

**OSCE FIFTEENTH ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL FORUM
PART II
21-23 MAY 2007, PRAGUE**

**TURKISH VIEWS ON DOCUMENTS;
EF.IO/13/07, EF.GAL/9/07 AND CIO.GAL/66/07**

This paper seeks to address, from the Turkish point of view, some of the elements contained in documents EF.IO/13/07 (Review of the implementation of OSCE commitment in the economic and environmental dimension), EF.GAL/9/07 (Tentative outcome and possible follow-up to the 15th OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum, 21-23 May 2007, Prague) and CIO.GAL/66/07 (OSCE Environmental Security Strategy)

A. Review of Commitments:

We thank the UNECE Secretariat for its comprehensive report on the review of the implementation of OSCE commitments in the economic and the environmental dimension focusing on the environment. We note the limited focus of the report around the five thematic areas of environmental performance, public participation, compliance with multilateral environmental agreements, water information and education for sustainable development, as well as its particular attention to Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia and South East Europe. We appreciate the four project proposals on “Improving water and health in South Eastern Europe, and Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia”; “Building capacity for environmental monitoring and reporting by enterprises and public authorities in Central Asia”; “Environmental indicator based assessments in Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia”; and “Creating a critical-mass: implementing education for sustainable development in South Eastern Europe”, annexed to the report.

We look forward to hearing the views of the countries targeted in the report.

The project proposals will need to be taken up at the Economic and Environmental Committee in order to identify the OSCE’s possible contribution to them, the resources required and our ability to make available those resources. We would appreciate it, if the UNECE could forward its own views on how it expects the OSCE to contribute to the implementation of these projects. The views, needs and priorities of the targeted regions must be the basis for any project implementation activity.

B. Tentative Outcome and Possible Follow-up:

This document and some of the questions therein partially overlap with the document on an Environmental Security Strategy. Therefore some of the issues pertaining to the Strategy will also be addressed in this section.

i. The discussion in **Plenary Session I** should be the basis for a definition of what “environmental security” is within an OSCE specific context, which should then feed into the revision of document CIO.GAL/66/07 (Environmental Security Strategy).

In determining a possible role for the OSCE in environmental security – in particular if that role is to entail early warning/monitoring- it is important to look at the entire cycle of factors leading to environmental degradation and depletion of natural resources such as water, top soil, forests, resulting in possible tensions and conflicts in the OSCE region. Without considering the overarching contribution of climate change resulting from green-house gas emissions to this cycle, any consideration of the issue as well as mitigation policies will be incomplete.

The contribution of co-operation on environmental security issues in conflict areas as a tool of peace, confidence building and reconciliation is a concept that requires further study as to its practical applicability. The ability of the OSCE to induce positive change through environmental co-operation in conflicts, at the core of which lie issues of national sovereignty and territorial integrity is likely to remain modest. It is not the OSCE's remit to enforce such co-operation but to facilitate it upon request.

The OSCE's role as a platform for dialogue on environmental security issues must be established on the basis of a clear definition and commonality of understanding among Participating States as to what "environmental security" means in an OSCE specific context, as well as on the basis of ongoing work in other fora in order to avoid duplication.

Mainstreaming environmental security issues into the political agenda of Participating States, particularly those in transition, must be supplemented with the necessary resources and donor capacity in order to ensure that political will translates into substantive action and value added for the common citizen.

ii. **Plenary Session II.** The OSCE's experience and role in sustainable water management has yet to be substantiated. How the projects relating to Sava Initiative, Chu and Talas and Dniester River projects have contributed to the accumulation of expertise at the OSCE needs to be defined. In this vein, the question of what makes the OSCE the institution of first choice for Participating States seeking mediation in their co-operation efforts with regard to transboundary waters should be satisfactorily answered.

