



Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

Office of the Secretary General
Section for External Co-operation



2004 OSCE-Japan Conference



**2004 OSCE- JAPAN CONFERENCE ON THE SEARCH FOR
CONFLICT PREVENTION IN THE NEW SECURITY
CIRCUMSTANCES — EUROPEAN SECURITY
MECHANISMS AND SECURITY IN ASIA**

Tokyo, 15 and 16 March 2004

Consolidated Summary

Table of Content

1	General information	3
1.1	Venue	3
1.2	Participation	3
1.3	Timetable and Organizational Modalities	3
1.4	Agenda	4
2	Concluding summary by the Co-Chairpersons	7
3	Reports by session rapporteurs	10
3.1	Session One: Current Practices of OSCE and Security in Asia	10
3.2	Session Two: Combating International Terrorism - Cases and Prospects in Europe and Asia, including the Issue of Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD).....	12
3.3	Session Three: Addressing Challenges to Security of Drugs, Human Trafficking and Small Arms – Cases and Prospects in Europe and Asia	16
4	List of participants	18
5	List of documents.....	24
6	Seating arrangement.....	26

1 General information

1.1 Venue

The Conference was held from 15 to 16 March 2004, in the Conference Room No. 761 of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan in Tokyo.

1.2 Participation^{*)}

- 1.2.1 Thirty-four OSCE participating States, including Ireland/EU and the European Commission took part in the Conference.
- 1.2.2 All Partners for Co-operation in Asia (Afghanistan, Japan, Korea and Thailand) and four Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation (Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, and Morocco) were represented.
- 1.2.3 The OSCE Secretariat and the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly were represented.
- 1.2.4 Nine member States of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) participated as observers.
- 1.2.5 The following international organizations and institutions were represented: United Nations Children's Fund, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, United Nations Development Programme, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, International Committee of the Red Cross, and GUUAM.
- 1.2.6 Representatives of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were able to attend and contribute to the Conference in accordance with the relevant OSCE provisions and practices. Seventeen NGOs and academic institutions were represented.

1.3 Timetable and Organizational Modalities

- 1.3.1 The Conference began at 9:30 a.m. (opening ceremony) on 15 March 2004 and ended at noon on 16 March 2004.
- 1.3.2 The Conference was conducted in three sessions.
- 1.3.3 The opening and closing sessions were co-chaired by H.E. Dr. Tatsuo Arima, Special Envoy of the Government of Japan, and H.E. Ambassador Ján Kubiš, Secretary General of the OSCE.
- 1.3.4 Each session had a moderator and a rapporteur.
- 1.3.5 The working language was English.
- 1.3.6 Arrangements were made for press coverage.
- 1.3.7 Other rules of procedure and working methods of the OSCE were applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the Conference.
- 1.3.8 The seating arrangement is shown in the Annex.

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

1.4 Agenda

Monday, 15 March 2004

9:00-9:30 Registration

9:30 Opening ceremony

Co-Chair:

H.E. Dr. Tatsuo Arima, Special Envoy of the Government of Japan

H.E. Ambassador Ján Kubiš, Secretary General of the OSCE

Keynote Address

H.E. Mr. Masatoshi Abe, Senior Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan

H.E. Mr. Ivan Petkov, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Bulgaria, Chairmanship of the OSCE

H.E. Mr. Willy Wimmer, Member of the German Bundestag, OSCE Parliamentary Assembly

10:15-10:30 Coffee Break

10:30-12:30 Session 1: Current Practices of OSCE and Security in Asia

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

Rapporteur: Mr. Karel Vosskuhler, Netherlands

Keynote speakers (10 minutes each)

Speakers

H.E. Ambassador Lamberto Zannier, Director, Conflict Prevention Centre, OSCE Secretariat

Dr. Thomas Wuchte, Politico-Military Advisor, Forum for Security Cooperation (FSC), USA / Dr. C.S. Eliot Kang, Senior Advisor/Foster Fellow of U.S. Department of State

Prof. Toshiya Hoshino, Osaka University, Japan

Mr. Kie-choen Lee, Deputy Director-General of Policy Planning Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Republic of Korea

Discussants

H.E. Ambassador Aleksi Harkonen, Permanent Representative of Finland to the OSCE

Ms. Martina Huber, Conflict Research Unit, Netherlands Institute for International Relations "Clingendael"

Mr. Koji Tsuruoka, Deputy Director-General of Foreign Bureau,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan

12:45 –14:00

Luncheon hosted by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan

Special Address

Dr. Akio Watanabe, Professor Emeritus at Tokyo University, President
of Research Institute of Peace and Security (RIPS)

Moderator

Mr. Yasuaki Tanizaki, Deputy Director-General of European Affairs
Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan

14:15-18:00

**Session 2: Combating International Terrorism
– Cases and Prospects in Europe and Asia, including the Issue of
Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD)**

Moderator: H.E. Dr. Tatsuo Arima, Special Envoy of the
Government of Japan

Rapporteur: H.E. Ambassador Bertrand De Crombrughe, Belgium

Speakers

H.E. Ambassador Francisco Seixas da Costa, Head of Permanent
Delegation of Portugal to the OSCE

H.E. Ambassador Halon Amin, Ambassador of Afghanistan to Japan

Dr. Anvar Azimov, Deputy Director for Multilateral European Co-
operation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Russian Federation

Prof. Naofumi Miyasaka, Associate Professor, Department of
International Relations, National Defence Academy, Japan

Mr. Michael D. Miggins, Head of Arms Control Policy Section,
Political Affairs and Security Policy Division, NATO

Discussants

H.E. Ambassador Brendan Moran, Head of Permanent Delegation of
Ireland to the OSCE / EU

H.E. Ambassador Rakhat Aliyev, Republic of Kazakhstan

H.E. Hiroshi Shigeta, Former Ambassador in Charge of International
Counter-Terrorism Co-operation, Japan

Dr. Piotr Antoni Switalski, Director of Strategy and Foreign Policy
Planning Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Poland

Mr. Nobushige Takamizawa, Director, Defence Policy Division,
Japanese Defence Agency

18:30-20:00

**Reception hosted by H.E. Mr. Masatoshi Abe, Senior Vice-Minister
for Foreign Affairs of Japan**

Tuesday, 16 March 2004

09:00-10:30

Session 3: Addressing Challenges to Security of Drugs, Human Trafficking and Small Arms – Cases and Prospects in Europe and Asia

Moderator: H.E. Ambassador Ján Kubiš, Secretary General of the OSCE

Rapporteur: Dr. Akiko Fukushima, Director of Policy Studies, National Institute for Research Advancement (NIRA)

Speakers

H.E. Ambassador Daan Everts, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands

H.E. Ambassador Dieter Boden, Head of the Permanent Mission of Germany to the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

Mr. Kitti Wasinondh, Director-General, Department of ASEAN Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Thailand

Mr. Li Genxin, Secretary-General of the China Arms Control and Disarmament Association, People's Republic of China.

