



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Economic and Environmental Forum**

EEF.GAL/3/08/Rev.1
22 February 2008

ENGLISH only

**SIXTEENTH MEETING OF THE
ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL FORUM: PART I**

Vienna, 28 and 29 January 2008

SUMMARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Theme, Format and Organizational Modalities for the Sixteenth Economic and Environmental Forum (PC Decision No. 798).....	3
Annotated Agenda of the Sixteenth Economic and Environmental Forum: Part I.....	6
Executive Summary.....	11
Welcoming Address by Ambassador Antti Turunen, Chairman of the Permanent Council, Permanent Mission of Finland to the OSCE.....	16
Welcoming Address by Mr. Bernard Snoy, Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities.....	18
Keynote Address by H.E. Kimmo Tiilikainen, Minister of the Environment of Finland.....	20
Concluding remarks by Ambassador Aleksi Härkönen, Head of the Finnish OSCE Chairmanship Task Force.....	24
Reports of the Rapporteurs	
Introductory Session: International frameworks - An anchor for security and environmental protection.....	27
Session I – Security aspects related to maritime co-operation.....	29
Session II - Environmental and economic aspects of maritime co-operation.....	30
Session III – Inland waterways co-operation.....	33
Session IV - Promoting regional and inter-regional co-operation on environmental security	36
Concluding Discussion – The role of the OSCE in follow-up to the Forum.....	38

671st Plenary Meeting

PC Journal No. 671, Agenda item 5

**DECISION No. 798
THEME, FORMAT AND ORGANIZATIONAL MODALITIES
FOR THE SIXTEENTH ECONOMIC AND
ENVIRONMENTAL FORUM**

28 and 29 January 2008 and 19 to 21 May 2008

The Permanent Council,

Pursuant to paragraphs 21 to 32 of Chapter VII of the Helsinki Document 1992, paragraph 20 of Chapter IX of the Budapest Document 1994, the OSCE Strategy Document for the Economic and Environmental Dimension of 2 December 2003 and Ministerial Council Decision No. 10/04 of 7 December 2004,

Recalling Permanent Council Decision No. 743 of 19 October 2006,

Taking into account the closing statement by the Chairperson of the Fifteenth Meeting of the Economic and Environmental Forum,

Decides that,

1. The theme of the Sixteenth Economic and Environmental Forum will be “Maritime and inland waterways co-operation in the OSCE area: Increasing security and protecting the environment”.
2. The Sixteenth Economic and Environmental Forum will be held over a period of five days, broken down as follows, and without setting a precedent for future Economic and Environmental Forums:
 - 2.1 On 28 and 29 January 2008 in Vienna;
 - 2.2 From 19 to 21 May 2008 in Prague.
3. A special session will be devoted to challenges faced by the landlocked developing countries during the Prague segment of the Economic and Environmental Forum.
4. Moreover, taking into account its tasks, the Economic and Environmental Forum will review the implementation of OSCE commitments in the economic and environmental dimension. The review, to be integrated in the Prague segment of the Economic and Environmental Forum, will address relevant OSCE commitments and in particular commitments related to governance and transport issues, with a special focus on environmental governance and transport security, including relevant international conventions and international co-operation initiatives.

5. Discussions of the Forum should benefit from input provided by other OSCE bodies and relevant meetings, including two preparatory conferences outside of Vienna, and deliberations in various international organizations.
6. Moreover, taking into account its tasks, the Economic and Environmental Forum will discuss ongoing and future activities for the economic and environmental dimension, in particular the work in implementing the OSCE Strategy Document for the Economic and Environmental Dimension.
7. The participating States are encouraged to be represented at a high level, by senior officials responsible for shaping international economic and environmental policy in the OSCE area. Participation of representatives from the business and scientific communities as well as other relevant actors of civil society in their delegations would be welcome.
8. As in previous years, the format of the Economic and Environmental Forum should provide for the active involvement of relevant international organizations and encourage open discussions.
9. The following international organizations, international organs, regional groupings and conferences of States are invited to participate in the Sixteenth Economic and Environmental Forum: Adriatic and Ionic Initiative; Arctic Council; Asian Development Bank; Barents Euro-Arctic Council; Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (Helsinki Commission, HELCOM); Black Sea Economic Co-operation; Caspian Environment Programme; Central Asian Co-operation Organization; Central European Initiative; Collective Security Treaty Organization; Commonwealth of Independent States; Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area; Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic; Council of the Baltic Sea States; Council of Europe; Danube Black Sea Task Force (DABLAS); Economic Co-operation Organization; Energy Charter Treaty; Eurasian Economic Community; European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders (FRONTEX); European Bank for Reconstruction and Development; European Environment Agency; European Conference of Ministers of Transport; European Investment Bank; Euro-Mediterranean Cooperation; Intergovernmental Commission TRACECA; Intergovernmental Organization for International Carriage by Rail; International Atomic Energy Agency; International Labour Organization; International Commission for the Protection of the Rhine; International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River; International Sava River Basin Commission; International Maritime Organisation; International Monetary Fund; International Organization for Migration; International Road Transport Union; International Road Federation; International Union of Railways; Intergovernmental Organisation for International Carriage by Rail; Interstate Council of the Central Asian Economic Union; North Atlantic Treaty Organization; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development; Organization for Democracy and Economic Development — GUAM; Organization of the Islamic Conference; Organization for Co-operation of Railways; Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change; Shanghai Co-operation Organization; Southeast European Cooperative Initiative; South-East European Cooperation Process; South Eastern Europe Transport Observatory; Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe; United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL); United Nations Conference on Trade and Development; United Nations Development Programme; United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE); United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP); United Nations Environment Programme; United Nations Industrial Development Organization; United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime; United Nations Special Programme for the Economies of Central Asia (UN SPECA); World Bank Group; World Customs Organization; World Trade Organization; and other relevant organizations.

10. The Partners for Co-operation are invited to participate in the Sixteenth Economic and Environmental Forum.
11. Upon request by a delegation of an OSCE participating State, regional groupings or expert academics and business representatives may also be invited, as appropriate, to participate in the Sixteenth Economic and Environmental Forum.
12. Subject to the provisions contained in Chapter IV, paragraphs 15 and 16, of the Helsinki Document 1992, the representatives of non-governmental organizations with relevant experience in the area under discussion are also invited to participate in the Sixteenth Economic and Environmental Forum.
13. In line with the practices established over the past years with regard to meetings of the Economic and Environmental Forum and their preparatory process, the Chairperson of both segments of the Sixteenth Economic and Environmental Forum will present summary conclusions and policy recommendations drawn from the discussions. The Economic and Environmental Committee of the Permanent Council will further include the conclusions of the Chairperson and the reports of the rapporteurs in its discussions so that the Permanent Council can take the decisions required for appropriate policy translation and follow-up activities.



Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

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

Vienna, 23 January 2008

The 16th OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum

Part 1 / Vienna, 28 - 29 January 2008

OSCE Congress Center, Hofburg, Heldenplatz, 1010 Vienna, Neuer Saal, 2nd Floor

“Maritime and inland waterways co-operation in the OSCE area: Increasing security and protecting the environment”

TENTATIVE AGENDA

Monday, 28 January 2008

09.30 – 10.30 **Opening Session** (open to Press)

Welcoming remarks

- **Ambassador Antti Turunen**, Chairman of the Permanent Council, Permanent Representative of Finland/OSCE Chairmanship
- **Mr. Bernard Snoy**, Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities

Keynote speaker

- **H.E. Kimmo Tiilikainen**, Minister of the Environment of Finland

10.30 – 11.00 Coffee Break

11.00 – 13.00 **Introductory Session: International frameworks - An anchor for security and environmental protection**

Moderator: Ambassador Antti Turunen, Chairman of the Permanent Council, Permanent Representative of Finland/OSCE Chairmanship

Rapporteur: Mr. Curtis Peters, Second Secretary, Delegation of Canada to the OSCE

Presentations followed by discussion

Ms. Eva Molnar, Director, Transport Division, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)

Mr. Antonios Vidalis, Policy Officer, Maritime Policy Task Force, European Commission

Mr. Edward Kleverlaan, Technical Officer, Marine Environment Division, International Maritime Organization (IMO)

Possible topics that could be addressed during the session

- *Current status and future prospects*
- *Enhancing political will to address security and environmental aspects of maritime and inland waterways co-operation - increasing potential for practical solutions*
- *Building national, regional and international frameworks for enhanced co-operation - challenges and opportunities*

13.00 – 14.30 Lunch Break

13.00 – 13.50 **Special Event:** Screening of the documentary film *Invaders from the Sea* (see Annex for more details)

Refreshments will be served in the Hofburg Cafeteria (2nd floor) after the film

14.30 – 16.00 **Session I – Security aspects related to maritime co-operation**

Moderator: Mr. Raphael F. Perl, Head, Action against Terrorism Unit (ATU), OSCE Secretariat
Rapporteur: Mr. Andrew Price, First Secretary, United Kingdom Delegation to the OSCE

Presentations followed by discussion

Mr. Ola Dahlman, Advisor, Swedish Institute for International Affairs

Mr. Dimitrios Theologitis, Head of Security Policy & Maritime Security Unit, DG TREN, European Commission

Captain John W. Koster, Commanding Officer / Officer in Charge, Marine Inspection, US Coast Guard Activities in Europe

Mr. Jorma Rytönen, PhD, Research Director, Kymenlaakso University of Applied Sciences, Kotka Maritime Research Institute, Finland

Possible topics that could be addressed during the session

- *Increasing maritime security - national and international perspectives*
- *Addressing multifaceted aspects of security*
- *Responding to the challenges of the 21st century in maritime security*

16.00 – 16.30 Coffee Break

16.30 – 18.00 **Session II - Environmental and economic aspects of maritime co-operation**

Moderator: Mr. Alistair Clark, Director of the Environment Department, EBRD

Rapporteur: Mr. Philip Reuchlin, Economic and Environmental Adviser, OSCE Secretariat/OCEEA

Presentations followed by discussion

Mr. Bjørn Kristoffersen, Head of Society and Environment, Arctic Growth Theme, StatoilHydro, Norway

Ms. Anita Mäkinen, Head of Marine Programme, WWF Finland

Ms. Heike Imhoff, Deputy Head of Division, International Protection of the Seas, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Germany, Head of the German Delegation to HELCOM, Deputy Chairperson of the Baltic Sea Action Plan Task Force

