



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

EF.GAL/7/07
12 February 2007

ENGLISH only

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

Vienna, 22 and 23 January 2007

SUMMARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Theme, Format and Organizational Modalities for the Fifteenth Economic and Environmental Forum (Decision No. 735).....	3
Annotated Agenda of the Fifteenth Economic and Environmental Forum: Part I.....	6
Executive Summary.....	10
Closing Remarks by Mr. Bernard Snoy, Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities.....	15
Closing Remarks by H. E. Ambassador Sanchez de Boado, Chairman of the Permanent Council.....	18
Reports of the Rapporteurs.....	20
Opening Session.....	20
Session I Environmental security and the specific challenges of land degradation and soil contamination.....	23
Session II Environmental governance, in particular as it affects land degradation and soil contamination.....	25
Session III Social effects of land degradation and soil contamination.....	27
Session IV Environmental security and sustainable economic development.....	30
Panel Discussion The role of the OSCE in follow-up to the Forum.....	32
Log of Contributions to the Fifteenth Economic and Environmental Forum.....	36

618th Plenary Meeting
PC Journal No. 618, Agenda item 5

DECISION NO. 735
THEME, FORMAT AND ORGANIZATIONAL MODALITIES
FOR THE FIFTEENTH ECONOMIC FORUM

22 and 23 January 2007 and 21 to 23 May 2007

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, among others, previously agreed commitments to make the Economic Forum more dynamic through a change in format and to increase its effectiveness by an improved preparatory process and an effective procedure for ensuring follow-up of its deliberations, while remaining within the existing budgetary practice,

Taking into account the closing statement by the Chairperson of the Fourteenth Meeting of the Economic Forum,

Decides that,

1. The theme of the Fifteenth Economic Forum will be “Key challenges to ensure environmental security and sustainable development in the OSCE area: Land degradation, soil contamination and water management”.
2. The Fifteenth Economic Forum will be held over a period of five days, broken down as follows and without setting a precedent for future Economic Fora:
 - 2.1 On 22 and 23 January 2007 in Vienna;
 - 2.2 From 21 to 23 May 2007 in Prague.

Moreover, taking into account its tasks, the Economic Forum will review the implementation of commitments in the economic and environmental dimension. The review, to be integrated in the Prague segment of the Economic Forum, will address these OSCE-(2 - PC.DEC/735 6 July 2006) commitments and, in particular,

environmental commitments with a focus on international conventions, national legislation and international co-operation experiences.

3. Discussions of the Forum should benefit from input provided by other OSCE bodies and relevant meetings, including two conferences outside of Vienna, and deliberations in various international organizations.

4. Moreover, taking into account its tasks, the Economic 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.

5. 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.

6. As in previous years, the format of the Economic Forum should provide for the active involvement of relevant international organizations and encourage open discussions.

The following international organizations, international organs, regional groupings and conferences of States are invited to participate in the Fifteenth Economic Forum: Adriatic and Ionic Initiative; Asian Development Bank; Barents Euro-Arctic Council; Black Sea Economic Co-operation; Central European Initiative; Collective Security Treaty Organization; Commonwealth of Independent States; Council of the Baltic Sea States; Council of Europe; Danube Commission; Economic Co-operation Organization; Energy Charter Secretariat; Eurasian Economic Community; European Bank for Reconstruction and Development; European Environment Agency; European Investment Bank; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO); International Atomic Energy Agency; International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD); International Labour Organization; International Monetary Fund; International Organization for Migration; Interstate Council of the Central Asian Economic Union (CAEU); North Atlantic Treaty Organisation; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development; Organization for Democracy and Economic Development — GUAM (GUAM); Organization of the Islamic Conference; Secretariat of the Basel Convention; Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD); Secretariat of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands; Secretariat of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD); Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change; Shanghai Co-operation Organization; Southeast European Co-operative Initiative; South-East European Co-operation Process; Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe; United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL); United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD); United Nations Conference on Trade and Development; United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE); United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP); United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); United

Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF); United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN HABITAT); United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO); United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC); United Nations University (UNU); United Nations Population Fund (UNPF); United Nations Special Programme for the Economies of Central Asia (UN SPECA); World Bank Group; World Customs Organization (WCO); World Health Organization (WHO); World Meteorological Organization (WMO); World Tourism Organization (WTO); World Trade Organization(WTO) and other relevant organizations.

