



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
The Secretariat**

**PREPARATORY SEMINAR FOR THE
NINTH MEETING OF THE OSCE ECONOMIC FORUM**

**"TRANSPARENCY AND GOOD GOVERNANCE IN ECONOMIC
MATTERS; INSTITUTIONS, GOVERNANCE AND ECONOMIC
PERFORMANCE"**

Bucharest, 27 and 28 March 2001

CONSOLIDATED SUMMARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY OF THE OSCE SEMINAR ON “TRANSPARENCY AND GOOD GOVERNANCE IN ECONOMIC MATTERS; INSTITUTIONS, GOVERNANCE AND ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE”	3
OPENING PLENARY SESSION: CHAIRMAN’S OPENING STATEMENT	6
REPORTS OF THE WORKING GROUP RAPPORTEURS	
Working Group A: The Dangers of Weak Institutions	10
Working Group B: Stronger Institutions Enhance Economy and Security.....	12
Working Group C: Contributions of Regional and International Co-operation to Enhancing Good Governance and Security.....	14
PROGRAMME OF THE THIRD PREPARATORY SEMINAR FOR THE NINTH MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC FORUM ON “TRANSPARENCY AND GOOD GOVERNANCE IN ECONOMIC MATTERS; INSTITUTIONS, GOVERNANCE AND ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE”	17
INTRODUCTORY NOTE.....	21
Annex 1: List of participants	
Annex 2: Statement by the Russian Federation	



Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

SUMMARY OF THE OSCE SEMINAR ON TRANSPARENCY AND GOOD GOVERNANCE IN ECONOMIC MATTERS; INSTITUTIONS, GOVERNANCE AND ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE

BUCHAREST, 27 - 28 MARCH 2001

1. On 27 and 28 March 2001, the OSCE, in co-operation with the Government of Romania, hosted a seminar on “*Transparency and Good Governance in Economic Matters; Institutions, Governance and Economic Performance*”, in Bucharest, Romania. This was the third and last in a series of preparatory seminars for the Ninth OSCE Economic Forum, to be held in Prague from 15 to 18 May 2001. The Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities and the Chairman-in-Office prepared the seminar jointly. More than 170 participants from OSCE participating States, the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, the office of the Representative on the Freedom of the Media, numerous representatives of OSCE Field Missions, several international organizations, non-governmental organizations, as well as the business and academic communities attended the event.

2. *His Excellency Mr. Mircea Dan Geoana, OSCE Chairman-in-Office*, welcomed the participants and elaborated on the importance of the economic dimension of security, as well as on the link between transparency, good governance and strong institutions. He underlined that differences in levels of economic development within the OSCE region represented a clear threat to security and hindered sustainable economic growth. The Chairman pointed to transparent economic environments and good governance as essential factors for the increase of economic prosperity and general stability in the OSCE region. In particular, he stressed the importance of increased regional co-operation. He emphasized that the OSCE could play a key role as a catalyst for co-operation between international organizations and institutions in the economic and environmental areas. Finally, he mentioned that top priority should be given to *strengthening* the activities of the OSCE missions by supporting their programs in the economic and environmental dimension.

3. *Mr. Thomas L. Price, Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities*, reiterated that disparities in levels of income *within and between* countries posed a serious threat to security. He pointed to the fact that disparities within the OSCE region had grown drastically in the last 25 years: in 1974 the ratio of disparity was 23:1, compared to the figure of 200:1 in 2001. To decrease disparities, good governance and *healthy* institutions need to be promoted and ensured.

4. Keynote speakers and participants expressed agreement on the interrelationship between transparency, good governance and economic performance. *Ms. Milica Uvalic, Vice Minister of Foreign Economic Relations, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, pointed to the fact that in the initial stages of transition, a number of crucial factors had been neglected or

ignored, such as the institutional framework of private and public governance. Also, the costs of transition had been underestimated. Due to these miscalculations new problems emerged as a by-product of transition. Finally, she mentioned the interdependence between economic and political factors. *Mr. Didier Fau, Director of the Stability Pact for Southeast Europe*, underscored the need for regional co-operation and its great benefits for transparency. At the same time, efficiency can also be increased by regional co-operation. First, by taking advantages of lessons learned it is possible to save time and resources. Second, regional co-operation would lead to regional progress, which understandably would be in the interest of each country. Third, globalization imposes that many issues related to governance can be dealt with only at regional level. Finally, regional co-operation is the best way to initiate and promote an active role of civil society. *Mr. David Nyheim, Forum on Early Warning and Early Response*, discussed the link between economic/governance indicators and their relation to early warning of crises and conflicts, as well as the institutional challenges faced when responding to the aforementioned warnings.

5. **Working Group A** dealt with the *dangers of weak institutions*. Participants discussed the direct link between weak institutions/non-transparent structures and the results which derive from them, those being bad governance and a stagnation of economic growth. Furthermore, WG A analyzed how the OSCE, through its political bodies, its field missions and its co-operation with international organizations, could be of use in the promotion of good governance practices. **Working Group B** focused on the way in which *stronger institutions enhance economy and security*. It was agreed that a sound political and institutional framework was essential for achieving a sustainable and prosperous economic and social development. It was underlined that institutions were a key factor in economic development as well as security, and hence they should be transparent and flexible. The question was raised as to whether economies in transition should transform *old* institutions or rather create *new* ones. In addition, it was noted that issues concerning the integration of minorities should be addressed, since they had a direct impact on overall economic development. **Working Group C** discussed the *contributions of regional and international Co-operation to enhancing good governance and security*. Practical aspects stemming from an increase in international co-operation were identified. Special attention was given to ways in which the OSCE itself could support such a process.

6. In the Closing Plenary, the rapporteurs presented the recommendations made by the working groups: participants called upon the OSCE to increase its liaison function by *facilitating* co-operation between governments or local authorities and international organizations, NGOs and the business sector. It was suggested that the OSCE *deepen* its role with regard to promoting regional co-operation. The link was drawn between the promotion of civil service reforms and good governance/prevention of corruption. Hence, it was pointed out that the OSCE could further *support* the strengthening of civil society, through the *promotion* of regional projects. There was consensus that lack of transparency in decision-making processes undermined the democratic nature of institutions, therefore it was suggested that the OSCE help *increase* public access to information and documents. It was stated that the OSCE *increase* its attention concerning the role of the media as a promoter for the spread of economic information. Participants in all three working groups stressed that the OSCE could, in co-operation with relevant international organizations, consider setting benchmarks for best practices in regard to good governance and transparency. Delegates stressed the importance of the *institutional strengthening* of the economic dimension of the OSCE. (The Russian delegation requested its statement be attached to the Seminar Summary). Finally, it was suggested that future discussions could *incorporate* a more

detailed analysis concerning the experience of *western* countries when dealing with lack of transparency and corruption.