Possible topics that could be addressed during the session

- *Environmental and economic co-operation between various stakeholders as a way to increase security*
- *Combining economic and environmental considerations for an integrated approach*
- *Promoting good governance in order to enhance environmental protection*
- *Addressing future challenges*

18.15

Reception hosted by the OCEEA

(Palais Pallavicini, Josefsplatz 5, 1010 Vienna)

Tuesday, 29 January 2008

09.30 – 11.00

Session III – Inland waterways co-operation

Moderator: Ms. Eva Molnar, Director, Transport Division, UNECE

Rapporteur: Mr. Raul Daussa, Environmental Programme Officer, OSCE Secretariat/OCEEA

Presentations followed by discussion

Mr. Philip Weller, Executive Secretary, International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR)

Mr. Manfred Seitz, Managing Director, Via Donau - Austrian Waterways Development Agency

Mr. Brosnislav P. Govorovsky, Head of Water Transport Department, Ministry of Transport and Communications, Republic of Belarus

Possible topics that could be addressed during the session

- *Security, environmental and economic aspects of inland waterways co-operation*
- *Transboundary co-operation - regional experiences*
- *Promoting co-operation and coordination between local and international actors and between various stakeholders*

11.00 - 11.30

Coffee Break

11.30 - 13.00

Session IV - Promoting regional and inter-regional co-operation on environmental security

Moderator: Ambassador Carlos Sanchez de Boado y de la Válgoma, Permanent Representative of Spain to the OSCE

Rapporteur: Mr. Lorenzo Rilasciati, Counsellor, Delegation of the European Commission to the OSCE

Presentations followed by discussion

Ms. Anne Christine Brusendorff, Executive Secretary, Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (HELCOM)

Ms. Violeta Velikova, Pollution Monitoring and Assessment Officer, Commission on the Protection of the Black Sea against Pollution (BSC)

Mr. Vladimir Mamaev, GEF Regional Technical Advisor, Europe and the CIS, UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre

Possible topics that could be addressed during the session

- *Exchanging experiences and best practises*
- *Inter-regional co-operation - prospects for mutual benefit*
- *Building partnerships*

13.00 – 14.30

Lunch Break

14.30 – 16.30

Concluding Discussion – The role of the OSCE in follow-up to the Forum

Moderator: Mr. Bernard Snoy, Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities

Rapporteur: Mr. Gabriel Leonte, Economic and Environmental Adviser, OSCE Secretariat/OCEEA

16.30 – 17.00

Coffee Break

17.00 – 17.30

Closing Session (open to Press)

- **Mr. Bernard Snoy**, Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities
- **Ambassador Aleksi Härkönen**, Head of the OSCE Task Force, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland/ OSCE Chairmanship

Invaders from the Sea shows how harmful organisms transported in ballast water by ships have caused biological and economic havoc around the world, largely due to expanded maritime trade and traffic volume over the last few decades. The effects in many areas of the world have been devastating. The film captures the dramatic impact of this issue on the lives of millions of people.

The film also highlights the progress made by IMO and the maritime industry in addressing this issue and the measures which can be taken to prevent the spread of harmful organisms.

Quantitative data show the rate of bio-invasions is continuing to increase, in many cases exponentially, and new areas are being invaded all the time. Volumes of seaborne trade continue to rise and the problem may not yet have reached its peak. Ballast is crucial for the stability of a ship and it is estimated that about 3 to 10 billion tonnes of ballast water are transferred globally each year, potentially transferring, from one location to another, species of sea life that may prove harmful when released into a non-native environment.

Invaders from the Sea won the gold award in the category of "Best United Nations Feature" at the "Stories from the Field", the third annual United Nations Documentary Film Festival, which took place in New York from 21 to 22 April 2007. The film was produced by IMO, in co-operation with the BBC (Natural History Unit) and the shipping industry. The Director was Sally Cryer. Filming for the documentary took place during 2005 and 2006, around the world, under the co ordination of a Steering Committee established by IMO at its Headquarters in London. The production enjoyed considerable sponsorship from Vela International Marine, BP Shipping and Wallenius-Alfa Laval Consortium, as well as from the Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency and support from the GloBallast pilot countries (Brazil, China, Iran, India, South Africa and Ukraine).

"Our film underlines the vital role of shipping to world trade and the global economy and IMO's permanent efforts to address, effectively and proactively, any problems arising from the operation of ships that may impact negatively on our mission to ensure safe, secure and efficient shipping on clean oceans. Winning this award will do much to make the general public appreciate even more the environmental work we carry out for the public good and for the achievement of Millennium Development Goals", said Efthimios E. Mitropoulos, Secretary-General of IMO.

The IMO documentary is intended to raise public awareness of the issue and of the measures being taken by IMO and shipping to tackle it, and is an invitation to Governments to implement the BWM Convention properly and effectively.

In 2004, IMO adopted the International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments (BWM Convention), a new international treaty to prevent the potentially devastating effects of the spread of aquatic organisms inadvertently transported in this way. When in force, the BWM Convention will require all ships to implement a Ballast Water and Sediments Management Plan. All ships will have to carry a Ballast Water Record Book and will be required to carry out ballast water management procedures to a given standard. Existing ships will be required to do the same, but after a phase-in period.

THE 16TH OSCE ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL FORUM

PART 1 / VIENNA, 28 - 29 JANUARY 2008

MARITIME AND INLAND WATERWAYS CO-OPERATION IN THE OSCE AREA: INCREASING SECURITY AND PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The theme of the 16th OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum is “Maritime and inland waterways co-operation in the OSCE area: Increasing security and protecting the environment”.

The First Part of the 16th OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum was held on 28-29 January 2008 in Vienna. The meeting was organized in close co-operation by the Finnish Chairmanship of the OSCE and the Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities (OCEEA). It followed the First Preparatory Conference, which took place in Helsinki on 10-11 September 2007. A Second Preparatory Conference will take place in Ashgabat on 6-7 March 2008. The Second Part of the Economic and Environmental Forum will be organized in Prague, on 19-21 May 2008.

Structure of the Forum

The First Part of the 16th Economic and Environmental Forum consisted of both opening and closing sessions, plenary sessions and one concluding discussion. The Forum was opened by **Ambassador Antti Turunen**, Chairman of the Permanent Council, Permanent Representative of Finland, OSCE Chairmanship, and Mr. Bernard Snoy, Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities. **H.E. Mr. Kimmo Tiilikainen**, Minister of the Environment of Finland, delivered a keynote address in the opening session. The next sessions were dedicated to the following topics:

- Introductory Session:** **International frameworks - An anchor for security and environmental protection;**
- Session I:** **Security aspects related to maritime co-operation;**
- Session II:** **Environmental and economic aspects of maritime co-operation;**
- Session III:** **Inland waterways co-operation;**
- Session IV:** **Promoting regional and inter-regional co-operation on environmental security;**
- Concluding Discussion:** **The role of the OSCE in follow-up to the Forum**

Over 250 participants, official representatives from OSCE participating States, International and Non-Governmental Organizations, the Business Community and the Academic Community, as well as OSCE Field Offices attended the Forum and engaged in discussions.

Expert keynote speakers presented their inside knowledge and their views, thereby stimulating the discussion. Throughout the deliberations, all the participants freely expressed their views and contributed to formulating concrete recommendations for further consideration by the OSCE Economic and Environmental Committee in Vienna and throughout the remaining part of the OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum process.

Main conclusions and recommendations on the possible role for the OSCE

The Vienna Forum highlighted the complexity of security, environmental and economic issues related to maritime and inland waterways co-operation and the multiple linkages among them. In that context a number of recommendations for possible OSCE involvement were formulated. A comprehensive overview of the discussions and the recommendations stemming from each session is presented in the Rapporteurs' Reports section.

The main recommendations could be grouped in the following categories:

Strengthening inter-agency co-operation

The Forum stressed that there was room for enhanced inter-agency co-operation, in order to reduce overlaps, redistribute tasks and improve policy integration.

Concerning the further development of **co-operation with the IMO**, a number of areas were mentioned, including combating invasive species transfer, developing oil spill response capacity and the possible application in the OSCE region of the Marine Electronic Highway Concept. It was also suggested that the OSCE could seek intergovernmental organization status with the IMO.

The OSCE should as well continue its **co-operation with the UNECE** as well as with other partners, both in the area of transport security, including trade facilitation, and in strengthening the institutional dimension on inland waterways and water management, in particular in a transboundary context.

Contributing to the implementation of existing legal instruments

Significant efforts have been made to regulate, at the international level, a variety of aspects related to maritime and inland waterways co-operation. There are a number of international legal instruments in place, such as the IMO or the UNECE Conventions. Nevertheless, the full implementation of commitments is sometime lagging behind. There is a greater need to ratify and implement existing international conventions than to develop new ones. The OSCE could engage itself in making an interdisciplinary analysis of what are the political obstacles to the ratification and full implementation of these international agreements.

The OSCE should focus **on promoting the ratification and implementation of existing conventions, regulations and standards**, therefore avoiding duplication. The OSCE should continue to work closely with other organizations, in particular the UNECE and the IMO, to assist with policy reforms and the further implementation and ratification of international instruments. This could be done by facilitating the dissemination of information regarding best management practices. The OSCE could, for example, participate in delivery of capacity building or training programs (e.g. The Globallast Partnership Program) aimed at enhancing the implementation of the security or environmental aspects of these instruments, at national or regional levels, including through its field presences. Strengthening synergies at the Secretariat level, between various units to achieve this purpose should be enhanced.

Contributing to the policy debate

The need for an integrated approach between various conventions relevant for maritime and inland waterways co-operation, in order to find better synergies, was also highlighted. A meeting on that issue could be considered.

With regard to **security issues**, the Forum discussions highlighted that countries had in the past focused more on the protection of critical infrastructure. A stronger focus should be on **promoting resilience and on managing risk**. The OSCE could help by promoting the idea of resilience as a means of enhancing security. The OSCE could be guiding the policy debate and identify new areas of co-operation. Workshops and training programmes could be envisaged, as well as the possibility of conducting a joint resilience analysis of an OSCE security issue or gathering a group of experts to identify resilience related issues and propose quick fixes.

It was also suggested that the OSCE participating States could develop a common risk management approach. The OSCE could also promote the harmonization and the mutual recognition of systems.