7. The Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation (Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Morocco and Tunisia) and the Partners for Co-operation (Afghanistan, Japan, Mongolia, the Republic of Korea and Thailand) are invited to participate in the Fifteenth Economic Forum.

8. 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 Fifteenth Economic Forum.

9. 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 Fifteenth Economic Forum.

10. In line with the practices established over the past years with regard to meetings of the Economic Forum and their preparatory process, the Chairperson of both meetings of the Economic Forum will present summary conclusions and policy recommendations drawn from the discussions. The Economic and Environmental Subcommittee 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

THE 15TH OSCE ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL FORUM
PART 1 / VIENNA, 22 - 23 JANUARY 2007

**KEY CHALLENGES TO ENSURE ENVIRONMENTAL
SECURITY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE
OSCE AREA: LAND DEGRADATION, SOIL
CONTAMINATION AND WATER MANAGEMENT**

ANNOTATED AGENDA

Monday, 22 January 2007

09.30 – 13:00 **Opening Session** (open to Press until 11.00)

09.30 – 10.00 **Welcoming remarks:**

- **Ambassador Carlos Sanchez de Boado**, Permanent Representative of Spain to the OSCE, OSCE Chairmanship
- **Ambassador Marc Perrin de Brichambaut**, Secretary General of the OSCE
- **Mr. Bernard Snoy**, Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities

10.00 – 11.00 **Keynote addresses – Global efforts to combat land degradation and soil contamination and the OSCE role**

Moderator: Ambassador Carlos Sanchez de Boado, Permanent Representative of Spain to the OSCE, OSCE Chairmanship

Rapporteur: Mr. Alexander Verbeek, Permanent Representation of the Netherlands to the OSCE

Keynote speakers:

- **Mr. Marek Belka**, Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)
- **Mr. Grégoire de Kalbermatten**, Deputy Executive Secretary of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)
- **Ms. Jacqueline McGlade**, Executive Director, European Environment Agency (EEA)

Discussion

11.00 – 11.30 Coffee Break

11.30 – 13.00 **Continuation of the discussion**

13.00 – 15.00 Lunch Break

15.00 – 16.15 **Session I – Environmental security and the specific challenges of land degradation and soil contamination**

Moderator: Dr. Deniz Yüksel-Beten, Head of Threats and Challenges Section, Public Diplomacy Division, NATO

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

Keynote speakers/Topics:

- **BG (R). Christopher King**, Ph.D., P.E., Dean of Academics, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College: *Concepts of Strategic Environmental Security*
- **Ms. Claudia Olazábal**, Agriculture and Soil Unit, Environment Directorate-General, European Commission
- **Mr. Frits Schlingemann**, Director and Regional Representative, UNEP Regional Office for Europe

Discussion

16.15 – 16.45 Coffee Break

16.45 – 18.00 **Session II – Environmental governance, in particular as it affects land degradation and soil contamination**

Moderator: Ambassador Doulat Kuanyshhev, Permanent Representative of the Republic of Kazakhstan to the OSCE

Rapporteur: Ms. Louise Callesen, Mission of Denmark to the OSCE

Keynote speakers/Topics:

- **Mr. Jeremy Wates**, Secretary to the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters: *The Aarhus Convention as a tool for Improving Environmental Governance in the Sphere of Land Degradation and Soil Contamination*
- **Dr. Friedrich von Bismarck**, CEO for the Governmental Program for the Rehabilitation of East-German Lignite Mines: *Mining - a Challenge for Environmental Security - Lessons learned in East Germany*
- **Mr. Sergio Alvarez**, Head of Area, International Affairs Department, Ministry of Environment, Spain

Discussion

18.15 **Reception hosted by the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities (Hofburg – Wintergarten, 2nd Floor)**

Tuesday, 23 January 2007

09.30 – 11.00

Session III – Social effects of land degradation and soil contamination

Moderator: Ambassador Taous Feroukhi, Representative of Algeria to the OSCE

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

Keynote speakers/Topics:

- **Dr. Fabrice Renaud**, Section Head, "Environmental Assessment and Resource Vulnerability", Associate Director of UNU Institute for Environment and Human Security, Bonn, Germany: *Impact of Land Degradation on Human Security: A major Push factor for Migrations?*
- **Dr. Falk Schmidt**, Scientific Officer, International Human Dimensions Program on Global Environmental Change, Bonn, Germany: *Human Dimensions of Land Use and Land Cover Change - the LUCC Example*
- **Ms. Anna Platonova**, Programme Officer, Migration/Freedom of Movement Unit, OSCE/ODIHR: *The issue of internal displacement in the OSCE context*