Discussants

H.E. Ambassador Guido Lenzi, Permanent Representative of Italy to the OSCE

H.E. Ambassador Kaoru Ishikawa, Director-General, Multilateral Co-operation Department, Japan

Mr. Jure Gasparic, State Under-secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Slovenia

Dr. Wolfgang Zellner, Acting Head, Centre for OSCE Research at the IFSH

Dr. Sophie Boisseau du Rocher, Research Associate, Institut Français de Relations Internationales (IFRI), France

10:30-11.00

Coffee break

11:00-12:00

Wrap-up Session

Co-Chair:

H.E. Dr. Tatsuo Arima, Special Envoy of the Government of Japan

H.E. Ambassador Ján Kubiš, Secretary General of the OSCE

Reports by session rapporteurs

Chairpersons' summary

Closing Remarks

H.E. Academician Blagovest Sendov, Ambassador of the Republic of Bulgaria to Japan, on behalf of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office

Representative of Japan

12:00

Adjournment

2 Concluding summary by the Co-Chairpersons

At the invitation of the Government of Japan and in accordance with OSCE Permanent Council decision No. 577, the OSCE-Japan Conference on The Search for Effective Conflict Prevention in the New Security Circumstances - European Security Mechanisms and Security in Asia was held in Tokyo on 15 and 16 March 2004. This event was the second joint OSCE meeting with Japan. (The first one, on Comprehensive Security in Central Asia - Sharing OSCE and Asian Experiences, took place in December 2000, in Tokyo).

The Conference was opened by H.E. Mr. Masatoshi Abe, Senior Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, and H.E. Mr. Ivan Velikov Petkov, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Bulgaria. H.E. Mr. Willy Wimmer was also invited to address the opening session on behalf of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly. The Conference was co-chaired by H.E. Dr. Tatsuo Arima, Special Envoy of the Government of Japan, and Ambassador Ján Kubiš, Secretary General of the OSCE.

Thirty-four OSCE participating States took part in the Conference, including many representatives from the Vienna-based delegations and from capitals. Representatives from the four Partners for Co-operation in Asia, four Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation and international organizations also participated. Nine member States of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) participated as observers. In addition, various representatives of non-governmental organizations and academic institutions also took part, and were encouraged to continue exchanges by maintaining an academic network.

The Senior Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, H.E. Mr. Masatoshi Abe, referred in his opening address to the two major aims of the Conference. The first one was to deepen mutual understanding of the new security circumstances. The second one was to contribute to efforts to combat new threats, such as international terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and missiles, and also to the search for effective prevention of regional conflicts through the promotion of dialogue and co-operation among participants by sharing knowledge and experience in those fields. Mr. Abe stressed the need for the international community to co-operate closely on common ground in dealing with these challenges.

H.E. Mr. Ivan Velikov Petkov, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Bulgaria, stated that, pursuant to the decisions adopted during the Eleventh Ministerial Council Meeting in Maastricht, in December 2003, an enhancement of the OSCE dialogue with the Partners for Co-operation had become increasingly important. The Conference afforded an excellent opportunity to share experiences on conducting crisis prevention activities and to discuss ways of further promoting dialogue between the OSCE and the Asian Partners for Co-operation on security matters. The event could also lay the foundation for regular exchanges of views and closer co-operation between the OSCE, the Asian Partners and other nations in the region, as well as Asian security-related bodies, on combating terrorism and organized crime.

In his address, H.E. Mr. Willy Wimmer, Representative of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, welcomed the hosting of the Conference by Japan. That was a clear indication of the importance attached by Japan to a peaceful unfolding of events in a complex region. The

experiences gained by the OSCE in preventive diplomacy, arms control and disarmament could be a source of inspiration for the Asian region.

The work of the Conference was conducted in three sessions: (1) *Current Practices of the OSCE and Security in Asia*; (2) *Combating International Terrorism: Cases and Prospects in Europe and Asia, including the Issue of Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD)*; and (3) *Addressing Challenges to Security of Drugs, Human Trafficking and Small Arms: Cases and Prospects in Europe and Asia*.

In the first session on ‘Current Practices of the OSCE and Security in Asia’, the Moderator concluded that the history and culture of security in Asia and Europe differed. In Asia, a patient, gradual and pragmatic approach was required, also with regard to the development of a security concept. Different views were expressed on the importance of institutionalization, but there was a general agreement that a basic framework for co-operation was needed to facilitate the implementation of practical measures. It would be necessary to go beyond the inter-State level and pay due attention to the role of non-State actors and the non-governmental community. There was a recognition of the beneficial role of the United States in the region, which would be compatible with a co-operative security framework. China’s role was steadily gaining in significance. There was also a general appreciation of the need to strengthen the OSCE’s co-operation with its Partners and with relevant international organizations in the region, such as the Shanghai Co-operation Organization (SCO).

In session two, on ‘Combating International Terrorism: Cases and Prospects in Europe and Asia, including the Issue of Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD)’, statements were made on regional initiatives by OSCE participating States and by Partner States to combat terrorism. Both preventive or defensive and repressive measures were highlighted, yet all the participants emphasized the importance of international agreement and co-operation. There was widespread agreement that the discussion about the exact nature of terrorism and the complexity of addressing it should not stand in the way of progress in several areas. Those included the universal ratification of multilateral instruments, clear intergovernmental co-operation within the OSCE and between OSCE participating States and Asian Partners for Co-operation, renewed efforts in public diplomacy to mobilize against terrorism and the focusing of special attention on causes of international terrorism and ways to resolve them. It was emphasized that the fight against terrorism was more efficient when human rights commitments were implemented and international humanitarian law was taken into account. The result would be avoiding the creation of new breeding grounds for terrorism and fostering the necessary resilience in opposing the terrorists’ objectives.

In session three, on ‘Addressing Challenges to Security of Drugs, Human Trafficking and Small Arms: Cases and Prospects in Europe and Asia’, the discussion revealed that trafficking in all its forms represented a growing transnational threat, that each form of trafficking required specific responses, and that revenues from trafficking often funded terrorism and violent conflicts. On human trafficking, it was noted that the number of victims was large and rising. Measures to combat that crime must be comprehensive, ranging from prevention of trafficking and protection of victims to prosecution of the perpetrators. The OSCE Action Plan to Combat Trafficking in Human Beings was introduced to the participants. On the subject of trafficking in small arms and light weapons (SALW), it was stressed that the excessive and destabilizing accumulation and uncontrolled spread of SALW posed a major security risk. Regarding drugs, it was recognized that the problem was multidimensional in nature, and undermined human and economic development, social

cohesion and the security and stability of the countries affected and that enhanced international and regional co-operation were therefore required to deal with it. Trafficking of all kinds could be controlled effectively by a combination of national, regional and global efforts.