Supporting regional co-operation

The Vienna Forum also emphasized that maritime and transboundary waterways issues are most efficiently addressed by using a **regional and sub-regional approach**. That is why regional marine and inland waterways conventions and action plans play such a crucial role. Along with non-compliance with existing regulations, insufficient regional co-operation was often cited as an important factor hindering positive developments.

The OSCE involvement, as a political organization, could be instrumental in further promoting and supporting sub-regional, regional as well as interregional co-operation. The OSCE could give a **political impetus to existing co-operative arrangements** and could also contribute to sharing of experience and best practices. The OSCE should develop a close relationship with regional organizations active on various seas or inland waterways and identify together the policy and institutional gaps.

In particular, the importance of **preparedness and response capacity to combat oil accidents** was mentioned. The OSCE could provide support for the development of regional oil spill arrangements in its region. It could also contribute towards improved local and regional collaboration and a stronger involvement of the private sector and of civil society in oil spills combating activities.

It was also suggested that the OSCE should promote better co-operation between neighbouring littoral states in the Baltic Sea, Black Sea and the Caspian Sea in training exercise and co-ordinated action to conduct save and rescue operations as well as to deal with pollution incidents at sea. The OSCE could also advocate and support the creation of a joint emergency response force. In that regard, the OSCE could support a more general political formula to stimulate co-operation at regional and global level.

One delegation presented in more details an earlier proposal to host an **expert conference on the issues of the safety of navigation and environmental security in a transboundary context in the Black Sea basin**. The main aim of the conference would be to enhance co-operation in the region, facilitate the exchange of experience, identify current challenges, and contribute to integrating efforts towards a more effective implementation of international conventions. The conference would bring together participating States, international and regional organizations and other players working in this area. Topics to be addressed could include improvement of navigation safety systems, prevention of emergency situations and mitigation of their consequences,

organization of search and rescue activities at sea, preserving the ecosystems along inland waterways and seaways, etc. Such an event should be coordinated with other planned events and initiatives in the region in view of enhancing its added value. It should benefit from regional organizations' existing expertise and networks.

With regard to inland waterways co-operation, one delegation offered to host a **sub-regional seminar on the Amu-darya basin**, later in the year.

Promoting exchange of experiences between regions

The OSCE should promote **exchange of experiences between regions** as different regions might be confronted with similar situations. Exchange of experiences should also be promoted across various sectors such as environmental protection, trade, transport, economic activities. The OSCE could consider facilitating the **exchange of best practices from the Barents and Baltic Seas to the Black and Caspian Seas** as well as potentially other transboundary bodies of water.

The recently adopted Joint Statement on Guiding Principles for the Development of Inland Navigation and Environmental Protection in the Danube River Basin was recognized as a positive example of regional as well as inter-institutional and cross-sector co-operation. The OSCE could promote the Joint Statement on Guiding Principles as well as help to develop more detailed guidance on specific issues. It was stated that the criteria and principles of the Joint Statement were also applicable to other large river systems, which could also benefit from such a process of dialogue. Therefore the OSCE could help **replicate the Joint Statement** process with other rivers (e.g. in the Volga River Basin).

Promoting multi-stakeholders co-operation

As many speakers emphasized, and as is also proved by many existing co-operation mechanisms, **stakeholders' involvement**, from an early stage, is an important element for the successful identification of problems and the efficient and sustainable conduct of activities. It contributes by mobilizing local knowledge, generating broad acceptance, etc.

The OSCE should therefore work on facilitating the participation of all stakeholders in planning processes regarding maritime and inland waterways co-operation activities, both with regard to environmental protection and to enhancing security.

Continuing the work on transboundary water issues

The OSCE should continue to support the implementation of various activities in this area. As a concrete example, further supporting the development of a project to manage flow distribution from the river Pripyat to the Dnieper-Bug canal was mentioned.

The OSCE could facilitate technical assistance for solving transboundary water issues. Transfer of technology could be another area where the OSCE, in co-operation with partners, could help.

Another area for possible OSCE contribution could be raising awareness and promoting mobilization of funds (including from IFIs) for specific projects in its region (i.e. in the Aral Sea region, elimination of Danube transport bottlenecks, etc.)

Documents

During the Vienna Forum, numerous documents and presentations were circulated. They can be found on the OSCE Website/16th Economic and Environmental Forum:

www.osce.org/conferences/eef_2008_vienna.html?page=documents

Further information can also be requested to the Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities.

WELCOMING ADDRESS

by Ambassador Antti Turunen
Chairman of the Permanent Council, Permanent Mission of Finland to the OSCE

Your Excellency, Minister Tiilikainen,
Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

On behalf of the Finnish Chairmanship, and as Chairman of the Permanent Council, it is my great pleasure to welcome you all to the first segment of the 16th Economic and Environmental Forum. I am very pleased to see so many of you here today.

At the outset, I would like to express my special thanks and appreciation to Minister Tiilikainen for attending the Forum. I would also like to thank all other speakers as well as moderators and rapporteurs who have accepted our invitation to participate in the Forum. Your contribution will be appreciated very much. I would also like to take the opportunity to thank Mr Snoy and his team for their hard work in organizing this Forum.

In its Chairmanship Programme, Finland stresses the importance of continuity in the work of the OSCE. This approach guided us also when we proposed the theme for this year's Forum. The theme "*Maritime and inland waterways cooperation in the OSCE area: Increasing security and protecting the environment*" draws on the work already undertaken by the previous chairmanships. The Belgian chairmanship in 2006 addressed transport issues whereas the Spanish Chairmanship discussed questions related to environment and security. Also the workshop on Transport, Security and Environment organized by Norway in October 2006 should be mentioned as a source of inspiration for the Forum.

Another aspect that Finland stresses in its Chairmanship Programme is cooperation. We believe that promoting co-operation in economic and environmental matters contributes to greater stability, security and prosperity, prevents conflicts and fosters reconstruction. On the other hand, neglecting economic and environmental challenges and problems may increase tensions inside and between States and regions. This applies to issues related maritime and inland waterways as well, and the aspect of co-operation is very much emphasised in the Forum process.

However, the theme was not chosen only because of the aspects of continuity and co-operation but because the topic is very important and topical, and because the OSCE can make a contribution by addressing security and environment related questions in the area of maritime and inland waterways cooperation. The theme covers the whole OSCE area as it addresses issues related to maritime and inland waterways as well as specific challenges of the landlocked countries.

The Forum process started already in Helsinki last September, when the first Preparatory Conference was held. Presentations and discussions showed clearly that security issues in the context of maritime and inland waterways are pressing and need to be addressed. In addition, the discussions in Helsinki underlined the complexity of the increasing number of environmental problems that we need to solve together.

Some preliminary conclusions were drawn at the end of the Preparatory Conference Helsinki. It was mentioned that the OSCE can play a key role in mobilizing political will in participating States in order to address security and environmental issues in relation to maritime and inland waterways co-

operation. The OSCE could also support the work of relevant international organizations by offering a platform for dialogue. The OSCE, with its comprehensive approach to security, is well-placed to discuss these questions, raise awareness, enhance cooperation and exchange best practises.

In my view, these preliminary conclusions are still valid. Today and tomorrow we will continue discussions and build upon the outcome of Helsinki conference. Our aim is to develop ideas further and come up with recommendations for the OSCE. I would like to stress that in our deliberations we should concentrate in particular on the role that the OSCE can play in maritime and inland waterways co-operation.

I encourage you to participate actively in the discussions and wish you all an interesting and stimulating Forum here in Vienna.

Thank you for your attention.

WELCOMING ADDRESS

by **Mr. Bernard Snoy**,
Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities

Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,
Distinguished participants,

I am pleased to join the Chairman of the OSCE Permanent Council, Ambassador Antti Turunen, in welcoming you all to this first part of the 16th OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum on **“Maritime and inland waterways co-operation in the OSCE area: Increasing security and protecting the environment”**.

I warmly welcome in Vienna the representatives of the 56 OSCE participating States, of our Partners for Co-operation and of our partner organizations as well as from the private sector, academia and numerous NGOs that are present here today. I am also delighted to greet the representatives from our OSCE field presences, Heads of Missions and our Economic and Environmental Officers. I am convinced that the high level and diverse participation at this Forum offers a strong guarantee for its success.

Over the next two days, we will analyse the challenges and the opportunities of maritime and inland waterways co-operation, putting emphasis on increasing security and protecting the environment in the OSCE area. Our main objective, during this part of the Forum, will be to identify the most realistic and suitable recommendations for future OSCE activities, taking on board the conclusions outlined at the Helsinki Preparatory Conference which took place in September 2007.

As Ambassador Antti Turunen rightly pointed out, the theme of this Forum and the emphasis that have been chosen reflect the fact that security and environmental challenges are interlinked and prominently present on the international agenda. It is widely agreed that secure and environmentally sustainable maritime, inland waterway and multimodal transportation networks have an important role in enhancing regional security and economic co-operation, and in promoting trade and generating economic development across the OSCE area.

At the Preparatory Conference in Helsinki, held in September 2007, we learnt about the work already done by other organizations and about existing international and regional frameworks for co-operation that are already in place. Taking this into account, the OSCE could act as a facilitator and catalyst, contributing to strengthening synergies and to the advancement of existing efforts. For example, we could support the ratification and more importantly, the implementation of legal instruments developed by partners such as the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). Also, it was recognized during the Conference that the OSCE can stimulate synergies between various regional co-operation mechanisms and has a role to play in supporting the promotion and exchange of best practices.

Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,
Distinguished participants,

Let me now without further delay turn to the agenda of the meeting, which has been based on the preliminary findings of the Helsinki Preparatory Conference.

Besides the opening and closing sessions, the Forum's agenda contains an introductory session, four working sessions and a concluding discussion aimed at highlighting the role of the OSCE in follow-up to the Forum.

The **Introductory Session** will set the tone by introducing the existing international frameworks for security and environmental protection and reviewing their current status and future prospects in the OSCE region. Our main partners, the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and the European Commission, will provide their experience and expert views, including identification of existing gaps and areas where special attention and enhanced co-operation are required and where the OSCE could play a useful role.

Later this afternoon, **Session I** will focus on security aspects in the fields of maritime co-operation. We will discuss national, regional and international perspectives, taking into account the complex challenges of the 21st century. The deliberations will identify how the OSCE could contribute to promoting co-operation in this area.

Today's last session, **Session II**, will address the environmental and economic aspects of maritime co-operation. Many countries in the OSCE area are facing a challenge when it comes to maintaining and developing the economic role of seas and oceans while at the same time safeguarding a clean and sustainable marine environment.

