, but a closer look at the hurdles European countries have had to overcome to progress on the path of CSBMs was called for so as to enlighten the protagonists of Korean relations. Converging views on the beginnings of the CSCE underlined the pragmatic and step by step approach that avoided large-scale institutionalisation, and favoured a learning-by-doing process.

Psychological aspects were underscored: in those early years marked by cold war and a very high degree of suspicion, the mere idea of opening up was revolutionary. Yet, as we sense today that the Vienna process may be slowing down, we cannot but be made aware of the fact that there must have been specific ingredients, in the early and mid seventies, for that revolutionary process to get underway. Different delegates stressed that both sides felt they had a lot to gain through negotiations, at a time of high tension and confrontation, further heightened by the fear of nuclear conflict and annihilation. That led to parallel levels of negotiations, on confidence building measures through the CSCE, as well as on disarmament through the MBFR process, which, however unsuccessful at first, led to the CFE treaty in 1990. Gradually, minds changed, to the point that bloc members sometimes moved more rapidly than those of the Neutral and Non-Aligned. The present slowing down of this process has to do with the betterment of the overall security situation: CSBMs are no longer as needed as before, because the level of predictability and of security is much higher today.

One delegate outlined the Asian view on what the main ingredients were that started the Helsinki process: first, a recognition of frontiers came about, which stabilised the status quo, unlike the North East Asian situation. Then, the existence of two distinct blocs in Europe made things simpler, when the leaders of those two blocks decided to engage in talks. Furthermore, the neutral and non-aligned nations played a crucial go-between role.

Other delegates expanded on these characteristics by underlining that these ingredients were brought to fruition by the multilateral framework provided by the CSCE, which set up a network of co-operation with no heavy hierarchy. It was argued that however important a role the N+N played, it was that of a catalyst, this being in fact more relevant than their neutral or

non-aligned status. It was further stressed that throughout the block to block approach, the West did not get to a unified position without intensive negotiations. A number of delegates also stressed that the CSCE went through a trial and error process, with some hits, but also some misses. The hits were mainly scored with all elements that raised the predictability of military moves.

One delegate suggested that the Helsinki Final Act found a launching pad in the balance of power previously achieved by the two blocs, which felt that only negotiation could move them away from that high level of mutual menace. Different replies stressed, however, that the powers facing each other had very different views and goals in entering the Helsinki process: the East wanted to secure borders and a status quo, the West pushed for an enhancement of the human dimension, Germany just wanted to become part of the process,... Whatever the motivations, it was a process, which had to start somewhere and be inventive. Moreover, however crucial a balance of power may be when dealing with arms control, that balance is not as necessary for CSBMs, since they can be set up independently from a strategic context. At the end of the day, stressed one delegate, what is most needed is a political will to move forward, be it step by step.

The question was raised as to which CSBMs proved to be failures. CSBMs appear not to be ideal in times of open and rapidly evolving crisis, as was demonstrated in the Balkan region. Furthermore, some measures decided in a certain context may prove ineffective when that context changes, as exemplified by the ceilings on notifications of manoeuvres, which have become largely irrelevant as a result of the general downsizing of forces. On the other hand, some CSBMs, like those aiming at transparency of military budgets, did not seem effective at first, but worked much more effectively at a later stage, and ended up enabling a much better civilian control of the armed forces. It was added that those CSBMs that failed in Europe did so in a special context, thus making it still possible that they would work elsewhere.

The possibilities of issue linkage in the Korean context was addressed by one delegate, who stressed that inter Korean talks have concentrated on three areas, namely economic co-operation and exchange, tension reduction and humanitarian matters. Whereas progress was registered in all three areas, it was of an uneven level, tension reduction being least advanced. Issue linkage will only be possible when dialogue develops further. Another delegate stressed the notion of flexible reciprocity instead of issue-linkage, and showed himself to be optimistic on prospects of confidence building with North Korea, by focussing on similarities between the two Koreas. In this context, and contrary to conventional wisdom, which has it that a gradual approach is to be favoured in most circumstances, he suggested that in Korea a more drastic approach be called for.

The chairman wrapped up the proceedings by underlining that all speakers had emphasised that there could be no mechanical adaptation of the European experience to other regions. Only home grown solutions can be effective. Lessons that can be carried over to the Korean situation are that setbacks and disappointments should not discourage from further attempts, and that political will is the key to an institutionalised dialogue.