In their conclusion, the Co-Chairpersons highlighted the following main proposals and suggestions:

- There are many OSCE activities that could serve as useful examples for Asia, as countries in the region consider steps to enhance preventive diplomacy;
- There may be scope for collaboration on the efforts undertaken by the OSCE and the ARF in tackling transnational and non-traditional security challenges. Such a common focus could provide an excellent basis for exchanges and cross-learning between the two organizations;
- The recently adopted OSCE Strategy to Address Threats to Security and Stability in the Twenty-First Century might be relevant beyond the OSCE region;
- On the issue of SALW and trafficking in human beings, it was proposed to consider arranging joint events with interested partners in Asia and the OSCE, taking into account that the two regions could benefit greatly by jointly addressing and combating such transboundary and transregional problems.

In the wrap-up session, the representative of the OSCE Chairmanship, H.E. Academician Blagovest Sendov, Ambassador of the Republic of Bulgaria to Japan, stated that following the Eleventh OSCE Ministerial Council meeting, which took place in Maastricht, Netherlands, the enhanced dialogue with the Partners for Co-operation had become a priority area of the Organization's activities. During the Conference current security circumstances in Europe and Asia were extensively reviewed and a number of new ideas and policy recommendations were elaborated. The Conference had attained its goals by contributing to the efforts of the international community in ensuring regional stability and security in Asia and combating new threats such as terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, trafficking in human beings, illicit trade in small arms and light weapons, narcotic drugs, sensitive materials and technologies.

The participants expressed their gratitude to the Government of Japan and the OSCE for jointly organizing and hosting the Conference, and carrying out diligent preparations. They welcomed the successful outcome. Japan was especially thanked for the warm hospitality provided to the participants.

On 16 March in the afternoon, all the OSCE-Japan Conference participants were invited to take part in an informal meeting with the participants of the ARF Workshop on Preventive Diplomacy, co-hosted by Japan and Thailand (on 17-18 March). During the meeting, the Secretary General of the OSCE, Ambassador Ján Kubiš, was invited to make an intervention on the outcome of the OSCE-Japan Conference. The Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre/OSCE Secretariat, Ambassador Lamberto Zannier, was also requested to intervene and provided an overview of preventive diplomacy tools in the OSCE. An exchange of views ensued.

3 Reports by session rapporteurs

3.1 Session One: Current Practices of OSCE and Security in Asia

Report by Mr. Karel Vosskuehler, Deputy Head of the Permanent Representation of the Netherlands to the OSCE

In Session 1, a focused, analytical and reasonably interactive exchange took place on the relevance of the CSCE/OSCE experience to the Asian security scene. Both its potential and limits to its applicability in the Asian regional context were discussed.

Ambassador Zannier presented a factual overview of the OSCE's institutional arrangements and toolbox, which functioned on the basis of dialogue. The consensus rule reinforced the sense of ownership by participating States. Even under the adverse conditions of the Cold War, joint commitments had been agreed upon. Particularly in the politico-military sphere, there was much that could be shared with interested parties in Asia.

In a joint presentation, Thomas Wuchte and Eliot Kang elaborated on politico-military issues, with reference to the experience of the Forum for Security Co-operation and the new OSCE Strategy to Address Threats to Security and Stability in the Twenty-First Century, emphasizing features such as the comprehensive multidimensional security concept and the OSCE's flexible, non-bureaucratic approach. Even when taking account of the specific conditions prevalent in Asia, there was scope for developing approaches to conflict prevention based on the OSCE's experiences, and the new threats and challenges gave a special incentive for co-operation.

Professor Hoshino drew a favourable response from his audience by his characterization of the new threats as asymmetric, amorphous and anarchic, and of the OSCE's characteristics as bridging, regional and non-confrontational. While there was great need for bridge-building in Asia, the development of a regional approach would have to be combined with bilateral approaches in which the US played a central role. The China factor was changing in a positive way. The rule of law would have to be at the centre of any Asian approach to dealing with the new threats.

Mr. Kie-cheon Lee also expressed the view that, on balance, the prospects for applying some of the OSCE's comprehensive approach in Asia were improving. A long-term vision would probably have to be combined with a step-by-step approach. Making efforts to establish a regime of peace on the Korean peninsula would be important for multilateral security co-operation. Multilateral approaches would have to complement bilateral approaches, and efforts would have to be made to engage North Korea. Interaction with the six-party talks would contribute towards overcoming mutual distrust and building confidence in Asia.

Ambassador Harkonen described the OSCE's decisions adopted at the Maastricht Ministerial Council related to outreach and a strengthening of co-operation with Partners, distinguishing between applicability of the CSCE/OSCE model on the one hand and increased co-operation with Partners on the other, all in the context of a division of labour with other international organizations. Soft security seemed likely to remain the OSCE's niche.

Martina Huber pointed out that, within the OSCE's comprehensive approach, measures that were good in one field could prove counterproductive in another. Strong points of the OSCE were its involvement in governance issues and with non-state actors, but priority-fixing was not its strength. The gradual evolution of CSBMs in the CSCE's early days, when linkage and parallelism had not blocked progress, was probably more relevant to Asian States than the more institutionalized OSCE. A broader political framework was needed. She also noted the need for special attention to be paid to the rule of law.

Mr. Tsuruoka saw the ARF as a natural focal point for the region. Some institutionalization was needed, and political attention would have to be brought to a higher level. Clearly the new threats transcended the inter-State level and globalization played a further reinforcing role. Any new form of co-operation should not damage the successful hub-and-spokes co-operation with the US, but it was clear that the States of the region would have to assume greater responsibility for their own security.

During the succeeding debate, speakers reacted to various aspects of the presentations, dealing with both commonalities and differences between the security cultures and conditions in Asia and Europe. It was pointed out that the OSCE's work in the politico-military sphere was based on a common concept that was still lacking in Asia. A presentation was made of the genesis of the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-Building Measures in Asia (CICA) process, which shared common features with the OSCE process. There was a discussion on the relative importance of institutionalization of the OSCE process, which was a cumulative, voluntary process based on convergence. Some speakers emphasized the need to be patient and not too ambitious, also recalling that the CSCE, and in particular its work on CSBMs had needed a long time to take off.

Both the role of the US in the region and the crucial, now more beneficial, China factor were discussed. One speaker pointed out that the OSCE's record in implementing some of its norms and standards, such as the inviolability of borders, was far from spotless and drew attention to the complications inherent in applying those standards in the grey zones outside of national control. Another speaker noted that, given the new threats and the increasing important role played by non-State actors, much had changed since the CSCE's early successes. As another speaker pointed out, the current threats to security and stability were less predictable than the former security risks and were not easy to tackle. Another speaker referred to the role of NGOs as partners for security. Remarks were made about Japan's role in confronting the proliferation of WMD. A brief statement was made on the European Union's new strategy document, which had conflict prevention at its heart.

The Chairperson summed up, saying that the histories and cultures of security in Asia and Europe differed and that, for Asia, a patient, gradual, pragmatic, bottom-up approach seemed indicated, also in the development of underlying concepts. On the importance of institutionalization, different views had been expressed, but clearly only a minimum was needed. It would be necessary to move beyond the inter-State level and pay due attention to the role of non-State actors and the non-governmental community. There had been a general recognition that the beneficial role of the US in the region (hub and spokes) should not be damaged and that the China factor was becoming more beneficial. There had also been a general consensus regarding the need to strengthen the OSCE's co-operation with its Partners and with relevant international organizations in the region, such as the Shanghai Cooperation Organization.