Tomorrow morning, **Session III** will address security, environmental and economic aspects related to inland waterways co-operation, thereby providing an excellent opportunity for exchanging regional experiences. The discussion will start from the fact that transboundary water co-operation requires close co-ordination between river basin countries. Various specific bilateral or multilateral agreements have been signed and commissions set up for the benefit of specific regions and beyond. We expect that the discussion will help us in designing the role that the OSCE could continue playing in facilitating co-operation, building on the examples provided by our projects on the Sava, Dniester and Chu and Talas rivers.

Session IV will concentrate on promoting regional and inter-regional maritime co-operation measures regarding environmental threats to security. This Session aims at further identifying ways to promote partnerships and at sharing experiences between the participating States concerned and relevant stakeholders. Particular attention will go to inter-governmental maritime co-ordination and co-operation mechanisms that are already in place in our region.

The **Concluding Discussion** and the **Closing Session** will make a synthesis of the key ideas stemming from the previous sessions. Our aim is to identify how the OSCE could contribute to strengthening maritime and inland waterways co-operation. I encourage you to actively contribute to the discussion with your ideas on specific follow-up activities. The conclusions may be further elaborated in the framework of upcoming Economic and Environmental Committee meetings.

As in previous years, the final results of the Forum process will be further elaborated during the Second segment of Forum that will be held in Prague on 19-21 May 2008. It will also take on board the conclusions of the second preparatory Conference, which is taking place on 6-7 March of this year in Ashgabat.

I am looking forward to a productive and rewarding exchange of views.

I thank you for your attention and wish you a pleasant stay in Vienna.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

by **H.E. Mr. Kimmo Tiilikainen**
Minister of the Environment of Finland

Mr. Chairman,
Mr. Secretary General,
Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is my great pleasure to be here today and take the floor in the opening of the first part of 16th OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum, to be held in the beautiful city of Vienna.

As already pointed out, the Finnish OSCE Chairmanship Programme for 2008, including the economic and environmental dimension, builds on a comprehensive concept of security. The theme chosen for this year's Forum is "Maritime and inland waterways co-operation in the OSCE area: Increasing security and protecting the environment". With this choice Finland has wanted to focus on a set of issues, which are, in a broad manner, significant to all OSCE participating States.

Achieving common understanding and agreement on concrete objectives and measures concerning environmental protection should help us to promote dialogue and to achieve a common view also in other areas of policy-making. Environment is becoming the forefront of international policy-making and will have a growing bridge-building role. This role, at its best, will contribute towards the consolidation of peace, security and stability in the whole OSCE area and beyond.

The overall theme of this year can be divided into two entities, or looked into from two angles – maritime areas cooperation and inland waterways co-operation.

Finland hosted in September last year the First Preparatory Conference of the Forum, in which the main emphasis of discussion was in maritime areas, the Baltic Sea and the Black Sea, as well as in the sub-regional co-operation attached to their protection and management. This discussion will continue here, and I welcome the wide participation of various stakeholders, such as international organisations and civil society. This will allow us a productive exchange of ideas, hopefully leading to broadly based conclusions and recommendations.

From Finland's point of view the protection of the Baltic Sea is a top priority. After the September Conference in Helsinki, an important event has taken place in the framework of the Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission, the Helsinki Commission or HELCOM. After a long preparation and a series of negotiations the HELCOM Baltic Sea Action Plan was adopted in November 2007 in Krakow, Poland, in a ministerial meeting of the Baltic Sea countries and the European Community, all members of HELCOM.

Finland attaches great expectations to the Action Plan, which sets an overall goal of achieving a Baltic Sea in good environmental status by 2021. The main problem areas of the Baltic Sea are thoroughly addressed in the Action Plan, namely eutrophication, hazardous substances, biodiversity and maritime activities, including the safety of maritime transport. With regard to the eutrophication the Action Plan proposes country-wise annual nutrient input reduction targets for both nitrogen and phosphorus.

I believe that the Baltic Sea cooperation, in many respects, and the Action Plan as its latest outcome, can be observed as a source of inspiration to other organizations and cooperation frameworks addressing similar challenges. The present situation in the Baltic Sea cooperation, also in light of the Action Plan, will be shared with you by the HELCOM Executive Secretary in her presentation tomorrow.

Cooperation on the Baltic Sea as well as on other regional seas is anchored to the agreement structures within the International Maritime Organization, IMO. The role of the IMO is decisive in all central fields of maritime policies, including the environmental protection. I wish to thank IMO already now for collaboration in developing the thematic discussion in this Forum. As mentioned, concrete forms of cooperation could be sought, for example, in the case of combating the threat posed by invasive species spreading with ballast water. The Baltic Sea States look forward to continued good cooperation with IMO also in the future to reach HELCOM targets dealing with ship-borne waste water releases and winter navigation matters.

Among other policy tools and instruments highly relevant to the Baltic Sea cooperation we should mention the EU instruments such as the Marine Strategy and the future Maritime Policy. Russia, for its part is showing an active interest in Baltic Sea Cooperation, and we look forward to the Russian Chairmanship in HELCOM.

Mr. Chairman,

Already in this first part of the Forum a further step will be taken to discuss inland waterways co-operation. We are assisted by a number of knowledgeable organizations, such as the UNECE, which has a very important role in this field. The UNECE Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes has proved to be an important framework for improved management of shared waters.

The concept 'Integrated Water Resources Management' and the planning tools developed to support this holistic approach have a special meaning in the eastern part of the OSCE area. The environmental strategies of the Caucasus and the Central Asia are to a great extent centred to water management, and there is a necessity to solve related transboundary questions.

The Second Preparatory Conference, scheduled to take place in Ashgabat, Turkmenistan in March and to be followed by the second part of the OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum in Prague in May, will allow a thorough discussion on the topics specific to these regions, including hopefully a more thorough discussion on the Caspian region and Central Asia. Water transport and co-operation related to water transport, regional aspects of security and the environment, binding together seas, lakes canals and rivers, can be elaborated within the theme. The specific issues raised by the landlocked states will be of course addressed as well.

I am particularly pleased about the active participation of the Eastern Europe, South-Caucasian and Central Asian countries in the work of the Economic and Environmental Forum.

Mr. Chairman, some words about the general objectives of the economic and environmental dimension of the OSCE.

Already a first look into the existing organizations, co-operation frameworks, conventions and international processes related to economic and environmental co-operation in the OSCE area leads us to ask, where and how the OSCE could be best placed to bring missing aspects and added value into the co-operation.

The purpose and the domain of the OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum is to address security-related, environmental and economic aspects and their interlinkages in the given context. This broadly defined mandate, although demanding, provides a special opportunity.

One of the key objectives is to contribute to achieving increased awareness and coordination within the existing frameworks. Of particular importance is the increased political commitment at a high decision making level as well as in a multi-stakeholder context. The Forum brings together relevant stakeholders in the OSCE area: the 56 OSCE participating States, the Asian and Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation and also international organizations, as well as representatives of civil society, business and the scientific communities.

When the environmental aspects were brought into the work of the OSCE, late 1990's, the need for a shared political commitment was identified as a prerequisite to resolving or tackling environmental issues. Although the general understanding of the importance of these issues has thereafter constantly increased, there are new challenges requiring data collection, awareness building and new capacities.

To mention the main challenge: climate change requires attention by all and at all decisionmaking levels in terms of combating, mitigation and adaptation. The specific role of the OSCE is to deal with the impact of climate change on security. I am pleased that climate change has already been addressed in the context of this year's theme of the Economic and Environmental Forum. The relevance of observing climate change will further increase in the remaining part of the work.

The mandate of the Forum allows addressing development and use of economic instruments in promoting environmental protection. While the macro-economic data supports the observation that environmental protection and economic development are mutually supportive, there is a long way to go to implement the legislation-based and voluntary economic instruments to this end in practice. In this sphere, the work of the OSCE in supporting the implementation of international environmental agreements is relevant and valuable.

The mandate of the Forum to look into security and environmental issues together with economic issues should encompass attention to effectiveness of investments and use of natural resources in a sustainable way. In numerous cases a conflict or a risk of a conflict has led to decisions, which result in overlapping investments, wastage of resources and putting unnecessary burden on the environment. We need to do more to address environmental risks and challenges. In addition responses need to be comprehensive. Confidence-building among stakeholders helps to create and implement environmentally sound policies.

Finally, I would like to refer to the field missions of the OSCE as a yet another strength of the economic and environmental dimension of the organization. The expertise of the field missions helps to exchange information and to network with other organizations. The OSCE can add resources and its contacts with the local administrations to facilitate the implementation of national and regional projects. A good example of this, to mention just one, is the comprehensive Environmental and Security Initiative, ENVSEC, implemented by OSCE in collaboration with the UNEP and the UNDP and a number of other organisations.

To conclude and to summarise, Mr. Chairman, I see the process of the 16th Economic and Environmental Forum being conducted as a part of a wider regional and international effort. The OSCE looks forward to working together and coordinating with other organizations to provide added value. In addition we see possibilities for the OSCE to lend political support and political energy to other initiatives but also possibilities for reciprocal support from other organisations to

OSCE initiatives. I hope this Vienna Segment of the Economic and Environmental Forum will contribute to such results.

On behalf of the Finnish OSCE Chairmanship I wish you all fruitful and productive discussion during the next two days at this important Forum. I am convinced that the results of the Economic and Environmental Forum will substantially contribute to Helsinki Ministerial meeting next December.

Thank you Mr. Chairman

CONCLUDING REMARKS

**by Ambassador Aleksi Härkönen,
Head of the Finnish OSCE Chairmanship Task Force**

Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

At the opening session of our meeting, we set a clear objective for our deliberations, namely to develop ideas and recommendations for future OSCE action in the area of maritime and inland waterways co-operation. We have been addressing a number of questions such as:

- How would the OSCE involvement in the area of maritime and inland waterways cooperation contribute to strengthening security and protecting the environment?
- How can the OSCE add value to the many global, regional, national, local and private initiatives which already exist in these fields?
- How can the OSCE contribute to a better coordination of such activities?
- What could the OSCE do to promote the goals of other organisations specialised in this field?