7. In his concluding remarks, *Mr. Adrian Severin, President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly*, reiterated the fact that a lack of transparency has a direct impact on the increase of corruption in the system, thereby underscoring the importance of increasing accountability as well as decentralization. He mentioned that *equal* attention should be given to *vertical* decentralization as well as *horizontal* decentralization. Mr. Severin finally stressed the need to further institutionalize the economic dimension of the OSCE and suggested organizing a joint OCEEA/OSCE PA meeting on strategies in fostering the development of small and medium enterprises. *Mr. Daniel Daianu, Representative of the CiO*, stated that it was essential to create more effective and stronger institutions which would in turn promote a sense that public policy was actually being pursued. He stressed that increased attention should be given to creating a framework which fostered regional co-operation. In his concluding remarks, *Mr. Thomas L. Price* emphasized that part of the OSCE's goals should be to *reduce*, rather than *reinforce* divisions present between east and west, as well as those between north and south. He listed four points that would help in implementing some of the recommendations suggested by the working groups. First, it was important to *categorize* problems regarding economic/environmental issues that have security implications. Second, the *convening* of meetings between governments, NGOs and the business community should be *increased* in order to prevent further conflicts. Third, *consciousness* of the threats stemming from economic weakness and environmental scarcity should be raised. And last, by increasing its links with other international organizations, through the platform concept, the OSCE should serve as a *catalyst* in preventing and finding solutions to conflicts.

**OSCE Seminar on “Transparency and Good Governance in Economic Matters;
Institutions, Governance and Economic Performance”
-Bucharest, 27-28 March 2001-**

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

Bucharest, 27 March 2001

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am pleased to welcome you, on behalf of the Romanian Chairmanship, to the third preparatory seminar for the Ninth OSCE Economic Forum. I wish you all a productive stay in Bucharest and every success to this seminar.

Before you begin to debate the substance, let me emphasize some issues that I consider of utmost importance for pursuing our common objectives.

Why is the economic dimension of security important?

As Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE, I have underscored on several different occasions that dramatic differences in levels of economic development in the OSCE region represent a major threat to our common security.

All the transition countries, including my own, have suffered years of neglect and economic mismanagement under communism. For transition countries this legacy has resulted in seemingly insurmountable economic obstacles. Poverty, unemployment and an inadequate response to economic concerns and problems have created conditions for the proliferation of negative trends such as organized crime, trafficking, corruption and extremism which erupts into violence.

They menace the OSCE values, threatening our security. They hinder economic development, endanger social cohesion and negatively impact on the day-to-day life of individuals. Over the last decade, we have witnessed tragic developments in some OSCE countries proving that democracy against a background of poverty and continued economic hardship is fragile and easily dislodged.

Over the last three months, I have had the opportunity to visit most of the countries in South-Eastern Europe and the Caucasus. I have spoken to governments, Parliamentary groups and NGOs about their problems and concerns. I can tell you that economic difficulties rank high among their list.

Why are transparency, good governance and development of strong institutions important?

Absence of transparency and good governance are in the medium and long run, serious threats to security and stability at the national level, and can generate “hot spots” for stability at the regional level.

Economic liberty, social justice, and environmental responsibility are indispensable for prosperity. All these could be interpreted as “transparency and good governance”.

What do we mean by transparency and good governance? Transparency is both the exchange of information between states and the right of the public (citizens, companies, NGOs) to be permanently and fairly informed on its government’s decisions. Concurrently, good governance is not a luxury; it is a long expected solution for a country.

A transparent and predictable economic environment creates incentives for investment and further facilitates economic growth. At the opposite pole, corruption represents a disincentive for investment; it generates misallocation of existing, often limited, resources and distorts competition. This hinders economic development. If corruption becomes general, institutional and organized, it erodes the legitimacy of the government and the confidence of the citizens, turning into a major threat to democracy.

Good governance refers principally to the role of the state in acting in the best interest of its citizens and in accordance with the rule of law. One very important aspect of good governance is the appropriate role of the state in the economy. This raises some fundamental questions such as: “which institutions are best suited?”, “which are the most efficient policies?” etc. Answering these questions means not only analyzing trends, but finding solutions. By laying out a blueprint for the most suitable institutions and putting into practice the right policies, poverty and underdevelopment can be overcome and, more importantly, stability and prosperity can be achieved.

Under the impact of globalization, governments should become agents of change and act to adopt the most successful practices conducive to the integration of national economies into the world economy.

To respond to the risks and to enhance the stability and prosperity of the OSCE region, certain conditions such as institutional development, government commitment, political will, citizen participation and the promotion of transparency are of crucial importance. This is true for all OSCE participating States and moreover for the countries in transition. For them long-term strategies are absolutely essential, both in terms of shaping domestic policies, as well as in defining the regional and inter-regional cooperation.

Why is regional co-operation essential?

We all agree that the security within the OSCE area is indivisible. Given the increased interdependency in the Globalization Age, developments within one State have implications for others. Cross-border problems demand cross-border responses to ensure that security and prosperity are accessible to all. Massive trade and development cannot be stimulated as long as political and security risks endure.

The need for enhanced inter-institutional co-operation has been emphasized often at previous meetings on the economic and environmental dimension. OSCE can play an important role, as a catalyst for cooperation between international organizations and institutions in the economic and environmental areas, based on the principles of complementarity and synergy. The preparatory seminar in Brussels, at the end of January this year, organized jointly by the OSCE and the European Commission is a positive example of such cooperation.

Regional organizations and their initiatives have a particular role to play. Co-operation between neighbors is essential in setting priorities and allocating resources. It generates self-confidence and a spirit of ownership. Only in this manner will the States in the region cease to be part of the problem and become part of the solution. The Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe has shown us what is possible through a concerted effort by regional countries, partner countries and international organizations. As a further concrete example of successful regional co-operation I would mention the South East European Co-operation Initiative (SECI) and the SECI Regional Center for Combating Cross-Border Organized Crime, hosted in Bucharest.

We believe that the strength of OSCE lies in its capacity to generate, promote and implement the most advanced ideas. We need determination and a strong sense of initiative, cooperation and responsibility to carry out our common goals. Thus, we want to link a conceptual basis to practical measures and ensure coherence and consistency in our activities.

Future direction of OSCE

We have noted with great interest the views of a number of States, concerning the need to strengthen the role of the OSCE within the economic dimension. We will be building on shifting sands unless we can first set the ground for a secure, stable and trustworthy economic environment. Romania shares this view. As Chairman-in-Office, we will work together with our partners in the OSCE to develop ideas on the most appropriate ways to increase the efficiency of our Organization in this field. We are determined to carry out this process.

We believe there is more that our OSCE field missions can do. I have seen the constant endeavor, often unnoticed, of the field missions who, together with local governments, NGOs, and in co-operation with other organizations present in the field, have developed and implemented a series of activities and grass-root initiatives. I want to thank them for their constant dedication.

Strengthening the activities of the OSCE missions, supporting their initiatives and programs in the economic and environmental dimension, using their unique expertise and knowledge of the realities in the field is one of our priorities.

This seminar is designed to engage representatives of governments and civil society, OSCE missions, international and regional organizations, business community and academics in a cross-fertilizing process. It is my belief that your dedicated work will generate valuable recommendations that, together with those formulated by the Almaty seminar in November last year and the already mentioned Brussels seminar will contribute to the success of the Ninth Economic Forum. The Forum is not the end of a process and its results should be enhanced through follow-up actions.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Before I conclude, I want to thank Tom PRICE most warmly for his hard and dedicated work as the first Coordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities. His active involvement and achievements have significantly shaped the activity of our Organization.