3.2 Session Two: Combating International Terrorism - Cases and Prospects in Europe and Asia, including the Issue of Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD)

Report by H.E. Ambassador Bertrand De Crombrughe, Head of the Permanent Mission of Belgium to the OSCE

H.E. Dr. Tatsuo Arima, Special Envoy of the Government of Japan, moderated the session.

The first keynote speaker, H.E. Ambassador Francisco Seixas da Costa, Head of the Permanent Delegation of Portugal to the OSCE, indicated at the outset that institutions had constantly to demonstrate their added value. That was a complex matter, particularly where terrorism was concerned, because the nature and ramifications of the phenomenon were not yet fully understood. For instance, even in the immediate aftermath of 11 September 2001, it had not been possible to finalize the comprehensive international convention against terrorism. Later, the Charter on Preventing and Combating Terrorism had been adopted at the Porto Ministerial Council Meeting in December 2002, under Portuguese Chairmanship. It represented a balancing act and contained a clear mandate for action. Still, the issue required more focus. He reminded the participants of initiatives that had been taken, that were being taken or that still were to be taken. He listed some very specific ones: ratification of multilateral conventions, improvement of document security, reduction of the spread of MANPADS and follow-up to the work initiated in the UN Counter-Terrorism Committee (UN Security Council Resolution 1373). The OSCE and the UNODC had hosted an international conference on precisely that subject on 11 and 12 March 2004.

The second keynote speaker, H.E. Ambassador Halon Amin, Ambassador of Afghanistan to Japan, described how Afghanistan had moved from terror to tolerance. He evoked the work of the US-Pakistan-Afghanistan Tripartite Commission on Trilateral Intelligence Cooperation, the deployment of smaller US military units in southern Afghanistan and the dispatch of provincial reconstruction teams to illustrate how the fight against terrorism could be made more efficient. In contrast, the threat generated by record levels of cultivation of, and trade in, narcotic drugs had increased. Massive efforts in law enforcement were being made with the support of major donors. Ambassador Amin emphasized, however, that enforcement alone was not enough. Since fanaticism fed on poverty, sustainable development initiatives must address, apart from the masses, disenchanted, disfranchised and disillusioned individuals, ready to be hired again by terrorist networks. He concluded by pointing to the contribution that the Conference was making towards bridging the gap between people whose heritage traced to different civilizations, faiths and orientations.

The third keynote speaker, Dr. Anvar Azimov, Deputy Director-General of the European Cooperation Department at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, called for renewed effort to bring about unity and co-ordination within the international community in the fight against terrorism. Anti-terrorist solidarity was being eroded by lingering differences of approach between States and by the inertia of the logic of double standards. The focus must return to a flexible global system capable of preventing as well as resolving situations of terrorism-related crime. To achieve that, four goals must be pursued: first, improve the international legal basis for antiterrorist-action, in particular with a view to international legal assistance; second, intensify the fight against the financing of terrorism; third, interdict access by terrorists to weapons of mass destruction; and fourth, increase control over the

trade in conventional weaponry. Practice pointed clearly towards the need to strengthen the United Nations. He called for technical assistance to countries and for increased co-operation with regional and subregional international organizations. He also described Russia's participation in and co-operation with the G-8, EU, OSCE, Russia-NATO Council, Council of Europe, Shanghai Cooperation Organization, ASEAN, ASEAN-ARF, APEC, CIS and the Collective Security Treaty Organization. He singled out the growing flow of contraband drugs, primarily from Afghanistan, as a particular threat, and mentioned the initiative Russia was taking in that regard on a UN-sponsored comprehensive international strategy.

The fourth keynote speaker, Professor Naofumi Miyasaka, Associate Professor at the Department of International Relations of the National Defence Academy in Japan, summarized developments in international terrorism since the 1990s. He described a decline in State sponsorship; a global marketing phenomenon in respect of weapons, technology, training and financing of terrorism; an increasingly leaderless movement, where "decapitation" had no effect; and an unprecedented freedom of movement made possible by weak States. He described a typology of terrorism through weapons of mass destruction, indicating that terrorists could reach their goals through a credible threat, whether or not they actually used such weapons. He also suggested that terrorists might be tempted by weapons of mass destruction if only because of the emphasis that governments were placing on distinguishing them from conventional means. He based his comments further on two case studies: the Al Qaeda threat and the Aum Shinrikyo attacks.

The fifth keynote speaker, Mr. Michael D. Miggins, Head of the Arms Control Policy Section in the Political Affairs and Security Policy Division at NATO Headquarters, described NATO's activities in the area of non-proliferation. He reminded the audience that the use or threatened use of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) had shaped many of the major crises over the past century: from the use of gas across the front-lines, through the nuclear age, to the Aum Shinrikyo attacks in Japan and the anthrax crisis in the United States in 2001. Proliferation of ballistic missile technology and of dual-use items was likewise a cause for concern. Multilateral agreements and initiatives, such as the Proliferation through Shipping Initiative (that had already resulted in 33 actual searches), had been the response but NATO was of the view that there continued to be a specific threat to its territory, populations and forces. It had launched a WMD initiative in 1999 to promote a better understanding of the issues and to find out how best to respond to them. Since that time, a WMD Centre had been established which helped co-ordinating WMD-related activities, improved intelligence and information sharing and supported defence efforts directed towards ensuring the Alliance's preparedness. Other NATO bodies had tackled issues such as threats by non-State actors, ballistic missiles, nuclear, bacteriological and chemical agents, missile defence and proliferation. Missile defence issues might be an area for useful NATO-Japan dialogue in the future. MANPADS and small arms and light weapons are being addressed through the Partnership for Peace work programmes and through co-operation with the OSCE.

H.E. Ambassador Brendan Moran, Head of the Permanent Delegation of Ireland to the OSCE and representative of the current EU Presidency, opened the discussion. He explained the actions the EU was undertaking in the fight against terrorism. The EU Security Strategy emphasized international co-operation. In that context, he outlined the work done together with Asian partners, including bilaterally with Japan, within the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM), with ASEAN and through technical co-operation with countries such as the Philippines and Indonesia. The EU had a specific strategy for combating the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, which focused on universal adoption of multilateral

instruments. It was seeking to develop new measures to strengthen the International Atomic Energy Agency, to preserve dual technology from improper use and to protect sensitive sites. It was also seeking to eliminate underlying tensions and bring about political solutions, *inter alia*, by fostering regional co-operation, so as to help mitigate the very reasons for acquiring those types of weapons. Lastly, he recalled that the EU Commission was financing the project on border management in Central Asia and the border monitoring operation in Georgia.