Session 2: Regional CSBMs

Dr. Wilfried Aichinger, Conflict Prevention Centre, OSCE Secretariat

By way of introduction, the Chair of sessions 2 a) and b) mentioned new threats being addressed by the OSCE, among them, *inter alia*, trafficking in human beings and control over scarce resources such as water in some areas. These issues, while not afflicting all participating States, certainly have the potential to be of concern to some of them. This illustrates the fact that, apart from a body of measures applicable to all, it was useful to consider CSBMs specific to issues involving regions or sub-regions.

After recalling the establishment of the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC) one decade ago, the first keynote speaker stressed the importance of negotiated CSBMs bilaterally or at a sub-regional level to complement the achievements reached under the CFE Treaty. These new regimes, among them the very encouraging Open Skies Agreement between Hungary and Romania, were tailor-made CSBMs that helped, at very little cost, in stabilizing the relations of Central and East-European States during a difficult transition phase.

The Dayton accords for the settlement in Bosnia and Herzegovina included a wide variety of CSBMs that provided for a relatively smooth implementation of the agreements in comparison to political obstacles which so far have hindered the completion of the stabilization process in the Balkans.

On the topic of CSBMs in South-Eastern Europe the keynote speaker stressed the importance of lessons learned in sub-regional arms control in general, and in Bosnia and Herzegovina in particular, with regard to the applicability of arms control measures in implementing new agreements. These measures in post-conflict stabilization are more likely to be successful if they meet the interests of all parties involved and are oriented towards integration in a pan-European security approach. To this end, the successful completion of Article V negotiations is of central importance.

The keynote speaker on CSBMs in Southeast Asia, related to the fact that regional measures in the context of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) focused on CBMs rather than CSBMs, although the distinction was mainly a scholarly one. CBMs have successfully helped advance the notion of comprehensive security in the region and both South and North Korea should take advantage of their participation in the ARF framework to foster implementation of bilateral CBMs.

A delegation stressed the importance of Thailand in promoting CBMs as politically binding, voluntary, and information-oriented measures furthering transparency. Likewise, it stressed the role of neutral and non-aligned countries as catalysts, co-ordinators or mediators during CSBM negotiations.

The concept of CBMs, in the light of experiences gained during an ARF seminar in Helsinki last October, had to supersede the military dimension, and required systemization, categorization and prioritization. It was stated that CSBMs are not a panacea and do not work without the political will of the parties concerned.

The importance of the ARF framework cannot be stressed enough because of the North Korean participation in it. As to whether North Korea was interested in increased transparency, participants questioned this since North Korea has not been prepared to repeat its participation in a second similar seminar.

On the question of CBMs developed in the ARF context, clarification was provided that these measures were not considered to be “ad hoc” approaches but reflected the voluntary nature of the measures.

Regarding the concern that CSBMs might violate the principles of non-intervention in internal affairs as well as the sovereignty of individual countries, the view was expressed that participating States entered these commitments on a voluntary basis, thereby rendering this concern obsolete. Likewise, it was mentioned that a gross violation of human rights in one country was a legitimate concern for all participating States because it had the potential of destabilizing the political situation, thereby endangering the security of neighbouring states.

Session 3: CSBMs in Northeast Asia

Report by Dr. Hong Ki-joon, Republic of Korea

During Session 3, participants engaged in a substantial discussion on CSBMs in Northeast Asia under the conceptual framework of the Concept Paper prepared for this Conference. The discussions particularly focused on the topic of which CSBMs are relevant for Northeast Asia in general and for the Korean Peninsula in particular. In doing this, participants used the discussions in the previous sessions about the European experiences in CSBMs as a valuable basis.

With regard to the question of CSBMs for Northeast Asia, participants agreed that European CSBMs are becoming a more relevant and realistic option for Northeast Asia than ever before, particularly due to the recent progress in the security environment in the region. Participants especially highlighted the positive impact of the recent breakthroughs in inter-Korean relations on the security relations in Northeast Asia as a whole. In this regard, they welcomed the normalization of relations between North Korea and a number of countries.

In the same vein, it was stressed that the international community should continue to support the engagement policy of South Korea and that the participation of North Korea in multilateral fora in Northeast Asia was essential. Participants underlined the importance of encouraging North Korea to participate in such fora and the international community as a whole. A number of delegations expressed their regret that North Korea, a key player in Northeast Asian security relations, was not present at this significant Conference.