I also want to thank him for agreeing to continue to co-operate with our Chairmanship, as “Co-ordinator Emeritus”, for the preparation of the Economic Forum in Prague and beyond, as the need may be.

Dear Tom, as recognition to your merits and constant support provided to the Chairman-in-Office, by the power vested in me by the President of Romania, I am proud to present you the Medal “Pentru merit” with the rank of “Mare ofițer”.

Thank you Tom for your dedication and good luck in your future activity and thank you all for your attention.

Working Group A: The Dangers of Weak Institutions

The working group dealt with the negative effects of weak institutions and non-transparent structures and their consequences in the form of bad governance and lack of economic growth. Discussion centered around how the assets of the OSCE, including its political bodies, field presences and institutions, in close co-operation with relevant international institutions and organizations can assist in promoting good governance practices and a more informed civil society. Below follow some recommendations to be considered in connection with OSCE's work to promote healthy and accountable institutions:

- Transition should be viewed not only as a shift from central and communist economy to market economy, but also as transition from political autocracy to political democracy. Weak, non-transparent and malfunctioning institutions threaten democracy, hinder economic growth and menace OSCE values and commitments. OSCE has an important role to play in promoting healthy and accountable institutions.
- A special role for the OSCE is to promote and facilitate practices whereby civil organizations and public administration enter into regular contacts and dialogue, intended to create trust and confidence in society.
- OSCE could, in co-operation with relevant international organizations, consider setting benchmarks for best practices in regard to good governance and transparency.
- Elected officials at all levels should be expected to demonstrate their political will to take steps against corrupt practices. This could be done through, *inter alia*, support for the adoption and implementation of laws criminalizing corruptive practices, support for codes of ethic conduct for elected officials and transparency in regard to decision-making processes. OSCE should seek ways and means to generate such political will and, as OSCE field presences have demonstrated, can act as a catalyst for positive measures against corrupted practices. The OSCE Parliamentary Assembly could play a special role in the promotion of best practices for elected officials.
- OSCE could facilitate anti-corruption networks for NGOs. It could also play a role in the training and advice to police and law enforcement authorities on anti-corruption and organized crime.
- Lack of transparency of decision-making processes undermines the democratic nature of institutions and the public's confidence in the administration. OSCE should promote openness and public access to information and documents, a principle laid down, *inter alia*, in the Aarhus Convention in regard to environmental matters. OSCE should continue to promote and raise awareness about Aarhus Convention.
- OSCE could, together with the Council of Europe, promote and raise awareness about best practices in regard to national control mechanisms, whereby parliamentarians, institutions or independent auditors, are granted the right and responsibility to control the executive power and its institutions. Together with an independent judiciary, such control mechanisms can promote and sustain good governance.
- OSCE, through the Economic Co-ordinator and field presences, could promote enhanced transparency in budget processes, spread knowledge about best practices to facilitate the

participation of the public in budget hearings, promote accessible information to the public about national and local budget processes and support endeavors by civic society in this regard.

- Freedom of information laws can play an important role in the promotion of good governance and transparency. In order to become effective instruments they should provide for the registration of all documents, possibilities for appeals through an administrative complaint procedure, and a last resort judicial review. OSCE can play a role for the promotion of such legislation, including through the work of its field presences and relevant institutions.
- For countries where institutions are weak and democratic progress slow, OSCE and other international actors should recognize the need to provide support both to key public institutions necessary to safeguard democracy and rule of law as well as to institutions, non-governmental organizations and civic society movements aiming at promoting democracy, respect for human rights and good governance. OSCE, through the work of its field presences and institutions, can and should act as a facilitator and promote chains of communication between officials and civil society, especially for groups and interests risking to be neglected or discriminated (rural entrepreneurs, women, ethnic minorities).
- OSCE can assist governments in assessing impact of policies on ethnic or disadvantaged groups in society and promote and monitor programs aimed to increase multi-ethnicity and tolerance.
- OSCE can, where relevant, assist in identifying serious bureaucratic bottlenecks or democratic deficiencies in the administrative systems and suggest ways and means to for governments and public institutions to address such problems, including by advising governments to receive assistance from other more competent organizations or institutions.
- OSCE could foster decentralization and local self government by identifying international donors that, through the provision of targeted funds, can assist governments in such efforts.
- Donors, when relevant in consultation with the OSCE, should continuously assess the best way to run projects. A community-based approach can often prove to be the most successful way to reach population groups in need or promote projects in rural areas.
- The OSCE should recognize the advantage of not being a donor organization; nevertheless it can identify niches of security-related and confidence building activities where to intervene also through small scale and/or extra budgetary projects.

Working Group B: Stronger Institutions Enhance Economy and Security

The main consensus in working group B, on the topic of *stronger institutions enhance economy and security*, was that a sound political and institutional framework is essential for achieving sustainable economic and social development as well as environmental responsibility.

The main issues addressed by the speakers and the participants were the following:

1. Institutions are a determining element in economic performance and security development. When addressing the issue of development, it is essential to define the appropriate institutions that are referred to and, more specifically, the groups and main actors to be involved in the process of institution building.
2. Strong institutions are not necessarily effective, and their impact might be as negative as the one stemming from weak institutions. Therefore, institutions should be adaptable, flexible, responsive and transparent.
3. A key issue is whether economies in transition should simply transform old institutions or create new ones, able to respond to new challenges. Therefore, it should be a permanent endeavor of the OSCE to develop, within its mandate, good examples of institution building, in order to meet the challenges of globalization.
4. Anti-monopoly institutions are essential towards the establishment and development of small and medium enterprises.
5. The concept of security needs to be more broadly defined. Such a concept of security involves the recognition that widening economic gaps, within societies and between countries, are a major threat to stability and peace. A secure Europe can not afford marginalized countries and populations.
6. Minority integration problems have a direct impact on overall economic performance and the creation of a business-friendly environment. Incentives such as land registration systems and titles to land and property, for example, are needed to give equal economic opportunities to minority ethnic groups and to all groups in society.
7. Foreign assistance policies should be developed in a balanced approach, providing an adequate basis for institutional development.
8. Regional chambers of commerce and associations of enterprises and businesses are an important tool to create pressure groups that may influence legislation towards effective institution building. Also, the role of Non-Governmental Organizations in providing expertise in specific issues should be taken into account.
9. The role of Parliamentarians, and Government officials, is paramount in fostering transparent economic processes through the development and implementation of comprehensive and effective legislation. Elected officials – in particular - should address

the concerns of citizens and groups of interest (business / enterprises), and provide oversight of executive practice.