H.E. Ambassador Bolat Nurgaliev, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Kazakhstan to Japan, stated that terrorism was not geographically bound and that there was a linkage with poverty and illiteracy. In his mind, however, the main threat arose from the lack of stability in Afghanistan. The Collective Security Treaty concluded between Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and the Russian Federation in January 2002 had therefore taken on a crucial value. As regarded weapons of mass destruction, he explained the successful disarmament process undertaken by Kazakhstan in the 1990s.

H.E. Hiroshi Shigeta, Former Ambassador in Charge of International Counter-Terrorism Co-operation, opened his statement by saying that terrorism actually was not something new but that it had changed in nature. Radicalism was the source and it was necessary to ask who the enemy was, in order to fight him effectively. In his view, it was a mistake to expand the scope of the fight against terrorism to the area of rogue States, failed States, Iraq or, today, to the ambition to create a new Middle East. That strained the commonality of sentiment that had existed just after 9/11. Also, it risked encouraging the emergence of hiding grounds for terrorists. Finally, it had to be understood that Al Qaeda was not an organization of the poor. To fight it, more was needed than military means; public diplomacy, education, and so on, were also required.

Mr. Piotr Antoni Switalski, Director of the Strategy and Foreign Policy Planning Department at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Poland, said that he was going to raise difficult questions. The OSCE needed to invent responses to new threats of which it had had hardly any experience. Should it not also look at the periphery of its geographical remit? How should it respond to the impression that the OSCE's Partners for Co-operation needed it less than it seemed to need its Partners? He also thought that, in the conflict cycle, we had already moved beyond the stage of conflict prevention.

Mr. Nobushige Takamizawa, Director of the Defence Policy Division at the Japanese Defence Agency, commented mainly on weapons of mass destruction. He cited Iraq and North Korea as cases demonstrating that more credible intelligence had to be developed. Proliferation was difficult to stop and, therefore, countries would do better to engage in the management of consequences. Japan had decided to pursue a missile defence system. It wished to do so in co-operation with friends and allies. It also viewed export control, and initiatives such as the Proliferation through Shipping Initiative as essential.

The Moderator opened the floor with the remark that two positions appeared to be juxtaposed: one holding that fanaticism fed on poverty, and another one that terror had nothing to do with poverty, that on the contrary, the fight must be concentrated on Al Qaeda.

A lively discussion ensued. One speaker expressed doubts as to whether the international community was implementing the right policies: on the one hand, the Taliban had been

expelled from power in Afghanistan; on the other, drug production and trafficking had increased, boding ill for the future. Governments might have to show more restraint in intervening. In reply, it was pointed out that dealing separately with distinct issues was unavoidable. In response to the position that terrorism had no justification whatsoever and that organized extremism deserved to be met with no tolerance at all, some rejoined that the root causes had to be addressed, or at least, that an effort had to be made to “deconstruct” the phenomenon and understand it. In reply it was stated that the search for root causes might take too long to be practical. One speaker gave the example of Northern Ireland, where the decision had been taken to adopt a political, rather than a martial law, type of approach. Another speaker suggested tackling head on clear-cut causes to which the international community had answers, such as rogue States, economic disarray and criminality, while leaving the other issues for further research.

The need to preserve human rights and humanitarian law was reiterated. A link was further established between the fight against terrorism and effective co-operation, not only in the area of law enforcement, but also in the area of border management and security. So-called 'closed-club' approaches, however, were not looked upon as helpful. Other speakers called attention to the fact that border security and management had been the subject of a task assigned to the OSCE, and that results were expected by the end of the year. It was also stated that border security and management was an issue that went beyond terrorism.

In regard to weapons of mass destruction, it was alleged that the world found itself in “Frankenstein - type” situations and that single-issue seminars were needed to address their complexities. The meeting was informed that a Hans Blix Fund was being set up to encourage multilateral non-proliferation efforts. One speaker denounced the lack of legal guarantees given to States that had renounced nuclear weapons: double standards were apparently being applied. Finally, one speaker expressed clear support for the view that the civilian benefits of nuclear energy had to be available to everyone, be it under tight international surveillance.

3.3 Session Three: Addressing Challenges to Security of Drugs, Human Trafficking and Small Arms – Cases and Prospects in Europe and Asia

Report by Dr. Akiko Fukushima, Director of Policy Studies, National Institute for Research Advancement (NIRA)

Session 3 addressed specific challenges to security, namely, trafficking in drugs, human beings and small arms and light weapons (SALW). The discussion revealed that trafficking in all its forms represented a transnational threat that was on the rise and that trafficking funded violent conflicts and terrorism. Trafficking posed a common challenge and demanded a comprehensive and joint approach. Trafficking of every kind represented a threat to both human and national security, often targeting the most vulnerable strata of societies and weakest States in terms of institutional capacity and governance. It was also pointed out that trafficking seriously undermined economic development and social cohesion, as well as the security and stability of the countries affected.

It was noted that, in combating trafficking, problems needed to have a common identification and assessment, and that specific forms of trafficking required specific responses on both the supply and demand sides that went beyond national and regional boundaries, to be followed by common actions nationally, regionally and globally. Legal loopholes in international law should also be filled in controlling trafficking.

On trafficking in human beings, it was noted that the number of victims of human trafficking was large and was increasing rather than diminishing. Moreover, it was underscored that the fundamental causes of human trafficking, including the victims' need to support their families, should also be addressed.

The OSCE and its participating States had adopted the Action Plan to Combat Trafficking in Human Beings in 2003 and would soon appoint a Special Representative on Trafficking Issues within the OSCE to implement the action decided on at the Maastricht Ministerial Council of the OSCE in December 2003. The Action Plan was comprehensive ranging from prevention of trafficking and protection of victims to prosecution of the criminals involved. It was pointed out that with a view to controlling trafficking in human beings, the OSCE had assisted countries in drafting legislation to combat trafficking, training police officers and judges, setting up national referral mechanisms for victims and supporting NGOs in establishing prevention campaigns and shelters for victimized women. It was also noted that continued co-operation and monitoring at the national, regional and global levels were essential for assisting countries of origin, transit and destination of trafficking.

On drug trafficking, it was noted that the concept should not be limited to trafficking in narcotic drugs, but should also comprise trafficking in amphetamines and the like, as well as precursors and chemicals for clandestine manufacturing of illicit drugs. It was pointed out that ASEAN had promoted co-operation in the fight against drug abuse and trafficking within its own ambit and with other countries, *inter alia*, by the promotion of public awareness of the dangers of drugs and social response, and strengthening of the rule of law including in the context of border management.

On trafficking in small arms and light weapons (SALW) and MANPADs, it was stated that the excessive accumulation and uncontrolled spread of such weapons posed a major security

risk. SALW were often used as the primary weapons in violent conflicts, which often claimed civilian victims. The use of such weapons also disrupted humanitarian assistance and reconstruction work and favoured recurrence of conflicts and an increase in violent crimes. Effectively collecting and destroying small arms and restricting illegal trade in SALW and MANPADs posed a global security challenge.