It was noted, however, that the lessening of tension on the Korean Peninsula would not directly lead to the emergence of a multilateral security co-operation in Northeast Asia. Some participants pointed out that some preconditions still need to be met. Particularly, it was stressed that normalization of bilateral diplomatic relations between all states in the region is imperative for the further development of multilateralism in the region. Others expressed the view that rather than asking the question whether the conditions were right for CSBMs, it was worthwhile to endeavour to create the conditions. Participants underlined that CSBMs can be approached in a creative manner and can evolve from very small steps. During the discussion it was generally recognized that political will is the most important ingredient for CSBMs for Northeast Asia. One delegation put forward the idea of an OSCA, an Asian organization modelled on the OSCE. The view was expressed that the ARF may be said to be an embryo of the OSCA.

As a first step toward CSBMs in Northeast Asia, it was suggested that 'a habit of dialogue' should be established in the region. In this regard, they recognized the value of existing fora such as ASEAN+3, APEC and the ARF, the importance of which was underlined several times particularly following North Korea's admission to this, the only formal multilateral security forum in the Asia-Pacific. It was hoped that the ARF could play a bridge-building role between North and South Korea. In addition, several participants underlined that the existing framework of Four Party Talks needs to be successfully completed. In pursuit of security co-operation in Northeast Asia, it was emphasized that the Northeast Asian region requires permanent and effective regular consultation mechanisms to enhance the feeling of

mutual trust and thus build confidence in security. In doing this, United Nations' universal principles can be a guideline for regional co-operation.

In the discussion, participants agreed that a comprehensive approach is important to tackle not only political and military issues, but also environmental, economic and humanitarian issues in the same framework. This is strongly supported by the European experience that the strategy of issue linkage was effective when vested interests were in conflict between different issues.

With regard to the question of CSBMs for the Korean Peninsula, participants noted that even though both North and South Korea agreed on some CBMs in the 1992 Basic Agreement, this has not yet been implemented. They pointed out that the absence of CSBMs on the Korean Peninsula is not due to any lack of understanding about their utility, but simply due to a lack of will to implement them. However, the inter-Korean summit in June of 2000 has sparked interest in new possibilities for building confidence and reducing tension between the two sides on the Korean Peninsula.

It was pointed out that since the inter-Korean summit meeting, incentives for CSBMs on the Korean Peninsula are increasing on both sides. For North Korea, for example, economic pressure from military build up, increasing military strength of the South in military technologies and strategies and a strategic change of attitude vis-à-vis US forces stationed in the South are increasing North Korea's incentive for CSBMs. Meanwhile, South Korea has incentives for CSBMs simply because its foremost strategic interest lies in reducing the danger of another surprise attack from North Korea.

From this point of view, a participant put forward a brief catalogue of possible CSBMs on the Korean Peninsula. It was also mentioned that in order to establish CSBMs on the Korean Peninsula, institutionalization of a sustainable process for instituting concrete CSBMs, verification by a mutually acceptable third party, and political approval at the top level are necessary.

It was also mentioned that the psychological aspect of CSBMs is important especially in dealing with North Korea. In this sense, international efforts need to be made in order to engage North Korea in a multilateral security dialogue in Northeast Asia.

It was noted that it may be argued that one precondition for CSBMs may be recognition of the status quo. One participant noted that there may be a potential dichotomy between the political acceptance of the status quo and the desire for unity.

Participants stressed the importance of North Korea seeing that they will gain from CSBMs and the importance of keeping the momentum going to ensure the process does not backslide was stressed. They needed to step into a longer perspective. Bilaterally attempts could be made to ensure that one thing leads to another and soft CBMs can lead to further measures. Some things can only be done bilaterally but there is a need for multilateralism. It was emphasized that institution-building and issue linkage would help to prevent backsliding.

The first keynote speaker noted that there had been attempts at inter-Korean dialogue which had been reactions to changes in the environment, such as in the early 70s and early 90s but that this series of sporadic dialogues did not develop and there was no institutionalization. Following the Inter-Korean Summit, to sustain the process it was necessary to commit to

steps concretely: they needed a practical, concrete, institutionalized process, with CSBMs. Yet the Summit had revealed some mismatches. The South Korean side has preferred an incremental approach, institutionalization whereas the North Korean system requires a process at the leadership level. There is a very interesting and complex system mismatch. It is only the top leaders in North Korea who can drive such a process and yet there is a need for institutionalization. He emphasized that the key to addressing the systematic mismatch, this asymmetry, is combining the political and incremental. There was a need to build in concrete measures.