The OSCE has no remit to mediate on sustainable water management issues within participating states, between state institutions, civil society and the business community, which is the purview of sovereign States, unless specifically so requested. International practice has demonstrated that transboundary water issues are best equitably addressed bilaterally or multi-laterally among riparian States, while taking into account the specificities of the water in question.

iii. **Plenary Session III.** The hypothesis that "promoting good governance is the answer to many environmental challenges" is at best questionable. The challenges of climate change – an ongoing challenge of some decades now- resulting from green-house gas emissions has yet to be addressed sufficiently by countries with the strongest good governance records as well as resources.

In developing OSCE-UNECE co-operation in the implementation of the UNECE conventions and in particular the Aarhus Convention and the Water Convention, it has to be kept in mind that not all Participating States are parties to the UNECE Conventions and Protocols.

Turkey would question the validity of the argument presented in the “Outcome Paper” that “the OSCE has a clear role in local capacity building, enabling better civil society contribution to water management and providing political impetus to intra and inter state cooperation and policy integration”. Neither do mandates of missions foresee such a role, nor do present resources enable the Organisation to carry out such a capacity building function. Vital to such a discussion would be a clear acknowledgement that the organisation does not have a remit for becoming involved in intra-State co-operation and policy integration in Participating States.

iv. **Plenary Session V.** The phenomenon of environmentally induced migration with conflict potential in the OSCE geography has yet to be substantiated by scientific evidence.

C. Environmental Security Strategy:

We thank the Spanish Chairmanship for the proposal on the “Environmental Security Strategy”.

We understand that the paper in its present format is a first draft that will undergo revision in light of the discussions at the Economic and Environmental Forum.

In view of the fact that the paper does not constitute a basis for negotiations our comments at present will be limited to those of a conceptual and principle nature.

i. **Introduction:** As mentioned previously, in any OSCE Environmental Security Strategy “environmental security” needs to be defined in an OSCE specific context. The introductory section of the Strategy needs to be revised structurally and made more coherent, focusing on a definition based on a common understanding of what “environmental security” means. Broad, sweeping statements, generalisations and unsubstantiated suppositions should be avoided.

ii. **Decision/Ministerial Declaration:** This segment of the Strategy, after streamlining, may form the basis for future negotiations in order to be able to adhere to the Madrid Ministerial timeline. The Action Plan should not be linked with it and should not be considered as a basis for negotiations.

References to “climate change” should be strengthened and the recognition of its overall detrimental impact on the depletion of water resources, land degradation, de-forestration and possible environmentally induced migration should become a focal point of the Strategy. Thereby the declaration should transcend the framework of the Maastricht Strategy which fails adequately to address climate change.

The rationale for the establishment of an “Environmental Diplomacy Network” and its possible future role and activities should be defined in order to allow for a constructive debate at the Committee regarding the merit of such an undertaking.

While one of the EEF sessions could be dedicated to environmental security as of 2009, this needs to be tied in to a broader discussion of how the themes for the EEF as of 2009 will be established, since it foresees altering the CIO’s present prerogative in defining the themes of Economic and Environmental Forums. This discussion should take place under the auspices of the Economic and Environmental Committee.

The appointment of a “Special Representative of the CiO for Environmental Security” would have to ensure that the Economic Coordinator’s role is neither diminished nor weakened and that the resources and support to be provided to such a Special Representative are established beyond the Spanish Chairmanship. Furthermore, it must be clearly understood that the mandate of such a Special Representative should be established by consensus.

The rationale, necessity and value added for an Environmental Security Code of Conduct, as well as its possible elements should be introduced by the Spanish Chairmanship and discussed at the Economic and Environmental Committee before a commitment is made through the Ministerial Declaration to start work on such a project.

iii. **Environmental Security Action Plan:** The Action Plan contains many elements – some controversial- which will require substantive and detailed discussions. It does not seem realistic to expect that a consensus could be reached on the Action Plan by the Madrid Ministerial. However, the various elements of the action Plan could be incorporated into the agenda of future Committee meetings, enabling informal, open ended consultations on them. This needs to be done without considering the Action Plan as a basis for negotiations.