It was noted that the OSCE had developed an effective set of tools to curb the illicit spread of SALW, to reduce existing stocks, to regulate trade in SALW and to provide assistance in the control or elimination of surplus arms to OSCE participating States that requested it. The OSCE had adopted the OSCE Document on SALW in 2000 and had recently published a Handbook of Best Practice Guides on Small Arms and Light Weapons, which aided governments in policy making and implementation.

In order to combat trafficking in SALW, it was also pointed out that suppliers or exporters of such weapons should be made aware of its implications. Marking and tracing were also recognized being essential in halting illegal trade in SALW outside their countries of origin.

At the end of the third session, the moderator, Ambassador Kubiš, Secretary General of the OSCE, without attempting to make a final recapitulation or summary, highlighted several points made the participants which he found particularly relevant:

- Common issues required common assessment and common responses, joint efforts and action;
- Efforts could be successful if they were combined with global, regional and national action;
- Specific forms of trafficking require specific responses and approaches;
- In addressing such transnational and non-traditional threats, the existence of legal loopholes and insufficient mechanisms could be mitigated by adhering to and fully using and implementing the existing legal instruments, be they global (UN) or regional, as well as by actively sharing national and regional experiences;
- An increase in co-operation among the UN, the OSCE and ARF was advisable;
- In that context, the two proposals for organizing joint events on combating trafficking in SALW and in human beings with interested partners in Asia and the OSCE, perhaps under the aegis of the UN, were deserving of support;
- Co-operation in other areas mentioned by the participants, e.g. regional networking of law enforcement agencies, support in capacity-building, co-operation in measures to strengthen border security and management or horizontal links with civil societies to mobilize them against trafficking might be considered.

4 List of participants

OSCE PARTICIPATING STATES

Germany

H.E. Ambassador Dieter BODEN Head of the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the OSCE
Mr. Ullrich KLOECKNER First Counsellor, German Embassy in Tokyo

United States of America

Mr. Walter DALCH Director, Office of Conventional Arms Control, U.S. Department of State
Mr. Thomas WUCHTE Foreign Area Officer, Office of Conventional Arms Control, U.S. Department of State
Dr. C.S. Eliot KANG Senior Adviser, Bureau of Arms Control, U.S. Department of State
Mr. Adam BLOOMQUIST Foreign Affairs Officer, Bureau of Arms Control, U.S. Department of State
Mr. Giovanni SNIDLE Special Advisor, Bureau of Arms Control, U.S. Department of State

Austria

H.E. Ambassador Peter MOSER Austrian Embassy in Tokyo

Azerbaijan

Mr. Kamil XASIYEV Deputy Head of the Permanent Mission of Azerbaijan to the OSCE

Belgium

H.E. Ambassador Bertrand DE CROMBRUGGHE Head of the Belgian Delegation to the OSCE

Bosnia and Herzegovina

H.E. Ambassador Dr. Bisera TURKOVIC Head of the Permanent Mission of Bosnia Herzegovina to the OSCE

Bulgaria/OSCE Chairmanship

H.E. Mr. Ivan PETKOV Deputy-Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Bulgaria
H.E. Academician Blagovest SENDOV Ambassador of the Republic of Bulgaria to Japan
Mr. Rakovski LASHEV State Expert, Directorate "OSCE Chairmanship", MFA
Mrs. Viara STEFANOVA Counsellor, Embassy of the Republic of Bulgaria in Tokyo
Mrs. Natalia MISHEVA Expert, Directorate "Asia, Australia and Oceania", MFA

Canada

Ms. Barbara MARTIN Director, Regional Security and Peacekeeping Department of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Ian TRITES Second Secretary (Political) and Vice-Consul, Embassy of Canada in Tokyo
Mr. Philip CORDIER Third Secretary (Political), Embassy of Canada in Tokyo

Croatia

H.E. Ambassador Drago BUVAC Ambassador of Croatia to Japan
Ms. Natalija BRMBOTA Minister-Counsellor, Embassy in Tokyo

Spain

Mr. Arturo PEREZ MARTINEZ Deputy Head of the Permanent Mission of Spain to the OSCE

Mr. Julio HERRAIZ	Political Counsellor, Embassy of Spain in Tokyo
H.E. Ambassador Aleksii HÄRKÖNEN	Finland
Mr. Matti HEIMONEN	Permanent Representative of Finland to the OSCE Minister-Counsellor, Embassy of Finland in Tokyo
Mr. Paul GRAHAM	France
H.E. Ambassador Colin MUNRO	Political Counsellor, Embassy of France in Japan
Ms. Polyxeni PETROPOULOU	United Kingdom
Dr. Gabor GYORIVANYI	Head of the UK Delegation to the OSCE
H.E. Ambassador Brendan MORAN	Greece
Mr. Gilbert DUBOIS	First Counsellor, Embassy of Greece in Tokyo
Mr. Cornelis KEIJZER	Hungary
H.E. Ambassador Ingimundr SIGFUSSON	First Secretary, Embassy of Hungary in Tokyo
Mr. Benedikt HASKULDSSON	Ireland/EU Presidency
H.E. Ambassador Guido LENZI	Head of the Permanent Mission of Ireland to the OSCE
Mr. Enrico VATTANI	European Commission
H.E. Ambassador Bolat NURGALIEV	Head of Unit, OSCE and Council of Europe, Directorate General for External Relations
Mr. Yerlan KUBASHEV	Counsellor, Delegation of the EC in Japan
Mr. Ashat RYSKULOV	Iceland
Ms. Elisabeth HALLENSTVEDT	Embassy of Iceland in Tokyo
Mr. Ove Christian OWE	Minister-Counsellor, Embassy of Iceland in Tokyo
Mr. Durbek AMANOV	Italy
Mr. Aziz ALIEV	Permanent Representative of Italy to OSCE First Secretary, Embassy of Italy in Tokyo
H.E. Ambassador Daan EVERTS	Kazakhstan
Mr. Karel VOSSKUEHLER	Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Kazakhstan to Japan
Mr. Peter GORISSEN	Second Secretary, Embassy of the Republic of Kazakhstan to Japan
Mr. Jan HEIDSMA	Kyrgyzstan
Ms. Wendela HARINGHUIZEN	Deputy Head of the Kyrgyz Delegation to the OSCE
	Norway
	Second Secretary, Royal Norwegian Embassy in Tokyo
	Trainee, Royal Norwegian Embassy in Tokyo
	Uzbekistan
	Director, UN and International Political Organizations Department, MFA
	Attaché, Permanent Mission of Uzbekistan to the OSCE in Vienna
	Netherlands/OSCE Troika
	Head OSCE Task Force
	Deputy Permanent Representative of the Netherlands to the OSCE
	Colonel, Permanent Representation of the Netherlands to the OSCE
	Minister Plenipotentiary, Royal Netherlands Embassy in Tokyo
	Political Section, Royal Netherlands Embassy, Tokyo