Discussion

11.00-11.30

Coffee Break

11.30 – 13.00

Session IV – Environmental security and sustainable economic development

Moderator: Ambassador Christian D. Falkowski, Head of Delegation of the European Commission to the OSCE

Rapporteur: Ms. Shelly Han, Senior Adviser, Commission on Security and Co-operation in Europe, USA

Keynote speakers/Topics:

- **Dr. Jose Luis Rubio**, European Society for Soil Conservation, Research Centre on Desertification, University of Valencia, Spain: *Implications of land degradation on socio-economics aspects and environmental security*
- **Mr. Oleg Mitvol**, Deputy Head of the Federal Service for the Oversight of Natural Resources, Russian Federation
- **Mr. Alistair Clark**, Director of the Environment Department, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development

Discussion

13.00 – 14.30 Lunch Break

14.30 – 16.30 **Panel Discussion – The role of the OSCE in follow-up to the Forum**

Moderator: Mr. Marc Baltes, Senior Economic Adviser, Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities

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

Panellists:

- **Mr. Bo Libert**, Regional Adviser, Environment and Human Settlements Division, UNECE
- **Mr. Andreas Bieber**, Head of Division, Soil Protection and Contaminated Sites, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Germany
- **Dr. Deniz Yüksel-Beten**, Head of Threats and Challenges Section, Public Diplomacy Division, NATO
- **Mr. Leonid Ivanchenko**, Chair of the Second Committee of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, Russian Federation
- **Ms. Petra Schwager**, Industrial Development Officer, Energy and Cleaner Production Branch, UNIDO

Discussion

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 Carlos Sanchez de Boado**, Permanent Representative of Spain to the OSCE, OSCE Chairmanship

THE 15TH OSCE ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL FORUM
PART 1 / VIENNA, 22 - 23 JANUARY 2007

**KEY CHALLENGES TO ENSURE ENVIRONMENTAL
SECURITY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE
OSCE AREA: LAND DEGRADATION, SOIL
CONTAMINATION AND WATER MANAGEMENT**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The theme of the 15th OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum is “Key challenges to ensure environmental security and sustainable development in the OSCE area: Land degradation, soil contamination and water management”.

The First Part of the 15th OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum was held on 22-23 January 2007 in Vienna. The meeting was organized in close co-operation by the Spanish 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 Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, on 16-17 November 2006, and focused on “Land Degradation and Soil Contamination”. It precedes the Second Preparatory Conference which will take place in Zaragoza, Spain, on 12-13 March 2007, and will focus on “Water Management”, and the Second Part of the Economic and Environmental Forum, to be organized in Prague, on 21-23 May 2007.

An Introductory Note to explore the possible role of the OSCE was circulated by the OCEEA (EF.GAL/2/07) ahead of the Vienna Forum.

Structure of the Forum

The First Part of the 15th Economic and Environmental Forum consisted of both opening and closing sessions, four plenary working sessions and one panel discussion.

The Conference was opened by Ambassador Carlos Sanchez de Boado, Permanent Representative of Spain to the OSCE (OSCE Chairmanship), Ambassador Marc Perrin de Brichambaut, Secretary General of the OSCE and Mr. Bernard Snoy, Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities.

The working sessions and the panel discussion were dedicated to the following topics:

- Session I** Environmental security and the specific challenges of land degradation and soil contamination

- Session II** Environmental governance, in particular as it affects land degradation and soil contamination
- Session III** Social effects of land degradation and soil contamination
- Session IV** Environmental security and sustainable economic development
- Panel Discussion** The role of the OSCE in follow-up to the Forum

Over 350 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 and panellists 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 Forum process.

Main conclusions and recommendations

Throughout the various plenary sessions it was repeatedly stated that the topics being discussed at this year's Economic and Environmental Forum – environmental security, sustainable development, land degradation, soil contamination and water management – are indeed of the highest international relevance. The topics under discussion are slowly finding their way to the highest political agenda as they are increasingly affecting the lives of common people – both within and outside the OSCE's region – as well as the security of States and regions.