The second keynote speaker noted that previous attempts at CSBMs had failed due to lack of will but North Korea now had strong incentives.

Co-Chairmen's Summary

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 9 November 2000, the 'OSCE-Korea Conference 2001' on the 'Applicability of OSCE CSBMs in Northeast Asia' was held in Seoul on 19-21 March 2001. Representatives of OSCE participating States, Partners for Co-operation, Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation and two Asian countries invited by the host, as well as various NGOs, participated. The objective of the Conference was to enhance understanding of multilateral security co-operation in the OSCE region, as well as to focus on perspectives for information and experience sharing in co-operation between the OSCE and Asia, notably in the fields of CBMs and CSBMs within the framework of co-operative and comprehensive security.

The Conference was opened by H.E. Lee Joung-binn, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade of the Republic of Korea, and H.E. Ambassador Ján Kubiš, Secretary General of the OSCE. The opening and concluding sessions were co-chaired by H.E. Ambassador Choi Young-jin, Deputy Minister for Policy Planning & International Organizations of the Republic of Korea, and by H.E. Ambassador Constantin Ene, Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE. At the concluding session, H.E. Mircea Dan Geoană, Chairman-in-Office, as Minister of Foreign Affairs of Romania, made an address.

The work of the Conference was conducted in three sessions: "OSCE Confidence- and Security-Building Measures (CSBMs)" (Session 1), "Regional CSBMs" (Session 2), and "CSBMs in Northeast Asia" (Session 3). Each session was chaired by a separate Chairman and dealt with different topics on which a rapporteur presented a report. The topics were as follows:

- · CSBMs : concept and history
- · OSCE CSBMs : lessons learnt
- · Regional CSBMs in the OSCE
- · CSBMs in other areas
- · Which CSBMs for Northeast Asia?
- · Which CSBMs for the Korea Peninsula?

The Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade of the Republic of Korea, in his opening address, underlined that the holding of the first joint OSCE-Korea Conference was a valuable opportunity, at this time of change in the security environment in Northeast Asia, to enhance common awareness of the necessity of addressing security challenges through regional security co-operation. He further mentioned that, following OSCE CSBMs, the countries of Northeast Asia needed to take a significant step toward the launch of a regional dialogue in Northeast Asia. In addition, he stressed that the new mood of reconciliation between South and North Korea should be continued so that it will lead to the establishment of a regime of lasting peace on the Korean Peninsula through mutual confidence building.

In his address, the OSCE Chairman-in-Office, the Romanian Minister for Foreign Affairs, focused on the special significance of the Conference, which provides an opportunity to present OSCE experiences and lessons learnt from them. The CiO emphasized that enriching and stimulating discussions, and intensive dialogue on matters of common interest during the Conference, would serve to strengthen partnership. Even if the OSCE model may not be applied directly to the promotion of confidence-building in this part of the world, it will no doubt serve as a useful reference point from which many valuable lessons may be learnt. The CiO concluded that the key message of this Conference should be the need to further develop the multifaceted dialogue between the OSCE and its Partners for Co-operation, to encourage and to creatively continue the search for appropriate forms of co-operation between the countries from their region to complement existing ones.

The Secretary General of the OSCE stated that the Conference reflected the increasing interest in Northeast Asia in the achievements of the CSCE/OSCE in its comprehensive and co-operative approach to security. The OSCE's experiences could not serve as a model to be mechanically replicated in Northeast Asia or anywhere else, but are certainly applicable. The content and structure of an indigenous CBM regime, with its institutional mechanisms of co-operation and dialogue, could only be developed by the interested parties, and could not be directly imported. The Secretary General added that the OSCE and its Secretariat, namely the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC) stood ready to share its experiences and technical expertise gained in the course of providing support to the OSCE-wide CSBM regime. The situation on the Korean Peninsula, which provides a fertile environment for furthering comprehensive CBMs, calls for the sharing of experience on confidence-building measures, contributing to mutual reassurance, transparency, predictability, improved contacts and dialogue.