10. Transfers of money from citizens to governments – i.e. taxes – should be insured by reliable public services. It is important to avoid situations where citizens are not willing to pay taxes because no services are provided.
11. Regionally focused initiatives are useful. They benefit from increased focus, relatively common problems and the reality of shared interests linked to stability and regional prosperity.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE OSCE ECONOMIC FORUM:

1. OSCE should consider an initiative to address institutional issues in a focused regional forum, with the specific goal of generating institution building proposals for evaluation by the business community. It is important for the OSCE to consider the successful models of SECI and UN/ECE.
2. The OSCE should address the issue of public and private partnership in contributing to institution building and promotion of trust between the partners.
3. The OSCE should achieve a comprehensive approach to security issues – problems can not and should not be allocated to a single “basket”. Interlocking issues require a response involving political, economic, environmental and social – human rights – responses.
4. The OSCE should develop and promote codes of ethical professional conduct, allowing the possibility of adopting and using such guidelines by individual enterprises and other professional institutions in member countries. They might also serve as a foundation for developing their own codes of conduct and professional standards.
5. The OSCE should continue to pay special attention to the role of the media, both as a means of freedom of expression, and as channel for disseminating economic information. The need for specialized journalists in the fields of business, economics and environment in transition economies, calls for the necessity of enhancing education and training for journalists in those fields.

Working Group C: Contributions of Regional and International Co-operation to Enhancing Good Governance and Security

Participants addressed the major themes and sub-themes as contained in the Draft Program of the Seminar. Representatives of OSCE field Missions, Governments of OSCE participating States, other international organizations, non-governmental organizations and business sector intervened. The discussion was oriented especially to identifying practical aspects of the international co-operation, with a special focus on the specific ways in which OSCE could support the process, within its mandate. New modalities of OSCE participation in the process have been suggested, aiming at the strengthening of the economic and environmental dimension of the organization.

The following ideas and recommendations could be retained for the debates of the Ninth Economic Forum:

1. Governments are the center for political decision. They have the main responsibility in promoting good governance and transparency. In the decision-making process, dialogue between Government and civil society (NGOs, business sector, etc) is a prerequisite for successful policies. International organizations, acting at field level, could provide advice and assistance to Governments.

OSCE could continue facilitating co-operation between Governments or local authorities and NGOs, business sector and other international organizations. OSCE has a role in increasing awareness both at national level and international organizations level. From this perspective, OSCE could increase its liaison function. A balance should be maintained among the three dimensions of OSCE, especially when referring to activities at field level.

2. Effective governments have the capacity to co-operate with different partners, *inter alia* with the business sector. Receptiveness to the demands of this sector contributes to the creation of favorable, predictable and stable business environment.

Both at headquarters and field level, OSCE could support governmental efforts to improve the business environment, acting as a “broker of expertise” through: diffusion of information on best practices; identification of needs and gaps in communication skills; facilitation of information sharing and dialogue.

3. In transition countries, promoting reforms of administration and civil service is crucial for good governance, respect of law, law enforcement and prevention of corruption. Civil service should be strong in its structure and flexible in its approach. High qualification, expertise, moral standards, and openness to dialogue with civil society representatives are key elements for efficient civil servants.

OSCE could support the strengthening of civil service through regional projects aimed at groups of neighboring States confronted with similar problems. Drafting a Code of Conduct for civil servants could be promoted and facilitated by OSCE.

4. There is a need for measuring performance in the area of good governance. Macro or micro economic indicators used to measure this performance are different from country to country and depend on national experience and statistical practice.

OSCE could develop means for measuring performance in good governance. These means become a useful feedback instrument for Governments in assessing the result of their policies and for the co-operation with civil society.

5. Regional co-operation can develop only in conditions of stability. In some regions of OSCE area, regional co-operation is increasing as result of various factors such as: responses to the globalization process, prospects of European integration, need to co-operate in the post-conflict reconstruction and development. In Central and South-Eastern Europe, regional co-operation is seen as a complement to and a tool of the European integration, as part of the pre-accession process. For some regions in post-conflict processes, regional co-operation becomes a tool of confidence building, of promoting good neighborliness and a new culture of partnership. Regional co-operation is developing the feeling of ownership for the participating States in various regional initiatives.

OSCE has a major role to play in relation to regional co-operation. Raising awareness, twinning programs, promoting regional co-operation to be beneficial to each participating State, networking NGOs from different countries, and better informing international organizations have been identified among the areas where OSCE can have a value added.

6. The reality confirms the co-existence of several initiatives of co-operation in the same region. These initiatives have different originators, sometimes with different agendas, priorities and interests. They are also in different stages of evolution or implementation. All of them have a common denominator: promoting stability, co-operation and good relations among beneficiary States.

OSCE can foster synergy of the initiatives addressing the same region, complementarity and a co-ordinated approach. The Platform for co-operative security is offering the tool to assure coherence of ongoing processes under various initiatives and activities of different international organizations. The possibilities of using efficiently this tool should be further explored. The Permanent Council should discuss and assess periodically the progress of OSCE in promoting regional co-operation.

7. In all its work on governance and economics, as part of a broader approach to security, the OSCE should adopt the following strategic principles:

- a) demand for engagement;
- b) value added and niche that can be filled;
- c) ability to back initiatives with available resources;
- d) relevance of initiatives to its broad mandate/approach to security.



Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

The Secretariat

**Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and
Environmental Activities**

Bucharest, 27 March 2001

**Third Preparatory Seminar for the Ninth OSCE Economic Forum
Bucharest, 27-28 March, 2001**

**TRANSPARENCY AND GOOD GOVERNANCE IN ECONOMIC MATTERS:
INSTITUTIONS, GOVERNANCE AND ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE**

Programme

Tuesday, March 27

0830 Registration of Participants

1000 Opening Plenary Session

- Welcoming remarks by:
 - **H.E. Mr. Mircea Dan Geoana, OSCE Chairman in Office**
 - **Mr. Thomas L. Price, Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities**
- Keynote Addresses:
 - **Ms. Milica Uvalic, Vice Minister of Foreign Economic Relations, FRY**
 - **Mr. Didier Fau, Stability Pact**
 - **Mr. David Nyheim, Forum on Early Warning and Early Response**
- Discussion of Keynote Addresses

1130 First Session of Working Groups

Working Group A: The Dangers of Weak Institutions

Moderator: Ms. Alina Mungiu-Pippidi, Romanian Academic Society

Rapporteur: Ms. Ann Marie Bolin Pennegård, Permanent Delegation of Sweden to the OSCE

Major themes and sub-themes to be addressed in this group might include:

- Weak institutions and consequences for governance
 - Improving public administration
 - How to provide essential public goods when there is budget retrenchment
 - The role of civic organizations in enhancing public administration

Speakers:

Ms. Petra Andersson, OSCE Spillover Monitor Mission to Skopje
Ms. Sona Ayvazyan, Environmental Public Advocacy Centre, Yerevan
Mr. Arcadie Barbarosie, Institute for Public Policy, Chisinau
Ms. Vera Nanivska, International Centre for Policy Studies, Ukraine
Mr. Jovan Teokarevic, Institute of European Studies, Belgrade

- How to deal with non-transparent structures
 - Formal and informal institutions
 - The underground economy
 - How to fight the criminalization of the economy

Speakers:

Ms. Annette Eisenmann, OSCE Presence in Albania
Mr. Liviu Muresan, Romanian Ministry of Interior
Mr. Robert Nowak, UN/ECE
Mr. Jerzy Osiatinski, Head of the Polish Delegation to the OSCE PA
Ms. Slagjana Taseva, Ministry of Finance, FYROM

Working Group B: Stronger Institutions Enhance Economy and Security

Moderator: Mr. Geoffrey Hamilton, UN/ECE

Rapporteur: Mr. Gustavo Pallares, OSCE PA International Secretariat

Major themes and sub-themes to be addressed in this group might include:

- Organized Markets and Institutions
 - How to create a business-friendly environment
 - How to fend off vested interests
 - How to create sound financial and banking systems
 - The role of foreign assistance

Speakers:

Mr. Zdravko Miovcic, Enterprise Development Agency, Banja Luka
Mr. Larry Sampler, Institute for Defence Analysis
Mr. Matti Sidoroff, OSCE Mission to Molodva

- Economy is Security
 - The threat of massive unemployment and social exclusion
 - The threat of economic stagnation
 - The threat of aid-addiction
 - The threat of major environmental damage

Speakers:

Mr. Daniel Daianu, Academy of Economic Studies, Bucharest
Mr. Jernej Stritih, REC, Budapest
Ms. Isabel Wolte, WWF International

Working Group C: Contributions of Regional and International Co-operation To Enhancing Good Governance and Security

Moderator: Mr. David Nyheim, Forum on Early Warning and Early Response

Rapporteur: Mr. Sorin Tanasescu, Permanent Mission of Romania to the OSCE

Major themes and sub-themes to be addressed in this group might include:

- Regional co-operation for enhancing good public and private governance
 - What can national governments do
 - What can business communities do
 - What can regional civic networks do

Speakers:

Ms. Katarina Jagic, SMEA, Zagreb

Mr. Declan Murphy, SEE Investment Compact, OECD

Ms. Arevik Saribekyan, Centre for Regional Development, Yerevan

- How can the international community contribute to developing regional co-operation and security
 - The role of the EU
 - The role of international donors
 - The role of SECI
 - The role of regional co-operation entities

Speakers:

Mr. M. Ziad Alahdad, World Bank Country Manager, Romania

Mr. Erwan Fouéré, European Commission

Ms. Gabriela Konevska, SECI Regional Centre for Combating Trans-border Crime

Ms. Cordula Wohlmuther, OSCE Project Co-ordinator in Ukraine

1300 Lunch Break

1500 Working Groups Resume – Second Session

1630 Coffee Break

1700 Working Groups Resume – Third Session

Reception Hosted by the Host Country at the Conference Site

Wednesday, March 28

1000 Working Groups Resume – Final Session

1230 Lunch Break

1500 Closing Plenary

- Reading of Rapporteurs' Reports
- Discussion from the Floor
- Closing Remarks by
 - **Mr. Adrian Severin, President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly**
 - **Mr. Daniel Daianu, Representative of the CiO**
 - **Mr. Thomas L. Price, Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities**

1700 Conclusion of Seminar



Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

The Secretariat

Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities

Introductory Note

Third Preparatory Seminar for the Ninth OSCE Economic Forum

Bucharest, 27-28 March, 2001

TRANSPARENCY AND GOOD GOVERNANCE IN ECONOMIC MATTERS: INSTITUTIONS, GOVERNANCE AND ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE

Almost eleven years since the fall of the Berlin Wall, the early and – in a certain way – naïve expectations of a quick and painless economic transition are gone. Both professionals and laymen realize that the process of economic transformation is much more complex and complicated than some imagined initially. Although inflation rates have come down dramatically in many transition countries, and some basic market institutions have finally been put into place, various indicators show a disconcerting picture. This picture obliges us to acknowledge that the geography of transition reveals an increasing diversity, with a few countries having achieved substantial economic and institutional progress, while many others are still struggling to solve the most basic problems of economic transformation while also dealing with increasing poverty and social dislocation.

At the start of the transition period, most of the attention of policy-makers was captured by price liberalization, privatization, stabilization and trade opening. Institutional change was, strangely, taken for granted. Nowadays one realizes that the new (market fitting) institutions cannot be created in a short span of time and that, fundamentally, they cannot but have domestic roots. Why has attention been shifting so glaringly towards the issue of institutional change? The answer can be twofold. First, we are reminded constantly by history and economic analysis that institutions determine, ultimately, economic performance. Therefore, neglecting them is costly for policy-makers. Second, institutional change is a time-consuming process and depends primarily on the local context. This observation generates a highly policy-relevant question: what kinds of institutions are taking root in transition countries and is there a role for public policy in this respect?

This year's OSCE Forum focuses on transparency and good governance. The second preparatory seminar, in Brussels, dealt with the issue of public and private governance under the impact of globalization; this seminar followed the seminar in Almaty of November 2000, which dealt with the overall theme in the Central Asian context. What links obviously the conceptual outline of all of these meetings is the role of institutions in enabling both public servants and managers of private enterprises to manage change in such a way that the welfare

of citizens grows steadily and their participation in political life is enhanced. Unfortunately, in many transition countries institutions need to be further strengthened. Institutional fragility leads to, and is reinforced by, the ineffectiveness of public policy, low overall economic performance, the mushrooming of the underground sectors and the criminalization of the economy, widespread corruption, increasing inequalities and declining social cohesion, etc. Fragile institutions and low economic performance heighten the sense of insecurity of governments, individuals and social groups, and can exacerbate not only conflicts within a state, but also tensions with neighbors.

For the reasons highlighted above, the seminar in Bucharest takes a look at public and private governance through the lenses of the need for institutional strengthening – with a special emphasis on South-Eastern Europe, the Black Sea region, and the Caucasus. Here a vicious circle operates currently: institutions affect economic performance and the quality of public policy; but since institutions are fragile, public policy (which itself hinges on institutions) needs to address this state of affairs. Governments in transition countries must find ways to overcome this apparently insurmountable problem.

The seminar in Bucharest will address the link between institutions and the quality of governance by tracing its dynamic to two major sources:

1. the almost congenital frailty of institutions during transition, particularly in the countries which were devoid of partial reforms before 1989, or have been embroiled in major conflicts since then;
2. the challenges posed by globalization and integration in the world economy.

The quality of institutions encompasses issues such as the definition and enforcement of property and intellectual property rights, the rule of law in general, transparency, institutionalized checks and balances, the interplay between formal and informal rules of the game, etc. As to globalization, on the one hand it presents extraordinary opportunities; on the other hand, it can entail social and economic fragmentation and cause massive political disruption. On all accounts the ability of public servants to formulate and implement appropriate policies is severely tested.