The Forum highlighted that global climate change, desertification, scarcity, mismanagement and unsustainable use of resources, military and industrial legacies, as well as transboundary pollution all have security implications. It was stated that the interlinked topics of land degradation and soil contamination strongly relate to the loss and shortages and/or mismanagement of vital resources such as water, soil and food. In the medium run, it is likely that if this situation persists, it may lead to local and/or regional conflicts. These problems transcend borders and can not be solved by one country or one organization acting alone. Co-operation and coordination are crucial and any efforts in addressing the subjects at hand must be joint ones. As well, it was emphasized that a strong civil society component should be envisaged when designing follow-up activities.

In this context, the proposal put forward by the Spanish Chairmanship of the OSCE to develop in the course of 2007 an OSCE Environmental Security Strategy received strong support. The work in that regard will continue in the OSCE context.

A number of issues, initially explored at the First Preparatory Conference in Bishkek were further examined and discussed at the Forum in Vienna.

First of all, it was highlighted that there is an urgent need to link environment and good governance. This need was emphasized in a variety of fields including deforestation, poor land practices, and environmental dangers of mélange, among others. It was stated that the OSCE and especially its field presences are well positioned to support the OSCE participating States in implementing good governance practices.

Furthermore it was said that social affects of land degradation and soil contamination such as environmentally induced migration could indeed be a concern of the OSCE. The OSCE should examine the exact role it could play in raising awareness of this problem and in promoting cooperation to tackle it as soon as possible.

Throughout the Forum and more in particular in session IV it became clear that environment and economic development have a key role to play in promoting environmental security. Through demonstrating corporate responsibility, businesses will become more competitive, not less. There exist win-win scenarios whereby business improve their environmental performance while also increasing their revenue/profits.

In the concluding Panel Discussion, the role of the OSCE in follow-up to this year's Forum was discussed.

A number of concrete follow-up proposals emerged out of the Forum. Some of them are presented below:

- The United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) together with the OSCE could launch a capacity and institution building initiative in Central Asia. Such an initiative would, among others, aim at raising awareness on and strengthening the implementation of the 'Convention'. The two organizations could work together with the countries in the region towards the creation of an International Centre for Monitoring Land Degradation and Desertification in Central Asia. A regional workshop can be envisaged as a first step in this direction. The OCEEA and the UNCCD Secretariat are currently consulting with Delegations concerned to determine the way ahead. Field presences would also be involved in this process.
- The OSCE and the UNECE should intensify their co-operation in promoting the existing international environmental conventions. In particular the importance of the principles of the Aarhus Convention was stressed. The OSCE and the Secretariat of the Aarhus Convention (UNECE) are considering organizing regional and national events focused on access to information, public participation and access to justice. In particular, activities related to access to justice will be prioritized and discussions of holding a regional high level judiciary workshop are underway with partners. The work on promoting the implementation of other conventions, in particular the UNECE Water Convention (as well as the continuation of joint water related projects), will be further discussed in the context of the Second Preparatory Conference to be held in Zaragoza, Spain, on 12 and 13 March 2007.
- The OSCE should increase its cooperation with organizations involved in promoting sustainable forest management (e.g. UNECE, FAO, MCPFE) and in this

context focus on combating illegal logging and other phenomena associated with it, such as corruption, organized crime, money laundering. In this context partnerships should be sought, including with organizations such as UNODC, the World Bank etc. Raising awareness and capacity building workshops can be organized at national or regional level.

- A conference on the co-operation between the public and the private sectors and the role of businesses in promoting sustainable development and environmental security was also proposed (it could to be done in cooperation with UNIDO, EBRD and other relevant actors).

Other preliminary ideas and recommendations include the following:

- The OSCE should continue its efforts in promoting good governance, with a renewed focus on environment; the OSCE could strengthen governance through education, training and capacity building at national and local levels;
- The OSCE could promote environmental security in areas of tension as a tool of peace and confidence building and reconciliation between parties; the OSCE should focus on identifying priorities in terms of threats to security and stability; The Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC) activities received a broad support and follow-up activities to the Forum (addressing land degradation and soil contamination) can be envisaged under the ENVSEC framework;
- The OSCE could serve as a platform for exchange of information, best practices and lessons learnt; in this context tackling and remediation of military and industrial legacies (mining sector) were mentioned; study visits could be organized;
- Combating the illegal transport of hazardous goods should also be an area of focus for the OSCE, together with relevant partnerships;
- The OSCE could assist in raising political awareness on the issue of environmental migration (including internal displacement caused by environmental considerations) and facilitate scientific research on the link between environmental degradation and migration, not only confined to the OSCE region but also in collaboration with Partners for Cooperation;
- The OSCE could work with the EBRD and others to improve the investment climate in transition countries and to improve the effectiveness of investment funds for specific environmental projects in these countries.