The Helsinki Preparatory Conference in September 2007 built a good momentum for our undertaking. It concluded that the OSCE, within its general mandate of enhancing security and co-operation, can play a key role in mobilizing political will in participating States to address security, economic and environmental issues in relation to maritime and inland waterways cooperation that the OSCE could act as a facilitator and catalyst, contributing to strengthening synergies in these areas. It suggested that our Organisation can support the implementation of existing legal instruments, can disseminate best practices, promote regional co-operation, provide support to various regional frameworks as well as towards strengthening inter-regional co-operation mechanisms. The Helsinki Conference also emphasized that the OSCE can promote a multi-stakeholder dialogue, including governments, the business community, civil society and academia. Calls for capacity building activities developed by the Secretariat and the field presences, in co-operation with relevant partners, were also noted.

During the past two days we have advanced quite a lot on this path and our discussions here in Vienna contributed to clarifying the role of the OSCE in the above mentioned areas. Many specific recommendations for OSCE were formulated and they should be followed up in the Forum process and in the Economic and Environmental Committee.

Let me briefly outline some preliminary conclusions, which I believe we can draw from this meeting.

To strengthen maritime security and safety, co-operation and co-ordination at all levels is essential. We were reminded that no single government, government agency, or private sector organisation possesses the authority, knowledge or resources needed to prevent or to manage the recovery of the maritime transportation system following an incident or an accident. Hence, there can be no single program or policy that can provide overall maritime security. It is only through improved co-operation and co-ordination, through the use of multiple approaches, that we can improve maritime security and safety. It was emphasised that new technology should be put to use without delay.

In the field of maritime environmental protection, the OSCE could, first and foremost, raise awareness of the importance of environmental protection in marine waters. Secondly, it could facilitate or encourage uptake of best management practices developed by IMO and other organisations.

Transport of energy poses a serious threat to the marine environment because of the risk of accidents. Emergency preparedness and response mechanisms should be in place. The OSCE should encourage co-operation for the prevention of accidents.

The threat of invasive species carried through ballast water, illustrated by the IMO film, is a serious threat to life in sea areas, lakes and rivers, and it also affects human activities. The OSCE could contribute by advocating and supporting the implementation of the IMO's Ballast Water Management Convention. The OSCE should also seriously consider the offer made by IMO to link into and benefit from the GloBallast Partnership Program by facilitating the attendance of training events.

Environmental risk assessment and management and environmental monitoring are yet other examples of activities which the OSCE, in co-operation with partners, could support.

The OSCE should support the activities of the UNECE and the implementation of the relevant conventions.

An example of good co-operation is the well-established co-operation among the Danube River Basin countries. The principles included in the recently adopted Joint Statement could be applicable also elsewhere. The OSCE could facilitate such co-operation wherever possible.

A regional approach in maritime and inland waterways co-operation has proved to be useful in addressing specific issues in the region concerned. Sharing experiences and lessons learned in between regions could be explored among the participating States. For example, Helsinki Commission's, HELCOM's experience in developing an ambitious Baltic Sea Action Plan could be useful in other regions.

The Black Sea region is another example of growing co-operation in maritime security and safety as well as in environmental protection. The OSCE should support the initiatives and activities of organisations like the Black Sea Commission, BSC.

In this context I would like to welcome the proposal made by Ukraine to host a follow up Conference in Odessa next summer and thank the Ukrainian delegation for the information provided.

We have also touched upon co-operation in the Caspian Sea region and issues specific to the landlocked countries. The OSCE and its partners are looking forward to further discussions during the upcoming Second Preparatory Conference in Ashgabat on 6-7 March 2008. Already now I would like to express the appreciation of the Finnish Chairmanship to the government of Turkmenistan for this important initiative.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I would like to acknowledge the great contribution of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental activities Mr. Bernard Snoy and his team to this First Part of the Forum. I would also like to express thanks to all participating States, international organisations and other participants for their valuable contribution to our common cause.

* * *

I would like to use the opportunity to announce a photo contest under the theme of “Waterways of Life”. The winner of the contest will be announced during the Prague Forum on 19-21 May 2008. Further details can be found on the OSCE Internet website.

THE 16TH OSCE ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL FORUM

PART 1 / VIENNA, 28 - 29 JANUARY 2008

MARITIME AND INLAND WATERWAYS CO-OPERATION IN THE OSCE AREA: INCREASING SECURITY AND PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT

REPORTS OF THE RAPPORTEURS

Introductory Session: International frameworks - An anchor for security and environmental protection

Moderator: Ambassador Antti Turunen, Chairman of the Permanent Council,
Permanent Representative of Finland/OSCE Chairmanship

Rapporteur: Mr. Curtis Peters, Delegation of Canada to the OSCE

The first presenter, **Ms. Eva Molnar**, Director, Transport Division, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), discussed maritime and inland waterways transportation (IWT) co-operation in the OSCE area. Focusing on two aspects of IWT, Ms. Molnar highlighted what she called “two sides of the same coin:” security and trade facilitation.

Ms Molnar went on to describe significant challenges to security, which include terrorism, smuggling and attacks on shipping personnel. Conversely, trade that relies on maritime and international waterway transportation is booming and there is a growing impetus to facilitate trade by reducing barriers (including those related to security), particularly in landlocked areas, which would provide open markets and better growth. States must seek a balance between facilitation and control because improved IWT is a key to achieving better socio-economic conditions, access to resources, and improved efficiency and service capacity.

To find this balance, Ms. Molnar argued there was a significant need for good logistics indicators to understand the value of facilitation and to determine target actions. Further, security arrangements should include land transportation within their frameworks. To achieve these goals, States should recognize that: facilitation and security serve common goals; there is a need for multilateral frameworks; IWT is an important aspect of global supply chain management; and IWT is a pan-European concern. Further, there is room for multi-agency co-operation, which could reduce overlap, redistribute tasks and improve integration. This is a potential area for OSCE involvement.

Mr. Antonios Vidalis, Policy Officer with the Maritime Policy Task Force of the European Commission (EC) underscored a strategic objective of the EU: the need for an all-embracing maritime policy that promotes both economic growth and environmental sustainability. The Commission has already undertaken significant efforts to realize this objective through extensive consultations with numerous stakeholders, the development of aims and an action plan, and bringing this initiative to fruition through concrete action.

The result of this work has clarified the need for a European Maritime Policy (EMP), an initiative welcomed by the European Council. There was no consensus yet on how this should be accomplished. In response, the EU has highlighted the importance of integrating mechanisms and

the subsidiarity approach, where decisions and measures are taken by areas and people directly affected.

There are three main areas currently under consideration for an EMP. The first is in the area of offshore activities which seeks not a sectoral approach, but rather policy integration that infuses cohesion and commonality into existing activities. The problems arising from this approach are the existence of too many actors, communication issues, standards concerns and the safeguarding of prerogatives. A second area of activity is Maritime Surveillance, which attempts to integrate existing and developing surveillance systems and networks to promote security and environmental protection. Integration would improve data collection, decrease duplication, be cost effective and facilitate information sharing. However, integration is technologically, legally and administratively difficult and is further complicated by existing initiatives that overlap. The third EMP area discussed by Mr. Vidalis sought to protect the marine environment.

Mr. Edward Kleverlaan, Technical Officer with the Marine Environment Division of the International Maritime Organization (IMO) discussed the role of his organization in developing an environmental standards and regulatory regime to govern every aspect of the shipping industry. However, Mr. Kleverlaan noted the IMO does not have an enforcement mandate and relies on governments to implement this regime and on the shipping industry to apply standards.

Given this reliance on others, the IMO needs partners and champions to assist in implementing standards and regulations and it is here that there is a role for the OSCE. In particular, Mr. Kleverlaan highlighted three areas of potential OSCE cooperation: combating invasive species transfer, developing oil spill response capacity and possible application of the Marine Electronic Highway Concept.

Mr. Kleverlaan also enumerated specific actions that the OSCE could undertake to further cooperation in these three areas. The OSCE could work with other organizations to assist with policy and legal reforms to the further implementation of conventions and the development of regional oil spill arrangements in the OSCE region. Further, the OSCE could facilitate best management practices and implementation of regulations and standards as well as promote ratification of international instruments. This could be facilitated if the organization sought intergovernmental organization status with the IMO and attended events related to maritime security and environmental protection. The OSCE could further engender environmental protection initiatives amongst decision makers and participate in delivery of IMO capacity building programs, including through its field missions.

The presentations generated considerable discussion. One delegation noted that water was just as important as other resources (including hydrocarbon) and that international and national initiatives and standards to manage this resource were needed. The same delegation highlighted existing efforts to achieve this in Central Asia and stressed the need for better water management to protect the Aral Sea basin. This delegation further requested the OSCE assistance for hydro-electric producing concerns.

A second delegation sought further clarification on efforts of the IMO towards implementing standards, noting the issues of flagging, when ship owners would seek to register vessels with countries with lower standards. Mr. Kleverlaan restated that the IMO could not enforce but could encourage voluntary standards and suggested that the OSCE had a role in pressing governments to implement these standards.

A third participant cited the need for NGO participation and asked the presenters about the impact of climate change. The presenters responded that the shipping industry had already responded to

climate change by seeking new shipping routes in Canada's Arctic region and that there was a need for governments to stay ahead of industry.

A final participant revisited Ms. Molnar's discussion on logistics indicators, asking for further clarification on this issue. Ms. Molnar responded by highlighting data issues, which made difficult international comparisons. The discussants suggested a further need for international agreements to include reporting requirements and voluntary audit schemes.

Session I: Security aspects related to maritime co-operation

Moderator: **Mr. Raphael F. Perl**, Head, Action against Terrorism Unit (ATU), OSCE Secretariat

Rapporteur: **Mr. Andrew Price**, United Kingdom Delegation to the OSCE

The Moderator, **Mr Raphael Perl**, set the scene. He described maritime transport as the glue holding the global economy together (90% of global trade in goods relied on shipping). As the global economy continued to expand, the security of maritime transportation became an increasingly important issue for all of us. Maritime transportation was seen as a particularly attractive target for terrorists. Multiple attacks on major ports, canals and shipping lanes could cause widespread physical and economic damage. International co-operation was essential to counter these threats and to mitigate their human, economic and environmental impacts. The OSCE, including through the Action against Terrorism Unit, was already undertaking activities to enhance maritime security.