In **Session 1** on "OSCE Confidence- and Security-Building Measures (CSBMs)," five keynote speakers focused on both the history and evolution of confidence- and security-building measures, as well as on their effectiveness or lessons learnt. Discussions pointed out the role and importance of the OSCE CSBMs, designed to reduce mistrust or misunderstanding between participating States. They revealed that the OSCE is now undoubtedly the organization with the greatest experience in these measures. It disposes of a panoply of instruments negotiated and refined over the years, that have contributed to fostering ties between all participating States. Some of these measures have developed through the adoption of new ones that increased transparency and mutual trust. The OSCE's comprehensive approach to security has resulted in new types of confidence-building measures.

In **Session 2** on "Regional CSBMs," participants dealt with the development of regional CSBMs in the OSCE and in other regions, including Southeast Asia. Several specific regional experiences of CBMs and CSBMs were presented, as possible sources of inspiration to Northeast Asia. The need for regional initiatives to be developed in full transparency towards neighbouring countries and to be complementary with wider efforts, was stressed. Discussions also centered on the effectiveness of CSBMs in improving the security environment in the region. It was agreed that the political will to initiate and to keep the multilateral co-operation process going is a key element in building a security dialogue in the region. Participants further acknowledged that a comprehensive and step-by-step approach to security, and linkages between different elements of security had proved to be valuable lessons to be learnt.

In **Session 3** on "CSBMs in Northeast Asia," there was general recognition that the security environment in Northeast Asia has been enhanced since the inter-Korean Summit last June. Participants noted that in the wake of the developments on the Korean Peninsula there is growing awareness of the necessity for regional efforts to address common security challenges. They also noted that the time is ripe for Northeast Asia to consider a forum for multilateral dialogue as a way to address diverse security issues. However, some participants expressed the opinion that there are still some limitations for various reasons, such as its diversity and lack of institutional mechanism, to the establishment of a regional security arrangement in Northeast Asia. In this regard, participants shared the view that political will and common understanding of the need for security co-operation is an essential first step towards the institutionalization of such an endeavour.

Participants shared the view that the dramatic breakthrough in inter-Korean relations in the year 2000 has paved the way for tension-reduction and reconciliation on the Korean Peninsula. They also expressed their support for the Republic of Korea's policy of reconciliation and co-operation toward North Korea and hoped this would continue to be developed to yield substantive results. Participants agreed that, in order to build upon this, in addition to positive progress within the two Koreas, the increased engagement of the international community was important. In particular, they underlined that a CSBMs regime specifically designed to meet the needs of the actors in Northeast Asia could play a co-ordinating role to this end, as evidenced in the European experience. Thus, it would be of great value to explore and implement applicable CSBMs of the OSCE in Northeast Asia. However, they noted that there were challenges to be faced on the path to realizing these efforts and that patience and co-operation on the part of the two Koreas would be crucial if such efforts were to bear fruit.

In their concluding remarks, the Co-Chairmen stated that, while generating impetus for wider dialogue, the Conference served as an opportunity to enrich debates, exchange views, and raise ideas and suggestions, thus contributing to the development of the OSCE dialogue with its Partners for Co-operation and constituting a valuable contribution to the dialogue within the region. The OSCE experience has shown that in overcoming numerous obstacles dialogue is essential as a means to build bridges.

Participants expressed their gratitude to the Government of the Republic of Korea for co-organizing and hosting this Conference as well as for their excellent preparations and warm hospitality.

III. List of Participants

OSCE Participating States

Germany

Ambassador Reinhard Bettzuege
Ambassador Dr. Hubertus von Morr
Ms. Beatrix Kania

Oberstleutnant Bernd Giebner
Dr. Peter Mayer
Mr. Oliver Schramm
Mr. Gerhard Mayer

Permanent Representative to the OSCE
Embassy, Seoul
Desk Officer, Disarmament & Arms Control
Directorate, MFA
Military Attaché, Seoul
Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Seoul
Counsellor, Seoul
Counsellor, Seoul

United States of America

Mr. Evans J. Revere
Mr. Brian L. Goldbeck

Mr. Thomas Underwood

Ms. Donna Phelan

Ms. Kathryn Schultz

Lieutenant Colonel Richard Tracey

Chargé d'Affaires, Embassy, Seoul
Political External Section, Chief, Embassy,
Seoul
Political External Section, Deputy Chief,
Embassy, Seoul
Foreign Affairs Officer, Office of
Conventional Arms Control, Bureau of Arms
Control, US Dep. of State, Washington
Foreign Affairs Specialist, East Asia & Pacific
Region, Bureau of Non-proliferation, US Dep.
of State, Washington
U.S. Army – Chief Strategy Branch, Strategy
and Policy Division – USFK