List of Participants

Preparatory Seminar for the Ninth OSCE Economic Forum

*“Transparency and Good Governance in Economic Matters:
Institutions, Governance and Economic Performance”*

Bucharest, 27 – 28 March 2001

2 April 2001

Kirschstein, Mr. Fred	Director, Private Enterprise Office, USAID Mission to Romania
Musatescu, Dr. Virgil	Senior Energy Advisor, Private Sector Initiatives Office, USAID Mission to Romania
Sampler, Mr. Larry	Institute for Defense Analysis
Scott, Mr. Robert	OSCE Desk Officer, United States Department of State

ARMENIA

Kazinian, Ambassador Karine	Armenian Embassy, Bucharest
Harutiunian, Mr. Grigor	Member of the National Assembly of the Republic of Armenia
Nersessian, Mr. Varuzhan	Deputy Head of the Armenian Delegation to the OSCE
Biyagov, Mr. Victor	Second Secretary, Armenian Embassy, Bucharest

AUSTRIA

Mandl, Mr. Christian	Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Austria to the OSCE
----------------------	---

AZERBAIJAN

Davudov, Mr. Irfan	Third Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Azerbaijan, Economic Development and Cooperation
--------------------	--

BELARUS

Zhartun, Mr. Sergei	First Secretary, Embassy of the Republic of Belarus in Romania
Biryukov, Mr. Anatoly	Counsellor, Embassy of the Republic of Belarus in Romania

BELGIUM

Del Marmol, Ambassador Danielle

Head of Mission, Permanent Mission of
Belgium to the OSCE

Maddens, Mr. Peter

Deputy Head of Mission, Permanent Mission
of Belgium to the OSCE

CANADA

Banks, Mr. Donald

Head of OSCE Section, Canadian Foreign
Affairs and International Trade Department

Lotin, Mr. Henry

First Secretary, Delegation of Canada to the
OSCE

SPAIN

De Salas, Mr. Alvaro

Counsellor, Spanish Delegation to the OSCE

FRANCE

Barbier, Ms. Elisabeth

Deputy Head of Delegation, Permanent
Representation of France to the OSCE

UNITED KINGDOM

Huckle, Mr. Alan

Head, OSCE/COE Department, Foreign and
Commonwealth Office, London

Mani, Mr. Philip

Second Secretary/Political, United Kingdom
Delegation to the OSCE

GREECE

Moschopoulos, Dr. Dimitris

Head of OSCE Section, Greek Ministry of
Foreign Affairs

HUNGARY

Aigyelan, Mr. György	Economic Counsellor, Hungarian Embassy in Bucharest
Béres, Mr. János	First Secretary, Hungarian Embassy in Bucharest
Sipos, Ms. Eva	Desk Officer, Department for Security Policy and Arms Control, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Hungary

ITALY

Varriale, Dr. Renato	Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Italy to the OSCE
----------------------	--

KAZAKHSTAN

Suleimenov, Ambassador Tuleutaj	Ambassador, Embassy of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Budapest
Abikenov, Mr. Arman	Third Secretary, Embassy of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Budapest

THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

Taseva, Ms. Slagjana	Ministry of Finance
----------------------	---------------------

MALTA

Buttigieg Scicluna, Ambassador Noel	Head of Delegation, Delegation of Malta to the OSCE
-------------------------------------	---

MOLDOVA

Caldere, Mr. Cheorghe	Counselor, Embassy of the Republic of Moldova, Bucharest
-----------------------	--

NETHERLANDS

Wolthers, Ambassador Paiter Jan
Duijn, Mr. Fred

Embassy of the Netherlands, Bucharest
Second Secretary, Embassy of the
Netherlands, Bucharest

POLAND

Osiatynski, Dr. Jerzy

Head, Polish Delegation to the OSCE PA,
Chancellery of the Sejm of the Republic of
Poland

Nowicki, Mr. Jan

Senior Counsellor, Polish Ministry for
Foreign Affairs

Rudkowski, Mr. Dominik

Secretary, Polish Delegation to the OSCE
PA, Chancellery of the Sejm of the Republic
of Poland

PORTUGAL

Rufino, Mr. Paulo

Deputy Head of Delegation, Portuguese
Delegation to the OSCE

ROMANIA/CHAIR-IN-OFFICE

Geoana, H.E. Mr. Mircea Dan

OSCE Chairman in Office

Banu, Mr. Daniel

Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Barbulescu, Mr. Alexandru

Special Advisor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Calin, Ms. Ramona

Special Advisor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Colteanu, Mr. Cristian

Secretary of State, Department of Foreign
Trade, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Daianu, Mr. Daniel

National Coordinator for the OSCE
Economic Forum 2001

Dumitrescu, Mr. Cristian

Delegation to the OSCE Parliamentary
Assembly

Dumitrescu, Ms. Alexandra

OSCE Department, Ministry of Foreign
Affairs

Ene, Mr. Alexander	OSCE Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Ionescu, Ms. Raluca	Ministry for Relations with Parliament
Leonte, Mr. Gabriel	Advisor, OSCE Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Lica, Ms. Mihaela	OSCE Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Maxim, Ms. Tatiana	Director, Press Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Mihut, Mr. Eugen	Deputy Director, OSCE Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Moiescu, Ms. Constanta	Ministry of Justice
Muresan, Mr. Liviu	Senior Advisor, Ministry of the Interior
Niculescu, Mr. Calin	Protocol Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Stoica, Ms. Emilia Cornelia	Chief of Budget Division, Ministry of Finance
Stroescu, Ms. Cristina	Chamber of Deputies, The Speaker's Office
Tanasescu, Mr. Sorin	Romanian Mission to the OSCE
Vasile, Mr. Dan	Director, Protocol Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Vasiliu, Mr. Florica	Diplomatic Counselor, General Secretariat of the Government

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Polischnk, Mr. Alexei	First Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Rudenko, Mr. Andrei	Counsellor, European Co-operation Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

SLOVAKIA

Iflecky, Ambassador Peter	Slovak Embassy, Bucharest
Goga, Dr. Roman	Undersecretary, Slovak Embassy, Bucharest

SLOVENIA

Bergant, Mr. Damjan	Second Secretary, Slovenian Mission to the OSCE
---------------------	---

SWEDEN/EUROPEAN UNION

Rönquist, Mr. Anders	Deputy Director, Division for European Security Policy, Ministry for Foreign Affairs
Azemopoulos, Mr. Dimitrios	Council of the European Union, Secretariat
Bolin Pennegård, Ms. Ann Marie	Minister, Deputy Head of the Permanent Delegation of Sweden to the OSCE
Von Beckerath, Mr. Andreas	Desk Officer, Swedish Embassy in Bucharest

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Fouéré, Mr. Erwan	Head of Unit, OSCE and Council of Europe Unit
Revelas, Mr. Kyriakos	Principal Administrator, OSCE and Council of Europe Unit

CZECH REPUBLIC

Kudlik, Mr. Jiri	Chief of Division, European Integration Department, Ministry of Finance
Tomasova, Ms. Bronislava	Attaché, Department of External Economic Relations and International Organizations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

TURKEY

Avci, Ms. Serife	Assistant Expert, Financial Crimes Investigaion Board, Turkish Ministry of Finance
Mullaoglu, Mr. Cemil	Assistant Expert, Financial Crimes Investigaion Board, Turkish Ministry of Finance
Tüzel, Mr. Omer	Counsellor, Embassy of the Republic of Turkey, Bucharest
Ünal, Mr. Mutalip	Chief Inspector, Treasury, Embassy of the Republic of Turkey, Bucharest

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA

Uvalic, Ms. Milica	Vice Minister of Foreign Economic Relations
Lalic Smajevic, Ms. Katarina	Diplomat, Directorate for the EU, Belgrade, Sector for Multilateral Affairs
Lopandic, Dr. Dusko	Director, Directorate for the EU, Belgrade

PARTNERS FOR CO-OPERATION AND MEDITERRANEAN PARTNERS FOR COOPERATION

EGYPT

El Hattab, Ambassador Samir	Ambassador, Embassy of Egypt, Bucharest
-----------------------------	---