Dr. Piotr SWITALSKI
Mr. Jacek BYLICA
Ms. Jadwiga RODOWICZ

H.E. Ambassador Francisco SEIXAS DA
COSTA

Mr. George Cristian MAIOR
Mr. Ovidiu Mihai COCENESCU
Mr. Serban LUNGU
Mr. Sorin George SAVA
Mr. Petre-Gheorghe STOIAN
Ms. Laura MIHAI

Dr. Alexander A. IVANOV
Mr. Anwar AZIMOV
Mr. V. KIREEV
Mr. E. SHUMILOV
Mr. N. NOZDREV

H.E. Ambassador Dr. Predrag FILIPOV
Mr. Slobodan PROSIC
Mr. Aleksandar DJORDJEVIC

H.E. Ambassador Julius HAUSER
Ms. Monika KEIMOVA

Mr. Jure GASPARIC
H.E. Ambassador Robert BASEJ
Mr. Bernard ŠRAJNER

Mr. Henrik NILSSON

H.E. Ambassador Karel ZABRAKOVSKY
Mr. Ivan VLCEK

Mr. Aykut KUMBAROGLU

Ambassador Yurii KOSTENKO
Mr. Olexandr ISHENKO

PARTNERS FOR CO-OPERATION

H.E. Ambassador Haron AMIN
Mr. Mohd Noor AKBARY

Poland

Director, Policy Planning Department
Director, Security Policy Department, MFA
Minister-Counsellor, Embassy in Tokyo

Portugal

Permanent Representative of Portugal to the OSCE

Romania

Secretary of State for Defence Policy, Ministry of
National Defence
Deputy Director –Strategic Affairs Directorate,
Ministry of National Defence
Director – Defence Integrated Planning Directorate,
Ministry of National Defence
PR Officer, Ministry of National Defence
Counsellor, Embassy in Tokyo
Third Secretary, MFA

Russian Federation

Director, Department of Asia-Pacific Regional
Issues, MFA
Deputy Director, Department of European Co-
operation, MFA
First Secretary, Embassy in Tokyo
First Secretary, Embassy in Tokyo
Second Secretary, Embassy in Tokyo

Serbia and Montenegro

Ambassador of Serbia and Montenegro to Japan
First Counsellor, Embassy in Tokyo
Third Secretary, Embassy in Tokyo

Slovakia

Ambassador of Slovakia to Japan
First Secretary, Politico-Military Dimension

Slovenia/OSCE Troika

State Under-secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Ambassador of the Republic of Slovenia in Japan
Counsellor Embassy of the Republic of Slovenia in
Japan

Sweden

First Secretary, Embassy in Tokyo

Czech Republic

Ambassador of the Czech Republic to Japan
Counsellor, Embassy in Tokyo

Turkey

First Secretary of the Turkish Embassy in Tokyo

Ukraine

Ambassador of Ukraine to Japan
First Secretary, Embassy of Ukraine to Japan

Ambassador of Afghanistan to Japan
Counsellor, Embassy of Afghanistan in Tokyo

Mr. Bashir MOHABBAT	Second Secretary, Embassy of Afghanistan in Tokyo
Dr. Tatsuo ARIMA	Japan Special Envoy of the Government of Japan, MFA
Mr. Koji TSURUOKA	Deputy Director-General of Foreign Policy Bureau, MFA
Mr. Yasuaki TANIZAKI	Deputy Director-General of European Affairs Bureau, MFA
Mr. Nobushige TAKAMIZAWA	Director of the Defence Policy Division, Japanese Defence Agency
H.E. Ambassador Kaoru ISHIKAWA	Director-General of Multilateral Cooperation Department
Mr. Masahiko HORIE	Director-General for International Relations, Defence Agency
Mr. Ichiro KOMATSU	Director-General of the European Affairs Bureau
Mr. Toshimitu ISHIGURE	Director of European International Organizations Division, MFA
Mr. Shinichi ASAZUMA	Principal Deputy Director, MFA
Ms. Mayumi FUKUSHIMA	Official, MFA
Mr. Tsuyoshi IDETA	Official, MFA
Mr. Yuchi SAKAMOTO	Assistant Director, MFA
Mr. Hisanobu MOCHIZUKI	First Secretary, Japanese Delegation, Vienna
Ms. Megumi YOSHII	MFA
Ms. Setsuko YAMAMOTO	MFA
H.E. Ambassador Chang-Beom CHO	Korea Ambassador of Korea to Austria
Mr. Kie-cheon LEE	Deputy Director-General of Policy Planning Department, MFA
Mr. Byong-jo KANG	Deputy Director of Security Policy Division, MFA
Ms. Vanvisa THAMRONGNAVASAWAT	Thailand Deputy Director-General, Department of International Organisations, MFA
Mr. Kittti WASINONDH	Director-General, Department of ASEAN Affairs, MFA
Ms. Tassani MIANCHAROEN	Deputy Director-General, Department of European Affairs, MFA
Ms. Napa SETTHAKORN	Director, Bureau of Anti-Trafficking in Women and Children, Ministry of Social Development and Human Security
Mr. Suriya CHINDAWONGSE	Counsellor, Department of ASEAN Affairs, MFA
Ms. Lada PHUMAS	First Secretary, Department of ASEAN Affairs, MFA

MEDITERRANEAN PARTNERS FOR CO-OPERATION

H.E. Ambassador Amar BENDJAMA	Algeria Ambassador of Algeria to Japan
Mr. Mustapha SEDDIKI	Minister Counsellor, Embassy of Algeria in Tokyo
H.E. Ambassador Hisham BADR	Egypt Ambassador the Arab Republic of Egypt to Japan
Mr. Salah SADEK	Counsellor, Embassy of the Arab Republic of Egypt to Japan
H.E. Ambassador Samir NAOURI	Jordan Ambassador of Jordan to Japan

Mr. Karim MASRI
First Secretary, Embassy in Tokyo

Morocco
H.E. Ambassador Abdelkader LECHEHEB
Ambassador of the Kingdom of Morocco to Japan
Mr. Nabigha HAJJI
Counsellor, Embassy of the Kingdom of Morocco
in Japan
Mr. Abdelilah EL HOUSNI
Minister Plenipotentiary, Embassy of the Kingdom
of Morocco in Japan

ARF MEMBER STATES

Indonesia
Mr. Arto Suryodipuro
Deputy Director, ASEAN Political Affairs
Mr. Lanang Geputro
Second Secretary, Indonesian Embassy

Laos
Mr. Khonepheng Thammavong
First Secretary

Malaysia
Mr. Ezuwan Hassan
Assistant Secretary
Dato' Siti Azizah Binti Sheikh Abod
Deputy Secretary General
Col. Roslan Bin Abdul Rashid
Military Officer

Mongolia
Dr. Zamba Batjargal
Ambassador

Myanmar
Col. Si Thu
Deputy Head of Department

New Zealand
Ms. Tredene Dobson
Policy Officer, North Asia Division

Philippines
Ms. Alicia C. Ramos
Assistant Secretary
Ms. Rosanna Marie B. Villamor
Third Secretary and Vice Counsel
Ms. Myca Fischer
Special Assistant, Office of the Under-secretary for
Policy