Austria

Mr. Othmar Wiedenhofer

Chargé d'Affaires a.i., Embassy, Seoul

Azerbaijan

Mr. Fariz Rzayev

Desk Officer, Dep. of Security Problems,
MFA

Belarus

Mr. Sergei Martynov
Ambassador Aleksandr Semeshko

First Vice-Foreign Minister, Minsk
Embassy, Seoul

Belgium

Ambassador Koenraad Rouvroy
Mr. Paul Jansen

Embassy, Seoul
First Secretary, Embassy, Seoul

Bulgaria

Ambassador Dimiter Ikonov
Mr. Valeriy Arzhentinski

Embassy, Seoul
Minister, Embassy, Seoul

Canada

Dr. Eber Rice
Colonel Luc Bujold

Counsellor, Embassy, Seoul
Military Adviser,
Delegation to the OSCE, Vienna

Denmark

Ambassador Leif Donde

Ambassador, Seoul

Lieutenant Colonel Manuel Morato
Mr. Ignacio Monge

Ambassador Lauri Korpinen
Mr. Ari Tasanen
Ms. Leena Ritola

Ambassador Hervé Ladsous
Brigadier General Marc Bottine

Mr Serge Lavroff
Mr. Jean-Phillippe Godard
Mrs. Catherine Clement

Mr. Paul Flaherty
Mr. Michael Cowin

Prof. Dr. Barry Gills

Ambassador Constantin Fotilas
Ms. Vassiliki Dicopoulou

Ambassador Bélo László
Dr. István Perosa

Ambassador Paul Murray
Mr. Peter Ryan

Ambassador Guido Lenzi
Ambassador Carlo Trezza
Mr. Fabrizio Pignatelli della Leonessa

Ambassador Torolf Raa
Ms. Toril Langlete

Ambassador Vitali Fen
Mr. Bakhtier Ibragimov

Ambassador Hein de Vries
Mr. Gert Heijkrop

Mr. Jaroslaw Ksiazek

Ambassador Fernando Jose Ramos Machado

Spain

Ministry of Defence, Madrid
Secretary of Embassy

Finland

Embassy, Seoul
Deputy-Director, Security Policy, MFA
First Secretary/Deputy Head of Mission,
Embassy, Seoul

France

Permanent Representative to the OSCE
Senior Military Advisor, Delegation to the
OSCE
Embassy, Seoul
Defence Attaché, Embassy, Seoul
First Secretary, Embassy, Seoul

United Kingdom

Counsellor, UK Delegation to OSCE
Research Analyst, North Asia and Pacific
Research Group, Foreign and Commonwealth
Office
University of Newcastle, Dept. of Politics

Greece

Embassy, Seoul
Counsellor, Embassy, Seoul

Hungary

Embassy, Seoul
Counsellor, Deputy Chief of Mission,
Embassy, Seoul

Ireland

Embassy, Seoul
Embassy, Seoul

Italy

Permanent Representative to the OSCE
Embassy, Seoul
Embassy, Seoul

Norway

Embassy, Seoul
First Secretary, Embassy, Seoul

Uzbekistan

Embassy, Seoul
First Secretary, Embassy, Seoul

Netherlands

Embassy, Seoul
Counsellor, Embassy, Seoul

Poland

Charge d' Affairs a.i./Counsellor
Embassy, Seoul

Portugal

Embassy, Seoul

Romania/OSCE Chairman-in-Office

H.E. Mr. Mircea Dan Geoană Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Romania,
Ambassador Constantin Ene Personal Representative of the C-I-O, MFA
Ambassador Viorel Isticioaia-Budura Embassy, Seoul
Ms. Paraschiva Bădescu Special Advisor to the C-i-O, MFA
Mr. Gheorge Gradinaru Political Counsellor, Embassy, Seoul
Ms. Tatiana Isticioaia Expert, OSCE Affairs, Embassy, Seoul
Mr. Cristian Teodorescu Director, Asia-Pacific Division, MFA

Russian Federation

Mr. Alexander Alekseev Deputy Director, Department of European Co-operation, MFA
Mr. Ivan Soltanovski Acting Head of Division on Conventional Armaments and CSBMs, Dep. for Security Affairs and Disarmament, MFA