Mr Ola Dahlman of the Swedish Institute for International Affairs advocated the development of a more resilient European supply chain. We had to accept that critical infrastructure could not be made totally safe, and to focus more instead on making our systems more resilient to internal (e.g. congestion, pollution) and external (e.g. natural or man-made disasters, acts of terrorism) threats to the supply chain. In other words we needed to be able to recover faster from a wider range of shocks by increasing our preparedness to handle such events when they happened. To do this we needed to develop layered defence systems and to strengthen the weakest layers. Rational and predictable human behaviour was an essential layer of defence, but potentially a weak one. The commercial cost of increasing resilience might be offset by the increased competitive advantage arising from being able to provide a more resilient service. The OSCE could help by promoting the idea of resilience as a means of enhancing security, perhaps through workshops and training programmes, and possibly by conducting a joint resilience analysis of an OSCE security issue.

Mr Dimitrios Theologitis, Head of Security Policy and Maritime Security at DG TREN at the European Commission, outlined the European Union's approach to the protection of ports and ships, the security of cargo and the provision of maritime surveillance. There already existed a raft of EU directives and regulations in these areas. These included a variety of IMO Conventions that had been transposed into EU law. In general, legislation was well implemented by Member States, though there were big differences in the way ship and port security was administered at the national level. It had been easier than expected to get the ports and shippers to implement EU security measures. In part this was because they had soon discovered that enhanced security also reduced theft, accidents and vandalism. The Commission was now engaged in discussions with Member States, stakeholders and the IMO on the further development of security measures (e.g. guidelines, best practices and minimum standards). The OSCE could play a role by encouraging and assisting participating States to ratify and implement all relevant IMO and other conventions in the field of maritime security.

Captain John Koster of US Coast Guard Activities Europe argued that no single programme or policy could guarantee maritime security and that multiple approaches and a process of continuous evaluation and improvement were needed. He advocated the development of multi-layered risk-based policies and programmes to secure critical infrastructure. He described the Maritime Security Risk Assessment Model (MSRAM) that had been developed by the US Department of Homeland Security to analyse the risk of terrorist attack across all US ports. Risk was modelled as a function of threat, vulnerability and consequence. The model was an important aid to decision makers in the development of layered risk based policies and in long run strategy resource planning. Ultimately it served to enhance security and reduce the risk of a terrorist attack.

Mr Jorma Rytönen of the Kymenlaakso University of Applied Sciences in Finland explained that vessels were getting bigger and maritime traffic, especially oil transportation, was becoming heavier. The risk of collision, for example along the Baltic Sea trade routes, was increasing and society was getting more concerned about the implications for human safety and environmental security. Traffic analysis had shown that the English Channel, the Spanish Coastline and the Turkish Straits were also particularly vulnerable. He explained that new systematic risk control tools were being developed to minimise these risks. Recent accidents in the Baltic Sea and the political impetus provided by HELCOM had accelerated work in this area. It was also necessary to improve information systems (eg incident reporting systems, casualty databases, reporting of electronic failures). New technologies and modern ships with on-board computers would help. Harmonising practices was also important.

In the panel discussion which followed there was general agreement that:

- Countries had in the past focused too much on the protection of critical infrastructure and not enough on promoting resilience.
- Countries should focus more on managing risk, especially human error.
- There should be more focus on developing minimum standards and harmonising systems, for example via the IMO.
- There was a greater need to ratify and implement existing international conventions than there was to develop new ones.

The representative of the European Community Shipowners' Association supported enhanced maritime security measures and advocated the promotion of a culture of security across the supply chain. He also urged the OSCE to avoid duplication, and to promote the ratification and implementation of existing measures and mutual recognition of systems.

The representative of Turkey outlined several naval initiatives and operations in which Turkey is involved in the Black Sea and the Mediterranean.

The representative of Germany delivered a strong message that international organisations, including regional initiatives, had to complement each others' activities.

Session II: Environmental and economic aspects of maritime co-operation

Moderator: Mr. Alistair Clark, Director of the Environment Department, EBRD

Rapporteur: Mr. Philip Reuchlin, Economic and Environmental Adviser, OSCE Secretariat/OCEEA

Mr. Bjørn Kristoffersen, Head of Society and Environment, Arctic Growth Theme, StatoilHydro, Norway, spoke about Statoil's role in oil exploration in the Barents Sea. In its present growth plan, StatoilHydro takes a holistic approach to planning, based on integrated ecosystem management. This increases co-operation between stakeholders, helps stability and security in new areas, giving rise in some cases to better technical solutions and facilitating the receipt of licenses to operate.

The primary area of interest (Barents Sea) is a multi-ethnic periphery region, surrounded by natural resource based economies, with potential tensions between stakeholders, unresolved boundary areas, harsh climatic conditions. It is as well a pristine and vulnerable environment.

StatoilHydro has established a model for sustainable development which is used each time planning is undertaken. This consists of:

1. Scenario development to define challenges in future and today;
2. Development of ecosystem knowledge;
3. Health, Safety and Environmental (HSE) standards and environmental technology;
4. Emergency response;
5. Stakeholder engagement and Corporate Social Responsibility;
6. Regional co-operation;
7. Profiling and alliance.

This proactive way of working in these areas has helped Statoil tremendously. As a recommendation, the OSCE should try to engage all stakeholders in decision-making processes.

Ms. Anita Mäkinen, Head of Marine Programme, WWF Finland, said that globalization and increased trade caused increased risk of shipping accidents and oil spills. In Finland, the amount of oil transported had increased from 20 million tons in 1995 to 140 million tons in 2006 and was forecast to increase by 2015 to 150 million tons. The main impacts of shipping were: emissions from ships, oil spills and invasive species. Despite lots of policies and international treaties, implementation of these was lagging behind.

The WWF uses a lot of spatial mapping with regard to establishing Particularly Sensitive Sea Area status (PSSA),¹ with associated protective measures as well as routing measures e.g. areas to be avoided, traffic separation schemes, deep sea routes, mandatory pilotage, mandatory escort towing.

The WWF has set up voluntary oil spill response programs. These aim to provide an organised group, included in a regional contingency plan, prepared to intervene in the immediate aftermath of an oil spill further to an order of the competent authorities.

The WWF recommendations for the participating States of the OSCE included the following:

1. To ratify and implement the existing international agreements;
2. To make an interdisciplinary analysis of what are the political obstacles to the ratification and implementation of these international agreements;
3. To improve maritime safety through IMO measures and regulations where needed;
4. To make an analysis to discover the spatial and temporal variations in human uses of the marine ecosystem resources in the OSCE area;
5. To undertake sensitivity mapping of sea areas;
6. To have good preparedness to combat oil accidents;

¹ A Particularly Sensitive Sea Area (PSSA) is an area that needs special protection through action by the IMO because of its significance for recognized ecological or socio-economic or scientific reasons and that may be vulnerable to damage by international maritime activities.

7. To improve local and regional collaboration involving also civil society in the oil spills combating activities;
8. To develop and establish new funding mechanisms in addition to the EU's Civil protection financial instrument.

Ms. Heike Imhoff, Deputy Head of Division, International Protection of the Seas, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Germany, and Head of the German Delegation to HELCOM, referred to the main threats to the marine environment in the Baltic Sea, namely pollution from land-based sources (*inter alia* industry, agriculture), impacts of shipping (emissions in the air, discharges into the sea, accidents, introduction of alien species), unsustainable use of resources, e.g. fisheries, and the destruction of habitats (*inter alia* off-shore installations).

The HELCOM Baltic Sea Action Plan is based on the regional application of the "Ecosystem Approach". It encompasses and integrates environmental objectives into sector policies in four priority areas:

- Eutrophication;
- Hazardous Substances;
- Biodiversity;
- Maritime Activities (including shipping).

Stakeholders are an important component in developing plans, since they represent all parts of society, ensure an adequate reflection of society's views, add particular experience and competence. In that context, Ms. Imhoff made the following recommendations:

- Solutions have to be tailor made for individual regional problems, utilising the principle of subsidiarity;
- Stakeholders need to be involved as early as possible and all groups should be represented. This ensures the broadest possible acceptance, improved quality of the political product and willingness of stakeholders to promote the needed political message and to support implementation of the necessary measures;
- The co-operation between policy decision makers, "green" and industry stakeholders needs to be strengthened.

Following speakers' presentations, the moderator, **Mr. Alistair Clark**, noted that the lessons from the Barents and Baltic Seas could be transferred to other seas, even in the Pacific. New oil and gas reserves tend to be in remote, sensitive and difficult areas, notably the Arctic. Exploration will be in these areas. So far it is unclear what would happen with an oil spill under the ice.

One participant noted its experience in dealing with oil spills. Particularly public pressure was crucial for mobilising political action. Indeed, what happened was generally a reactive scenario, which should be substituted by a pro-active one. If the governments had known in more detail the characteristics of the oil they were dealing with, the clean-up would have been much more effective.

One delegation asked the OSCE to organise a presentation from the Arctic Council to the OSCE in order to find out what they are doing.

One participant asked Statoil to elaborate on carbon capture and storage techniques.

One delegation stated that there was no room for the OSCE to get engaged in the Arctic issues as this was being dealt with bilaterally and under the auspices of the Arctic Council.

One speaker noted the necessity to avoid duplication of work and called for more coordination.

Session III: Inland waterways co-operation

Moderator: Ms. Eva Molnar, Director, Transport Division, UNECE

Rapporteur: Mr. Raul Daussa, Environmental Programme Officer, OSCE Secretariat/OCEEA

Mr. Philip Weller, Executive Secretary, International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR), presented the Danube River Basin which is the most international river basin in the world with 81 Million inhabitants in 19 Countries. It is heavily used for drinking water (over 20 Million people), irrigation, industrial production, power production and inland navigation. The basin has an important ecological value due to its rich biodiversity and provides ecological services such as flood protection.

The legal framework for the protection of the river basin is based on two conventions: The Danube River Protection Convention (Sofia 1994) for co-operation to assure the protection of water and ecological resources and their sustainable use in the Danube River Basin and establishing the ICPDR and the EU Water Framework Directive (2000) to ensure “good status of all waters” by 2015, based on the principle of integrated river basin management and stakeholder participation (EU WFD).

All riparian countries are parties to the ICPDR except Montenegro which is in the ratification process and all EU and non-EU states have committed to apply the EU WFD principles.

The goals of the ICPDR are to strengthen international co-operation, ensure sustainable water management, control floods, and reduce pollution loads to the Black Sea. Furthermore, to implement the EU WFD, all parties have agreed to develop a River Basin Management Plan for the Danube.