Singapore
Ms. Teo Lay Cheng
Deputy Director General
Ms. Yeo Seow Peng
Senior Policy Officer

Viet Nam
Snr. Col. Pham Cong Tuan
Deputy Director
Mr. Vu Ho
Officer

ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE

OSCE Secretariat

H.E. Ambassador Ján KUBIS
Secretary General
H.E. Ambassador Lamberto ZANNIER
Director, Conflict Prevention Centre
Dr. Monika WOHLFELD
Head of External Co-operation
Ms. Elizabeth ABELA
Senior External Co-operation Officer
Ms. Aldona SZYMANSKI
Senior External Co-operation Assistant

OSCE Parliamentary Assembly

Mr. Willy WIMMER
Member of the German Bundestag

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

United Nations Children's Fund

Mr. Yoshiteru URAMOTO
Director, UNICEF Tokyo
Ms. Asako SAEGUSA
Programme Officer, UNICEF Tokyo

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

Ms. Pirkko KOURULA
Regional Representative
Ms. Nathalie KARSENTY
Senior Legal Officer

- United Nations Development Programme**
Ms. Akiko YUGE Director, UNDP Tokyo Office
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization**
Mr. Michael MIGGINS Head, Arms Control Policy Section
- International Committee of the Red Cross**
Ms. Marguerite CONTAT HICKEL Diplomatic Adviser, Humanitarian Diplomacy Unit
- GUAM**
Mr. Oleksandr YUROV Executive Director of Information Office of GUAM
- NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS AND SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS**
- CASA ASIA, Spain**
Mr. Rafael BUENO Director, East-West Dialogue
- Center for International Relations, Poland**
Ms. Maria WAGROWSKA Journalist, Security Policy Expert
- Center for Pacific Asia Studies (CPAS) Stockholm University**
Dr. Masako IKEGAMI Associate Professor, Director
- Centre asie ifri, France**
Ms. Sophie BOISSEAU DU ROCHER Researcher
- Centre for OSCE Research at the IFSH**
Dr. Wolfgang ZELLNER Acting Head of Centre
- China Arms Control and Disarmament Association**
Mr. Genxin LI Secretary General
- International Christian University**
Professor Takako UETA International Christian University
- Kyoto University**
Professor Hiroshi NAKANISHI
- National Defense Academy, Japan**
Associate Prof. Naofumi MIYASAKA
- National Institute for Research Advancement, Japan**
Dr. Akiko FUKUSHIMA Director of Policy Studies and Senior Fellow
- Netherlands Institute of International Relations "Clingendael"**
Ms. Martina Huber Research Fellow
- Osaka University**
Professor Toshiya HOSHINO Osaka School of International Public Policy
- The Hiroshima Peace Institute**
Professor Nobumasa AKIYAMA Assistant Professor
- The Japan Forum on International Relations (JFIR)**
Mr. Ken JIMBO Director of Research
- The Japanese Institute for International Affairs (JIIA)**
Mr. Hiroshi SHIGETA Former Ambassador
- Tokyo University**
Dr Akio WATANABE Emeritus Professor, Chairman of the board of directors, Institute of Peace and Security
- University of Helsinki, Aleksanteri Institute**
Professor Marku KIVINEN Director
Dr. Timo HELLENBERG Director of EU-Office

5 List of documents

Number	Author	Document
001	OSCE-Japan	Agenda
002	OSCE-Japan	List of Participants
003	H.E. Mr. Masatoshi Abe, Senior Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan	Opening Statement
004	H.E. Mr. Ivan Petkov, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Bulgaria	Opening Statement
005	H.E. Mr. Willy Wimmer, Parliamentary Assembly	Statement
006	H.E. Ambassador Lamberto Zannier, Director, Conflict Prevention Centre, OSCE	Statement
007	Mr. Thomas Wuchte and Dr. C.S. Eliot Kang, U.S.A	Statement
008	Dr. Toshiya Hoshino, Osaka University, Japan	The State of Affairs and the Challenges in Security Cooperation in Asia – A Japanese Perspective
009	Mr. Lee Kie Cheon, Deputy Director-General for Policy Planning, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Republic of Korea	Lessons to be Drawn from the Experience of the OSCE for Multilateral Security Cooperation in Northeast Asia
010	Dr. Akio Watanabe, Professor Emeritus, University of Tokyo, President of the Research Institute for Peace and Security, Japan	Special Address at Luncheon – One World: Dream or Reality?
011	Ambassador Francisco Seixas da Costa, Portugal	Intervention
012	Prof, Naofumi Miyasaka, Japan	Speaking points
013	Dr. Anvar Azimov, Deputy Director, Department of European Cooperation, MFA, Russian Federation	Speech
014	Ambassador Daan Everts, Head of the OSCE Task Force, MFA, Netherlands	Statement under Session 3
015	H.E. Ambassador Dieter Boden	Abstract
016	Kaoru Ishikawa	External Factors for Asian Development
017	Mr. Michael Miggins, Head, Arms Control Policy Section Political Affairs and Security Policy Division, NATO	Presentation
018	Mr. Jure Gasparic, State Under-secretary, MFA Slovenia	Statement – OSCE border security management concept
019	H.E. Ambassador K. Nurgaliev, Kazakhstan	Presentation for Session 1 – The Role of the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-Building Measures in Asia in Maintaining Regional Security
020	H.E. Ambassador K. Nurgaliev, Kazakhstan	Presentation for Session 2 – Kazakhstan’s initiatives in Combating International Terrorism and Proliferation of WMD

021	Secretariat	Information on the Informal Meeting with the ARF Workshop Participants
022	H.E. Ambassador Haron Amin, Afghanistan	Statement
023	Mr. Perez Martinez, Spain	Statement – The Issue of Proliferation of WMD
024	Ambassador Dr. Dieter Boden, Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany to the OSCE	Presentation – Small Arms and Light Weapons in the OSCE – A German View
025	Mr. Perez Martinez, Spain	Statement – Combating Terrorism
026	Ms. Marguerite Contat Hickel, ICRC	Statement: Key points by the International Committee of the Red Cross
027	Mr. Kitti Wasinondh, Director-General of the Department of ASEAN Affairs, MFA of Thailand	Address
028	Dr. Oleksandr Yurov, Director of the GUUAM Information Office in Kiev	Statement
029	Mr. George Cristian Maior, Secretary of State for Defence Policy, Ministry of National Defence, Romania	Speech
030	Mr. Jure Gasparic, State Under-secretary, MFA Slovenia	Revised Statement No. 018
031	Co-Chairpersons	Concluding Summary
032	Mr. Li Genxin, Secretary-General of the Chine Arms Control and Disarmament Association, People's Republic of China	Talking points
033	H.E. Academician Blagovest Sendov, Ambassador of the Republic of Bulgaria to Tokyo, OSCE Chairmanship	Closing Remarks

6 Seating arrangement