Slovak Republic

Ambassador Peter Sopko Embassy, Seoul
Mr. Jan Chladek Embassy, Seoul

Sweden/EU

Ambassador Bo Lundberg Embassy, Seoul
Mr. Kaarlo Laakso Counsellor, Embassy, Seoul

European Commission

Mr. Luc Vandebon Minister Counsellor, Seoul
Mr. John Sagar Political Analyst, Seoul

Switzerland

Dr. Jean-Jacques de Dardel Head, Euro-Atlantic Security Section, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Aldo de Luca Counsellor, Embassy, Seoul

Czech Republic

Ambassador Ivan Hotek Embassy, Seoul
Mr. Filib Skaba Embassy, Seoul

Turkey

Ambassador Tomur Bayer Embassy, Seoul
Mr. Cinar Ergin Second Secretary, Embassy, Seoul
Ms. Oya Ergin Third Secretary, Embassy, Seoul

Ukraine

Mr. Oleksii Stepanov First Secretary, Embassy, Seoul

Partners for Co-operation

Japan

Dr. Takahiro Shinyo Head of Delegation, Deputy Director-General, European Affairs Bureau, MFA
Mr. Koichi Aiboshi Counsellor, Embassy, Seoul
Mr. Kazuya Otsuka Assistant Director/Major, First Western European Division, European Affairs Bureau, MFA
Mr. Tomotaka Yoshimura Official, National Security Policy Division, Foreign Policy Bureau, MFA

Ms. Takako Ueta

Advisor, Professor, International Christian University

H.E. Mr. Joung-binn Lee

Dr. Young-jin Choi

Mr. Joon Oh

Mr. Sang-mo Yeon

Mr. Dong-ik Shin

Mr. Chang Beom Kim

Mr. Jeong-hyun Ryu

Mr. Jo-young Jeon

Ms. Eun-ji Seo

Mr. Jong Kwon Youn

Col. Hyun-kun Yoon

Mr. Kyung-soo Kim

Lt.Col. Won-woo Lee

Mr. Kyong-soo Lho

Korea

Minister, MOFAT, Seoul

Dep. Minister, MOFAT, Seoul

Dep. DG, MOFAT, Seoul

Counsellor, Embassy, Vienna

Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Director, MOFAT, Seoul

Dep. Director, MOFAT, Seoul

Asst. Director, MOFAT, Seoul

Asst. Director, MOFAT, Seoul

Asst. Director, MOFAT, Seoul

Professor, National Defence University

Researcher, KIDA

Officer, Arms Control Bureau, MND

Professor, Seoul National University

Thailand

Ms. Suchitra Hiranprueck

Ambassador Sorayouth Prompoj

Ambassador Vachai Vannasinn

Ms. Vimon Kidchob

Director-General, ASEAN Affairs, MFA

Embassy, Vienna

Embassy, Seoul

Director, European Affairs Division 1, MFA

Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation

Ambassador Ahmed Boutache

Mr. Djamal Boutiab

Algeria

Embassy, Seoul

Counsellor, Seoul

Ambassador Hussein Derar

Egypt

Embassy, Seoul

Mr. Eli Shaked

Mr. Ariel Shafransky

Israel

Chargé d' Affairs, Embassy, Seoul

Deputy Chief of Mission, Embassy, Seoul

Ambassador Jaafar Alj Hakim

Mr. Kamal Arifi

Morocco

Embassy, Seoul

Deputy Head of Mission, Embassy, Seoul

Ambassador Mondher Jemail

Mr. Sadok Bou Ali

Tunisia

Embassy, Seoul

Counsellor, Embassy, Seoul

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

H.E. Ambassador Ján Kubiš

Ambassador Márton Krasznai

Dr. Wilfried Aichinger

Ms. Elizabeth Abela

OSCE Secretariat

OSCE Secretary General

Director, Conflict Prevention Centre

Senior Communications Network Officer

Adviser, Office of the Secretary General

Guests of the Host Country from the ASEAN Regional Forum

China

Dr. Jian Xu Associate Professor, China Institute of
International Studies, Beijing

Vietnam

Ambassador Nguyen Van Xuong Embassy, Seoul
Mr. Nguyen Van Hung Embassy, Seoul

Non-Governmental Organizations and Scientific Institutions

The Asia Foundation

Mr. Scott Snyder Representative to Korea, Seoul

Graduate School of Asia Pacific Studies

Dr. John B. Kotch Associate Professor, Hanyang University,
Seoul

Prof. Dennis C. Florig Associate Professor of American Studies
Hanyang University, Seoul

The Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security (IFANS)

Mr. Hong-Kyoo Park Professor, IFANS

Mr. Seo-Hang Lee Professor, IFANS

The Institute of Korean Studies

Mr. Myong-Whai Kim President, Seoul

Institute for Science and International Security (ISIS)

Ms. Holly Higgins Research Analyst

National Institute for Research Advancement (NIRA)

Dr. Akiko Fukushima Advisor, NIRA

Sejong Institute

Mr. Dae Sung Song Senior Research Fellow

Mr. Hyun Ik Hong Research Fellow

Mr. Dae Woo Lee Research Fellow

Mr. Sang hyun Lee Research Fellow

Mr. Tai Hwan Lee Research Fellow

IV. List of Documents distributed during the Conference*)

#	Date	Author/Institution	Title	Language
001	19 March	Republic of Korea	Concept Paper	English
002	19 March	OSCE- Republic of Korea	Agenda and Workplan	English
003	19 March	OSCE Secretariat	Preliminary List of Participants	English
004	20 March	H.E. Mr. Joung-binn Lee, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Republic of Korea	Opening Statement	English
005	20 March	Amb. Jan Kubis, OSCE Secretary General	Opening Statement	English
006	20 March	Amb. N Daag, Sweden/EU	Key-note statement	English
007	20 March	Conflict Prevention Centre(CPC), OSCE Secretariat	Compilation of CSBMs	English
008	20 March	Mr. Oh Joon, Republic of Korea	Key-note statement	English
009	20 March	Amb. Guido Lenzi, Italy	Key-note statement	English
010	20 March	Dr. Wilfried Aichinger, CPC, OSCE Secretariat	Key-note statement	English
011	20 March	Amb. Rainer Bettzuege, Germany	Key-note statement	English
012	20 March	Ms. Suchitra Hiranprueck, Thailand	Key-note statement	English
013	20 March	Amb. Marton Krasznai, Director, Conflict Prevention Centre, OSCE Secretariat	Key-note statement	English
014	21 March	Mr Ivan Soltanovski, Russian Federation	Key-note statement	English
015	21 March	Mr Air Tasanen, Finland	Statement	English
016	21 March	Dr Barry Gills, Newcastle University, UK	Key-note statement	English
017	21 March	Mr Takahiro Shinyo, Japan	Key-note statement	English
018	21 March	Dr Scott Snyder, Korea Representative, The Asia Foundation	Key-note statement	English
019	21 March	Mr Kyongsoo Lho, Seoul National University, Republic of Korea	Key-note statement	English
020	21 March	Dr. Jian Xu, China Institute of International Studies, Beijing	Key-note statement	English
021	21 March	OSCE Secretariat	Final List of Participants	English
022	21 March	Russian Federation Delegation	Shangai Five Group – contribution to discussion on CSBMs in other regions	English
023	21 March	Egypt	Statement	English
024	21 March	H.E. Mr Mircea Dan Geoană, Chairman-in-Office, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Romania	Address	English
025	21 March	South and North Korea	Agreement on Reconciliation, Nonaggression, and Exchanges and Cooperation between South and North Korea	English
026	21 March	Co-Chairmen	Summary	English

*) Documents are available upon request from Documents Distribution, Conference Services

Annex

Seating Arrangement

	OSCE Secretariat D/CPC OSCE SG Co-Chair OSCE CiO (<i>closing</i>) MOFAT Korea (<i>opening</i>) Co-Chair (<i>Sessions:</i> Chairman Rapporteur)	
Germany		Sejong Inst.
USA		NIRA
Austria		ISIS
Azerbaijan		IKS
Belarus		IFANS
Belgium		GSAPS
Bulgaria		Asia Foundation
Canada		Vietnam
Denmark		China
Spain		Tunisia
Finland		Morocco
France		Israel
UK		Egypt
Greece		Algeria
Hungary		Thailand
Ireland		Korea
Italy		Japan
Norway		Ukraine
		Turkey
		Czech Republic
		Switzerland
Uzbekistan		
Netherlands		
Poland		
Portugal		
Romania/CiO		
Russian Federation		
Slovakia		
Sweden/EU		
European Commission		