In general, the OSCE should find and strengthen synergies and links with other organizations and process such as the “Environment for Europe” process and the upcoming Ministerial Conference in Belgrade in October 2007, where the results of the OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum could be presented.

It was also suggested that future OSCE conferences should be made ‘carbon neutral’.

A comprehensive overview of the discussions and the recommendations stemming from each session is presented in the Rapporteurs’ Reports section.

Annex – distributed documents

During the First Part of the Forum, numerous documents and presentations were circulated. A list of these documents is included in the Consolidated Summary. The documents will be published on a CD-Rom available upon request from the OCEEA. Further information on the Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities and the Economic and Environmental Forum process can be found on the OSCE Website: www.osce.org/eea.

CLOSING REMARKS BY THE CO-ORDINATOR OF OSCE ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. Chairman,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

After two days of intense deliberations, I am pleased to welcome you at the closing session of the first part of the 15th OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum.

I sincerely believe that our meeting achieved its main objective. The Forum built upon the existing OSCE experience in the area of environmental security and sustainable development and on the results of the preparatory Conference in Bishkek, which contributed a lot to identifying the OSCE's possible added value as far as addressing land degradation and soil contamination is concerned. As you know, my Office, in close co-operation with the Spanish Chairmanship, prepared a paper on the possible role of the OSCE in the follow-up to the 15th Economic and Environmental Forum. Many of the ideas mentioned in that Introductory Note were further discussed over the last two days and other suggestions were formulated. We are now closer to defining the role of the OSCE in the areas under discussion and to identifying concrete activities to be implemented in the future, to preparing a more comprehensive plan of action in follow up to the Forum.

After discussing these issues at a political level, in the framework of the Economic and Environmental Forum, I feel encouraged to continue working, together with our partners, in areas such as:

- Raising awareness, in partnership with other international organizations, on environmental security, and contributing to capacity building in Central Asia and other regions to enhance cross-border co-operation and sustainable land management; The OSCE could work to develop a toolbox of best practices of existing expertise on promoting environmental security;
- Promoting, in particular, environmental security in areas of tension as a tool of peace and confidence building and reconciliation between parties in conflict;
- Continuing good governance activities and try to give these efforts a renewed focus on environment;
- Co-operating with the Secretariat to the Aarhus Convention in order to improve its implementation by States Parties of the Convention. This can be done, e.g., via OSCE supported Aarhus Centres or via jointly organized workshops;
- Co-operate with the European Environment Agency to promote a better distribution of information and to ensure that duplication of efforts is avoided;
- Contributing to the collection and exchange of reliable international data on desertification and other aspects of land degradation and environmental security; training activities and seminars on desertification and other relevant issues related to environmental security could be organized, in co-operation with partners such as the UNCCD; Such activities could be envisaged in particular in Central Asia but also with the OSCE Partners for Co-operation.

- Assisting in raising political awareness on the social effects environmental degradation can have, such as environmentally induced migration, and facilitating scientific research on the link between environmental degradation and migration; We could envisage co-operation with academic and research institutions such as those present today;
- Promoting a more thorough implementation of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement in order to make sure that internally displaced people are given the adequate protection outlined in the Guiding Principles;
- Offering a platform for exchange of information, best practices and lessons learnt for actors involved in the remediation industry, particularly among participating States with common legacies in the mining sector;
- Increasing co-operation with organizations involved in promoting sustainable forest management, in particular by focussing on combating illegal logging and other phenomena associated with it, such as corruption, organized crime, etc; training and capacity building, including of local police forces in rural areas can be envisaged;
- Promoting a better interaction between all relevant stakeholders, including the business community and civil society, on issues related to environmental security and sustainable development; in that regard we could consider promoting the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, which have an environmental component, or develop joint activities together with UNIDO or EBRD.