Mr. Weller explained the main problems faced by the river basin (floods and droughts, pollution, and hydro-morphological alterations) and presented the Joint Statement on Guiding Principles for the Development of Inland Navigation and Environmental Protection in the Danube River Basin (EEF.IO/7/08, 24 January 2008).

The Joint Statement is a guiding document for the development of the “Joint Programme of Measures” requested by the EU WFD, the maintenance of the current inland navigation infrastructure and the planning of investments in future infrastructure and environmental protection projects.

The Joint Statement is the result of intense negotiations with sectors that might seem as having opposed interests but that have found a common ground for co-operation. It was adopted by the ICPDR in December 2007, the Danube Navigation Commission in December 2007 and the International Commission for the Sava River Basin in January 2008.

Mr. Weller highlighted two lessons for the OSCE: first that the criteria and principles of the Joint Statement are also applicable for other large river systems and second that such a process of dialogue would be beneficial for other river basins. He therefore proposed that the OSCE could promote the Joint Statement on Guiding Principles, help to develop more detailed guidance on

specific issues and support the implementation activities in specific projects and finally assist using such a process in other river basins (e.g. in the Volga River Basin)

Mr. Manfred Seitz, Managing Director, Via Donau - Austrian Waterways Development Agency, provided an overview of the economic importance of the Danube region, the European inland navigation policy, and explained selected projects from Via Donau.

The Danube region is an economic powerhouse for Europe, with GDP growth forecast of 4%, trade growth of 6-7% and traffic increase of up to 9%. Given these growing trends, waterways transportation is a good option as it is an environmentally friendlier transportation mode. The main problem for the navigation on the Danube is concentrated in just 400 km of river course. Mr. Seitz claimed that the total funds needed to eliminate the 18 bottlenecks were just 1 billion EURO, which was modest compared to the volume of investments in road and railways, but the main obstacle to overcome was the lack of political will.

Mr. Seitz explained that the European Inland Navigation Policy is based on the adoption of the NAIADES action programme, which was launched in 2006 and comprises numerous actions and measures to boost transports on inland waterways. The programme runs until 2013 and is to be implemented by the European Commission, the Member States and the industry itself.

Mr. Seitz elaborated on the Austrian inland navigation and presented the National Action Plan which is a catalogue of measures developed in co-operation with inland ports and the inland navigation sector to plan the Austrian shipping policy until 2015. Via Donau is the Austrian national waterway operator owned by the Ministry of Transport Innovation and Technology and responsible for 351 km of the Danube waterway.

Mr Seitz presented several projects, among them the Integrated River Engineering Project East of Vienna, which includes a Danube flood plain national project, demonstrating that environmental needs are taken into consideration while planning navigation projects, as stated in the Joint Statement on guiding principles presented by Mr. Weller. A second project highlighted was the Danube River Information Systems (DoRIS), which provides telemetric systems and information services in order to increase the safety and efficiency of inland waterway transport. Mr. Seitz explained the components of DoRIS and the results of the pilot phase with more than 95% of vessels equipped with computers and antennas.

Finally, Mr. Seitz concluded with the following remarks:

- The Danube waterway is a key transport axis of the enlarged Europe;
- A sustainable transport system in Central & Southeastern Europe requires higher share of IWT;
- River Information Services are powerful tools to modernize IWT and enable its integration into managed logistic chains of European industry;
- Improvement of the waterway infrastructure is a precondition for the economic prosperity of the Danube navigation but requires an integrated approach towards environmental needs;
- Strategic and project based co-operation among Danube states is necessary to fully exploit the potential of Danube transportation;
- Development agencies and promotion centers for IWT are proven instruments for successful policy implementation;
- The European transport policy strongly supports a sustainable development of Danube waterway.

Mr. Brosnislav P. Govorovsky, Head of Water Transport Department, Ministry of Transport and Communications, Republic of Belarus, described the transboundary rivers crossing Belarus and the international conventions to which Belarus is party (among them the Helsinki Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes) as well as several bilateral and trilateral efforts aimed at the protection of water resources.

Mr Govorovsky summarized the most significant problems faced by Belarus such as the lack of basin management in the current administrative territorial control system of water resources in the country, and the insufficient use of the waterways potential of the water systems of Belarus.

In order to overcome the problems, co-operation with international donors is underway for the development of transboundary basin management plans for rivers, the adaptation of administrative-territorial control system of the water resources in Belarus to the basin management principle, using the experience of the EU countries, and lastly the feasibility study of the actions for the transit waterway that is connecting the Baltic and the Black Seas via the Dnieper-Bug channel.

He then elaborated on this last project, which deals with the flow distribution from the river Pripjat to the Dnieper-Bug canal, provided by the transboundary Beloozerskaya hydrologic system, which is situated on the territories of the Republic of Belarus and of Ukraine. In order to meet the requirements of both states, to reduce damage effect of flood water in a full-flowing period and to compensate the lack of water in a dry period, it is necessary to coordinate the operating rules for this hydrologic system. The first meeting of experts aimed at working out these rules was organized by the OSCE and the UNEP in September 2007. The project details together with the Statement of Mr. Govorovsky are available (EEF.DEL/6/08, 25 January 2008).

During the discussion, one delegation explained the current state of issues regarding inland waterways and transboundary lakes shared with its neighbouring countries (EEF.DEL/14/08, 29 January 2008).

Another delegation summarized the main points of a circulated statement (EEF.DEL/1/08, 23 January 2008) highlighting the drop in the water level of the Aral Sea due to bad water management practices and calling for a multidisciplinary approach and international co-operation to solve the environmental catastrophe, and suggested that the OSCE could promote mobilization of international financial institutions (IFIs) and specific projects in the region.

Another delegation summarized a circulated statement on the History and Role of the Central Commission for the Navigation on the Rhine which is the oldest agreement on water basin still in place (EEF.DEL/21/08, 30 January 2008).

The President of the **Danube Commission** explained briefly the history of the Belgrade convention (Belgrade 1848) and supported the Joint Statement on Guiding Principles presented by Mr. Weller. He explained that the sterile confrontation between ecological protection and navigation could be avoided with the mentioned joint statement, as it combined both positions. The Danube Commission expressed that OSCE could support projects on the Danube like the elimination of bottlenecks to ensure navigation for ships with 2.5 meters depth hulls in whatever meteorological conditions. He finally proposed to replicate the Joint Statement process in other rivers.

One delegation highlighted positive experiences on these issues, including the dialogue with a neighbouring country on the Danube Delta.

The representative from **Southeast European Cooperative Initiative** (SECI) explained the role of SECI and of the Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe in the promotion of the partnership for

infrastructure development and said that expert co-operation needed to be supported at political level. Finally she stated that the Stability Pact was phasing out and would be replaced by a Regional Co-operation Council in Sarajevo, and that a formal contact with the OSCE had been already established and further contacts with OSCE missions was foreseen.

One delegation congratulated the ICPDR, and the Danube and Sava Commissions for the joint statement and explained the its country supported the establishment of the Sava Commission, including through the works of an army corps of engineering.

Session IV: Promoting regional and inter-regional co-operation on environmental security

Moderator: **Ambassador Carlos Sanchez de Boado y de la Válgoma**, Permanent Representative of Spain to the OSCE

Rapporteur: **Mr. Lorenzo Rilasciati**, Counsellor, Delegation of the European Commission to the OSCE

The Sessions' goal was to focus on promoting regional and inter-regional maritime co-operation on environmental threats to security. The session was also aimed at further exploring regional experiences related to maritime co-operation, with a special focus on environmental issues, and to identify ways and means towards promoting partnerships and sharing experiences and best practises through the OSCE.

Ms. Anne Christine Brusendorff, Executive Secretary of HELCOM, highlighted the intrinsic value of a clean marine environment as an essential element, amongst others, to life, climate regulation, and CO2 absorption. She explained that the importance of protecting the marine environment of the Baltic Sea led HELCOM to develop a new concept aimed at the conservation of ecosystem services with a cross-sectoral and holistic approach: the ecosystem approach. Ms. Brusendorff stressed that marine ecosystem issues should be addressed with a regional and sub-regional approach. That is why regional marine conventions and action plans play a crucial role. As an example, she introduced the main features of the HELCOM Baltic Sea Action Plan, which is a regional application of the ecosystem approach with the aim of obtaining a healthy Baltic Sea. The development of the Action Plan involved HELCOM and non-HELCOM countries, stakeholders, and NGOs. The Action Plan quantifies the characteristics of a healthy Baltic Sea; it has an integrated approach (environment considerations in all sectors); the system includes parameters to measure the efficiency of the actions undertaken. Examples of HELCOM inter-regional co-operation were also presented such as: a twinning agreement with the Nairobi Convention; co-operation with the OSPAR Convention, the Black Sea Commission and the Mediterranean Action Plan. She finally listed a series of possible areas of OSCE involvement such as support for interregional co-operation; sharing of experience and best practices.

Ms. Violeta Velikova, Pollution Monitoring and Assessment Officer from the Black Sea Commission, introduced some of the most pressing environmental problems affecting the Black Sea, mainly caused by oil spill disasters, pollution, maritime traffic, fouling, illegal fishing, illegal discharges. The need to be prepared (and prevent) oil spill disasters was recognised by the Black Sea Commission member countries and a co-operation exercise was launched in 2007. Ms Velikova informed on the need to proceed with a new assessment of oil pollution in the Black Sea due to the increase of trade and economic growth in the region, which are increasing the number of ships and vessels. The lack of regional co-operation was also highlighted as well as the high level of non-compliance of regulations. Ms Velikova listed some of the most pressing needs in order to monitor

and protect the Black Sea, such as an automatic information system between Black Sea countries in order to track illegal discharge; the need to develop Strategic Environmental Assessments as well as Environmental Impact Assessments in order to assess the potential negative impacts of transboundary energy projects; the need of implementing activities aiming at promoting the ratification and implementation of legal instruments as well as institutional and capacity building, awareness raising and training activities. Underlining the fragile environment of the Black Sea Ecosystems, she stressed the need for international and regional assistance. The involvement of the private sector is crucial and coordination/co-operation with international organisations (OSCE, EU, WB) is also needed. .