OSCE SECRETARIAT

Price, Mr. Thomas	Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities
Baltes, Mr. Marc	Deputy Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities
Santiago Fink, Ms. Helen	Senior Economic Officer
Rampolla, Mr. Gianluca	Environmental Advisor

Ruggiero, Ms. Cristina

Meetings Assistant

Thurman, Ms. Aleksandra

Secretary

OSCE HIGH COMMISSIONER ON NATIONAL MINORITIES

van der Stoel, Mr. Max

OSCE High Commissioner on National
Minorities

OSCE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

Severin, Mr. Adrian

President

Pallares, Mr. Gustavo

Counsellor and Presidential Adviser

OSCE REPRESENTATIVE ON THE FREEDOM OF THE MEDIA

Kaiserova, Ms. Halka

Senior Adviser

OSCE REPRESENTATIVE ON THE SITUATION IN FYROM

Frowick, Mr. Robert

OSCE FIELD MISSIONS

OSCE PRESENCE IN ALBANIA

Eisenmann, Ms. Annette

Economic and Environmental Officer

OSCE CENTRE IN ALMATY

Ibrasheva, Ms. Madina

Expert on Economic and Ecological Affairs

OSCE OFFICE IN BAKU

Smith, Mr. Michael

Economic and Environmental Officer

OSCE CENTRE IN BISHKEK

Melenevsky, Mr. Mykola

Economic and Environmental Officer, OSCE
Field Office in Osh

OSCE MISSION TO CROATIA

Troncoso, Mr. Jose Maria

Economic and Environmental Officer

OSCE MISSION TO ESTONIA

Machl, Ms. Sabine

Deputy Head of Mission

OSCE MISSION TO LATVIA

Brennan, Mr. Neil

Deputy Head of Mission

OSCE MISSION TO MOLDOVA

Sidoroff, Mr. Matti

Public Affairs Officer

OSCE SPILLOVER MONITOR MISSION TO SKOPJE

Ungaro, Ambassador Carlo

Head of Mission

Andersson, Ms. Petra

Economic and Environmental Adviser

OSCE PROJECT CO-ORDINATOR IN UKRAINE

Wohlmuther, Ms. Cordula

Project Officer

OSCE OFFICE IN YEREVAN

Evers, Mr. Frank

Economic and Environmental Advisor

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION

Mihes, Ms. Cristina

National Correspondent in Romania

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Cosse, Mr. Stephane

Resident Representative, Romania

OECD

Murphy, Mr. Declan

SEE Investment Compact

SECI

Konevska, Ms. Gabriela

Regional Centre for Combating Trans-Border
Crime

STABILITY PACT FOR SOUTHEAST EUROPE

Fau, Mr. Didier

Director

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME, ROMANIA

Zarzan, Ms. Xarmen-Loura

Programme Officer

UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

Hamilton, Mr. Geoffrey

Regional Advisor, Trade Promotion, Trade
Division

Nowak, Mr. Robert

Economist

UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES

Albu, Mr. Andrei

Public Information Officer, UNHCR Branch
Office for Romania

WESTERN EUROPEAN UNION

Triantaphyllou, Mr. Dimitrios

Research Fellow, Institute for Strategic
Studies

WORLD BANK

Alahdad, Mr. M. Ziad

Country Manager, Romania

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mathey-Boo, Ms. Marie-Helene

Special Advisor on Africa

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

THE AMERICAN FRIENDS OF ROMANIA, USA

Nicholson, Mr. Peter Nicolae

Executive Director

ASSOCIATION FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - IASI

Iurea, Ms. Dorina

President

Leu, Mr. Iurii

General Manager

CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL PRIVATE ENTERPRISE, BUCHAREST

Priola, Mr. Eduard

Advisor

Talaban, Ms. Magdalena

Project Assistant

CENTER FOR PREVENTION OF INDUSTRIAL POLLUTION, MOLDOVA

Leu, Ms. Svetlana

President

CENTRE FOR REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT, YEREVAN

Saribekyan, Ms. Arevik

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY, ROMANIA

Cristesca, Ms. Forina-Laurenta

Journalist, Press and Communication

**CIVIL SOCIETY PROMOTION CENTER, BOSNIA AND
HERZEGOVINA**

Mrdja, Mr. Milan

Program Manager

ECOPRAVO FOUNDATION, UKRAINE

Kravchanko, Ms. Svitlana

ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT AGENCY, BANJA LUCA

Miovcic, Mr. Zdravko

ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC ADVOCACY CENTRE, YEREVAN

Ayvazyan, Ms. Sona

**ERINA, JOURNALISTS' LEGAL ENVIRONMENTAL CENTRE,
FYROM**

Ivanova, Ms. Marijana

Journalist

“FORMA F” POSUSJE, WESTERN HERZEGOVINA

Dinek, Ms. Marijana

Executive Director

FORUM ON EARLY WARNING AND EARLY RESPONSE

Nyheim, Mr. David

Co-ordinator

**INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC HEALTH, BOSNIA AND
HERZEGOVINA**

Agic, Ms. Nova

Deputy Director

INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY, CHISINAU

Barbarosie, Mr. Arcadie

INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR POLICY STUDIES, UKRAINE

Nanivska, Ms. Vera

REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL CENTRE, BUDAPEST

Stritih, Mr. Jernej

Executive Director

REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL CENTRE, KIEV

Pavlychenko, Dr. Petro

Executive Director

STRATEGY CENTRE, ST. PETERSBURG

Torkhov, Mr. Denis

Project Manager

WORLD WILDLIFE FUND

Wollte, Ms. Isabelle

Danube Carpathian Program

BUSINESS COMMUNITY

INSIEME WEEKLY NEWSPAPER

Mitan, Ms. Madalina

Editor-in-Chief

Hornoiu, Ms. Corina

Editor

IPACRI ROMANIA

Duica, Ms. Luminita

Marketing Representative

IRIS CENTER, ROMANIA

Popescu, Ms. Irina

Project Assistant

Uestemean, Ms. Adelina

Project Coordinator

NINE O’CLOCK PUBLICATIONS

Dimofte, Mr. Catalin

Senior Editor, Business and Finance

PUBLIROM FD., NOVA “VOCEA”

Ion, Mr. Gheorghe

SINCLAIR ROCHE TEMPERLEY

Erderi, Ms. Alexandra

Lawyer, Corporate Finance

Mircea, Mr. Valentin

Senior Lawyer

SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTREPRENEURS’ ASSOCIATION, ZAGREB

Jagic, Ms. Katarina

SOCIETE GENERALE ASSET MANAGEMENT – BRD

Eftimescu, Ms. Cella Alina

Managing Director

TOFAN GROUP, BUCHAREST

Gheorghiu, Ms. Virginia

Senior Vice President

ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

INSTITUTE FOR EUROPEAN STUDIES, BELGRADE

Teokarevic, Mr. Jovan

Research Fellow

ROMANIAN ACADEMIC SOCIETY

Mungiu-Pippidi, Ms. Alina

**ТРЕТИЙ СЕМИНАР ПО ПОДГОТОВКЕ
IX ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКОГО ФОРУМА ОБСЕ
(Бухарест, 27-28 марта 2001 года)**

УКРЕПЛЕНИЕ ЭКОНОМИЗМЕРЕНИЯ ОБСЕ

Российский подход к проблематике экономизмерения ОБСЕ основывается на ключевых положениях Боннской конференции (1990), Будапештского (1994), Лиссабонского (1996), Стамбульского (1999) саммитов и др. Исходим из того, что мир и стабильность в регионе ОБСЕ зависят не только от укрепления деминститутов и соблюдения прав человека, но и от стабильного экономического развития государств.

В Хартии европейской безопасности (п.31) наши государства зафиксировали обязательство уделять "надлежащее внимание" экономизмерению "как одной из составляющих нашей деятельности по раннему предупреждению и предотвращению конфликтов". Задача ОБСЕ, таким образом, – выявлять на ранней стадии риски и вызовы в области экономической безопасности на всем пространстве ОБСЕ и предпринимать меры по их предотвращению.

Цели сотрудничества в процессе укрепления экономической безопасности:

- создание предпосылок стабильного экономического развития в регионе ОБСЕ;
- развитие равноправного и недискриминационного экономического и научно-технического сотрудничества и торговли;
- создание условий для свободного движения товаров, капиталов и услуг на пространстве ОБСЕ;
- создание такого режима передвижения людей, который не препятствовал бы контактам между деловыми сообществами;
- не допускать негативных последствий, которые интеграционные процессы, происходящие на пространстве ОБСЕ, могут оказывать на государства, которые в этих процессах не участвуют;
- содействовать развитию регионального, субрегионального и трансграничного экономического сотрудничества;
- решать проблемы, связанные с миграцией рабочей силы и предотвращением незаконной миграции;
- создавать благоприятные условия развитию среднего и малого бизнеса и содействовать диалогу деловых кругов.

В рамках поддержки демократических процессов в государствах с переходной экономикой ОБСЕ следует содействовать:

- интеграции этих государств в мировую экономику и их вступлению во всемирные и региональные организации на стандартных условиях;
- развитию экспортного потенциала этих государств и созданию равных условий их участия в мировой торговле;

- устранению дискриминационной практики в торговле.

Приоритетными считаем следующие темы для дискуссий в рамках экономизмерения ОБСЕ:

- методы регулирования международной торговли и их влияние на сотрудничество между государствами;
- протекционизм во внешней торговле отдельных государств и их объединений, его влияние на международную торговлю и развитие экономики других стран;
- выявление социально-экономических предпосылок кризисов и международное сотрудничество в целях их предотвращения;
- социально-экономические последствия конфликтов и международное сотрудничество в целях их преодоления;
- проблемы, возникающие в связи с экономической интеграцией;
- защита социально-экономических прав иностранных граждан.

Придаем большое значение регулярному проведению обзоров выполнения обязательств государств-участников в экономической и экологической сферах.

Считаем, что настало время для выправления дисбалансов в работе ОБСЕ, которая изначально базировалась на равенстве трех измерений безопасности. Сегодня экономизмерение остается единственной "корзиной", лишенной институциональной структуры. Диалогу между государствами-участниками по вопросам второй "корзины" необходимо придать систематизированный характер. Приветствуем повышение интереса к этому вопросу со стороны государств-участников и активизацию работы на этом направлении Председательства ОБСЕ.

Оптимальным вариантом институционализации экономизмерения считаем следующий:

- главные встречи Экономфорума должны проходить в Праге на уровне старших должностных лиц;
- встречи Форума на экспертном уровне должны собираться в Вене на регулярной сессионной основе, в случае необходимости с участием представителей из столиц;

Экономкоординатору ОБСЕ и его офису должно быть поручено выполнять функции постоянного секретариата Форума.

Дополнительно должны проводиться регулярные заседания "Друзей экономизмерения".

Такая структура экономизмерения должна обеспечивать:

- систематическое рассмотрение основной темы Форума, которая, согласно установившейся практике, ежегодно определяется государствами-участниками как приоритетная;
- гибкость при инициировании и обсуждении насущных экономических и экологических проблем, отвечающих интересам государств-участников;

- регулярный и подробный обзор выполнения обязательств в экономической сфере;
- регулярное рассмотрение на Постсовете наиболее важных проблем второй "корзины" по рекомендации Форума;
- постоянный механизм обратной связи с миссиями ОБСЕ посредством их отчетов и предложений по вопросам второй "корзины" (кстати говоря, миссиям ОБСЕ следовало бы концентрироваться не на разного рода семинарах, а на разработке конкретных проектов);
- институционализацию диалога и взаимодействия с другими международными организациями (взаимодействие ОБСЕ со специализированными органами ООН, прежде всего ЕЭК, можно было бы сделать темой спецсессий Форума);
- развитие исследовательского потенциала ОБСЕ по вопросам второй "корзины" посредством приглашения научных кругов на встречи Форума.

В практическом плане предлагаем следующую программу действий:

15-18 мая	IX Экономфорум рассматривает весь комплекс вопросов, связанных с укреплением экономизмерения ОБСЕ, и выносит соответствующие рекомендации.
Май-июнь	Постсовет рассматривает рекомендации Экономфорума и принимает решение о сроках и темах 1-го и 2-го заседаний Форума в Вене на экспертном уровне.
Сентябрь	1-е заседание Форума на экспертном уровне.
Начало ноября	2-е заседание Форума на экспертном уровне.
Конец ноября	СМИД в Бухаресте утверждает упомянутую институциональную реформу экономизмерения ОБСЕ и принимает программу экономико-экологической работы ОБСЕ на 2002 год.

ПРОБЛЕМА ФОНДОВЫХ РЫНКОВ

Нам хотелось бы привлечь внимание участников семинара к проблеме, о которой идут споры среди экономистов в нашей стране и за рубежом. Речь идет о возможном **мировом кризисе фондовых рынков**. Эта проблема непосредственно касается вопроса "good governance", который является темой предстоящего Экономфорума ОБСЕ.

Согласно аналитическим данным ряда экспертов, специализирующихся в области макроэкономики, начиная примерно с 1998 года, происходит **устойчивый скачкообразный обвал фондовых рынков**. За последний год держатели акций, входящих в расчет американского технологического индекса Nasdaq, потеряли 3,9 трлн. долл., что превышает объединенный ВВП Великобритании, Франции, Бельгии и Австралии вместе взятых. Причем высказывается мнение, что это только начало.

Такие кризисные явления объясняются, в первую очередь, **падением части так называемой "новой экономики"**, т.е. экономики компьютерной, информационной, интернето-виртуальной.

Подобные соображения можно поддерживать или оспаривать. Подчеркиваю, они, разумеется, не представляют официальной позиции российской стороны, но активно обсуждаются в России и вызывают интерес и озабоченность нашей общественности. Ведь если эти прогнозы окажутся верны, то возникнет **реальная угроза экономической безопасности**, причем не только российской. Тогда ситуация потребует адекватных мер со стороны государств.

В этой связи было бы целесообразным:

- включить пункт о кризисе фондовых рынков в **повестку Экономфорума**,
- попросить представителей **США сделать специальный экспертный доклад** по этому вопросу на Экономфоруме,
- поручить **Экономкоординатору** держать ситуацию с фондовыми рынками в постоянном поле зрения ОБСЕ и в случае необходимости предлагать государствам-участникам соответствующие рекомендации.