Mr. Vladimir Mamaev, GEF Regional Technical Advisor, Europe and the CIS, UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre, presented the regional governance system of the Caspian Sea and the “Caspian Environmental Programme”. The programme was launched in 1988 with the goal of achieving an *“environmentally sustainable development and management of the Caspian ecological resources in order to obtain the optimal long-term benefits for the human population of the region”*. He listed a series of problems affecting the Caspian Sea and having a transboundary effect, such as the decline of fishing, the loss of biodiversity, the degradation of coastal landscapes and coastal habitats, the decline of environmental quality, the decline of the sea level, and of human health, the introduction of alien species, the contamination of water due to off-shore oil and gas activities. He explained that the common root causes of such a situation in the Caspian Sea should be looked for in the weak economy, population growth, inadequate public awareness, weak governance, inadequate investments, lack of regional conventions and participation in regional and international agreements. In order to respond to these challenges the Caspian Sea countries agreed on a list of environmental quality objectives and hot spots and adopted in 1998 a Framework Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment in the Caspian Sea, which entered into force in May 2006.

Following the presentations, one country presented the developments in the area of environmental co-operation in the Central Asian region. Countries of Central Asia adopted a regional plan for the protection of the environment. Water management, soil contamination, desertification, air pollution and preservation of mountain regions were some of the main areas the action plan tackled. Countries of the region also had agreed to have a framework regional convention for the protection of the environment and sustainable development in Central Asia.

One country underlined the vital importance of having a regular flow of water. Furthermore, the impact on environment, biodiversity and economic development of the contamination of the Caspian Sea was stressed. To this end a monitoring centre had been established. The need to protect biodiversity and sea was judged important. In order to respond to such a situation a series of activities aimed at cleaning up the Caspian Sea and treating sewages to prevent and avoid discharge in the sea had been undertaken.

One country stressed the importance that the OSCE field presence played in its territory and praised the ENVSEC Initiative. Awareness raising, and training activities were considered of high importance. It was stressed that landlocked countries depended on the willingness of their neighbours to allow access to the sea. For that reason co-operation on environmental and economic issues was an important measure to build trust as well as a factor to resolve conflicts and achieve peace. OSCE/OCEEA and the Economic and Environmental Officers in the field presences had an important role to play.

One delegation, seconded by two other delegations, complained and expressed disagreement with regard to some comments of a political nature included in a document circulated by an NGO. The Co-ordinator acknowledged that the document referred to went beyond the theme of the Forum.

One country praised the OSCE, the EU, and the UNECE for their crucial contribution in the progress achieved regarding co-operation on a transboundary river, in which that country was involved. Over the last two years the organizations and the countries involved had been quite active and able to resolve some of the issues that arose among riparian states. An Intergovernmental Commission would be also established.

Concluding Discussion: The role of the OSCE in follow-up to the Forum

Moderator: Mr. Bernard Snoy, Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities

Rapporteur: Mr. Gabriel Leonte, Economic and Environmental Adviser, OSCE Secretariat/OCEEA

The moderator started by introducing the general objective of the session, namely to identify, taking into account the discussions in previous sessions, the specific role the OSCE could play in follow-up to the Forum. It could consist in raising awareness, improving co-ordination, contributing to the implementation of commitments in the area of maritime and inland waterways co-operation. The importance of partnerships with other organizations as well as the role the OSCE field presences could play in this process was emphasized.

A representative of a landlocked country restated his interest in the topic under discussion, mainly as far as the economic aspects of co-operation were concerned. With regard to environmental co-operation, he said that it could and should contribute to mitigating, reducing damages likely to be incurred by increased economic activity. He also emphasized the importance of a multi-dimensional approach and of involving the general public. He stressed the importance of trust as far as co-operation was concerned and added that co-operation was more efficient when parties involved identified concrete benefits and recognized the potential risks associated with the lack of co-operation. The OSCE could be useful in raising awareness regarding policy matters, so that those who had responsibilities would act.

Another representative spoke about the risks associated with oil spills and pollution by sewage water. He underlined the role of intergovernmental co-operation on management of water resources and preserving the quality of water. At the same time he stressed the importance of involving both state authorities and NGOs and private enterprises in such co-operative efforts. The general public should have access to environmental information. Finally he emphasized the need for a balanced approach, taking into consideration both economic and environmental aspects, as the way to ensure sustainable development.

Another delegation referred to the need for co-operation in addressing regional transboundary environmental problems. He said that the OSCE could play a useful role and praised the work under the framework of the Environment and Security (ENVSEC) Initiative. He then raised the issue of a power plant which was going to be built in a neighboring country, close to the border. He also called for enhanced co-operation with regard to a transboundary river, on various aspects including flooding.

One delegation presented in more details an earlier proposal to host an expert conference on the issues of the safety of navigation and environmental security in a transboundary context in the Black Sea basin. The main aim of the conference would be to enhance co-operation in the region,

facilitate the exchange of experience, identify current challenges, and contribute to integrating efforts towards a more effective implementation international conventions. The conference would bring together participating States, international and regional organizations and other players working in this area. Topics to be addressed could include improvement of navigation safety systems, prevention of emergency situations and mitigation of their consequences, organization of search and rescue activities in the sea, preserving the ecosystems along inland waterways and seaways, etc.

One representative welcomed the theme of the proposed conference. He believed it should build upon existing co-operation and also bring in experiences from other regions. He further on referred to his country's activities and co-operation with others in this field, including through contributing vessels for training activities, organizing meetings etc. He stressed the importance of the multilateral comprehensive system of co-operation, at global and also at regional level. He then said that accidents causing maritime pollution, in particular through oil spills, happened recently in various regions, sometimes for similar reasons. Often, the post disaster response was too slow or insufficient. Normally, it should include measures against ship owners, regionally coordinated emergency response bodies, and prioritizing environmental protection. Therefore, the issue of international co-operation and exchange of experience was crucial. There should be joint rules for maritime activities. The representative then spoke about climate change, which he described as a pressing problem requiring a common action. Both technological and organizational elements should be employed and co-operation should be established at various levels, including among experts. The representative called for the creation of a joint emergency response force. That should be possible, as already joint exercises, trainings and programmes had been conducted. In that regard, the OSCE could search for a general political formula to stimulate co-operation at regional and global level.

One delegation presented the situation related to a river which formed one of its country's borders. There was recurrent flooding, mainly caused by the melting of glaciers, affecting the crops. The river often changed its course, leading to transboundary problems. Regulating the river's course would contribute to avoiding such problems, improve the state of the river and might be useful for the development of agriculture as well as of inland waterways transport. Another matter of concern for his country was a natural lake formed by a natural dam, which had now become unstable. A collapse of the dam would also affect other neighboring countries. The OSCE could facilitate technical assistance for solving these problems. Transfer of technology could be another area where the OSCE in co-operation with partners could help. Finally, the delegation offered to host a sub-regional seminar on the Amu-darya basin, later in the year.

Another delegation raised the issue of the value added the OSCE could bring. Existing co-operation processes would continue with or without OSCE's involvement. The OSCE might contribute in strengthening inter-regional co-operation, by facilitating the exchange of successful practices. In that context, the OSCE field presences could play a useful role, by transferring expertise on the ground.

One participant stressed the importance of strengthening linkages between sectoral approaches as well. The OSCE could be offering opportunities to exchange experiences between regions, as they might be confronted with similar situations, but also across various sectors such as environmental protection, trade, transport, economic activities. The OSCE should develop a close relationship with regional organizations active on various seas or inland waterways and identify together the policy and institutional gaps. The OSCE might also be useful in providing support to existing international conventions, discuss shortcomings in implementation and identify constructive approaches to overcome them. As, well, the OSCE could be instrumental in strengthening maritime security. He

also referred to the recently adopted EU Strategy for Central Asia and welcomed the active involvement of the Central Asian participating States in the Forum's discussions.

An NGO representative underlined that transparency was an important element as it created confidence among partners who developed joint projects. Good communication, access to information, raising awareness among stakeholders, including at the political level, were equally useful. He then referred to an inter-regional co-operation model launched last August by the EU, which would stimulate progress towards further developing territorial co-operation. Further on, he highlighted the need for an integrated approach between various conventions relevant for maritime and inland waterways co-operation. A meeting on that issue would be useful. Countries were anyway requested to report on their actions to meet the requirements of various conventions and it might be useful if all these aspects would be discussed together, to find better synergies.

The representative of the Black Sea Commission, referring to the proposal for a regional conference on the safety of navigation and environmental security in the Black Sea basin, said that it should be coordinated with other planned events and initiatives in the region, as that would enhance its added values. The representative expressed willingness to contribute to this process, by making use of the organization's existing expertise and network.

One delegation expressed appreciation for the great level of expertise the Forum brought together. Nevertheless, it saw a limited niche for the OSCE with regard to the topics under discussion. The OSCE should focus on promoting good governance and environmental security. The OSCE could contribute to institution building, promoting transparency, and conflict prevention. The field missions were a very useful instrument of the organization.

The HELCOM representative invited the OSCE to its 3rd stakeholders' conference in March and expressed the wish to continue and further develop the co-operation with the OSCE.

Another delegation said that we should be cautious and not overestimate the role of the field presences. While they could be useful in many instances, they could not do much, for example, in the case of a maritime accident and in the remediation of its environmental consequences. As well, not all the countries around some seas hosted field presences.

An OSCE field presence representative said that they could be useful in transferring know-how, building local capacity, and also in ensuring continuity, through establishing local connections and supporting the continuation of existing projects.

The ATU representative stated that the Forum discussions were useful in identifying gaps and in indicating where the OSCE could bring added value. The OSCE could be guiding the policy debate and identify new areas of activity. He referred to the human factor, the risks of accidents, and to the managed risk approach. We had first to see what data was missing and needed in order to make a correct judgment. It was suggested that the OSCE participating States could develop a common risk management approach. As well, with regard to existing international conventions, the OSCE could support national implementation, could develop guidelines in this regard, or could gather data on the status of implementation. He later on highlighted the concept introduced by one speaker, namely resilience. In that connection, the OSCE could possibly conduct a survey or gather a group of experts to identify resilience related issues and propose quick fixes.

Another representative of an OSCE field presence, referring to the role of the OSCE in the follow-up process, said that the field missions had limited national mandates and also often limited capacities. He added that the Secretariat should mobilize political support, identify political objectives and tasks and develop partnerships with other organizations. The field presences could

help as far as local implementation was concerned. He finally expressed confidence that the OSCE could bring added value in the follow-up process.

One delegation stressed that in the follow-up process to the Forum the OSCE should seek to promote complementarity and avoid duplication.