My Office stands therefore ready to propose a number of activities and projects related to the above mentioned areas which could be presented and further discussed at the second part of the Economic and Environmental Forum in Prague in May. We have in mind capacity building initiatives, as well as initiatives for regional events with the intention to improve regional and sub-regional cooperation in the area of environment, and in particular land degradation and soil contamination. My Office stands ready to facilitate exchanges of experiences, best practices and information among interested participating States. My Office will also consult with the OSCE's Environment and Security Initiative partners as well as with other organizations such as the UNCCD, EEA, FAO, MCPFE, OECD etc. regarding the identification of future co-operation activities.

I also strongly encourage the Economic and Environmental Officers from the OSCE Field Presences to carefully consider the recommendations of this Forum when designing their plans for future activities. Such activities could be already planned and included in the budget proposals for 2008.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am looking forward to the next step in this year's Economic and Environmental Forum process, namely the second preparatory Conference, on 12-13 March, in Zaragoza, Spain, where we will discuss in detail issues related to water management. A Tentative Agenda for the Zaragoza Conference will be circulated soon.

Let me conclude by thanking all those who have worked hard behind the scene to make this Forum Meeting a success: the Spanish Chairmanship, the Conference

Services, the Rapporteurs for each session, the interpreters and the staff of my Office. I would also like to express my thanks to the speakers and moderators who stimulated and facilitated our discussions, as well as to all of you, representatives of delegations to the OSCE and guests from capitals. The Economic Forum is and should be a joint effort; and I want to thank you all for your active participation, your comments and suggestions, as well as the ideas you put forward. We will take them into account when developing follow-up proposals. I am looking forward to working closely with you in that regard.

I would like to stress the importance I attach to the contribution of the OSCE Field presences. I am glad that many Economic and Environmental Officers participated in the Forum. My Office is constantly in touch with them and I am looking forward to their follow-up ideas. Their knowledge and expertise is invaluable to us.

I wish you a good and safe trip home and I am looking forward to meeting you again in Zaragoza or in Prague.

CLOSING REMARKS BY H. E. AMBASSADOR CARLOS SANCHEZ DE BOADO, CHAIRMAN OF THE OSCE PERMANENT COUNCIL

Distinguished Ambassadors,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

I should like to thank you all again, as I did yesterday, for attending this first part of the 15th Economic and Environmental Forum, which we are closing this afternoon. Once again, I should like to praise the work of Mr. Bernard Snoy, Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities, and the outstanding efforts of his staff in organizing and holding this event.

Over the past two days, we have discussed different environmental problems, placing special emphasis on the strong link between environmental problems and security. The environment has ceased to be a field in which only experts have an interest. The ordinary man on the street and citizens of the towns and villages of this globalized world are aware of the great damage being done to ecosystems, of global warming, of the shortage of water and of other consequences — harmful consequences — of human activity. What we now have is a general discussion and one of enormous importance, since we are talking about security and how that security may be seriously compromised if we do not act quickly to alleviate the growing environmental damage.

The Spanish Chairmanship believes that the Economic and Environmental Forum is one of the most important forums of the OSCE. This is why, today more than ever before it is necessary to support initiatives such as the elaboration of an Environmental Security Strategy, something that we have been championing with enthusiasm since Spain assumed the Chairmanship and that is already being prepared with the invaluable collaboration of the Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities (OCEEA). Your contributions over these past two days will be taken into account and we should like to invite you to continue to contribute to the elaboration of this Strategy. Our view is that as far as possible this Strategy should take the form of a document agreed upon by consensus and reflecting the widest possible range of viewpoints. I strongly urge all the delegations of the participating States to lend their full support to and place their trust in this vital initiative, which we are convinced will place the OSCE at the forefront of the international organizations working in the field of environmental security.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

As stated in the Introductory Note distributed at the start of this Forum, the Spanish Chairmanship has set out its priorities in four main areas, which were reflected in the structuring of the sessions:

- Environmental security;
- Environmental governance;
- Social effects of environmental problems;
- Environmental security and sustainable economic development.

Turning now to more specific measures, apart from the aforementioned Environmental Security Strategy, we welcome the proposal put forward by Mr. Grégoire de Kalbermatten, Deputy Executive Director of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, to establish a Regional Dryland Centre in Central Asia, and we shall ask the OCEEA, the experts of the participating States and the OSCE missions to examine the possibilities of initiating the aforementioned project.

On the other hand, Spain believes that the role of the OSCE entails more than just co-operation with other international organizations, and Spain wants our Organization to promote responsible and committed management in matters of environmental protection. To that end, Spain takes a favourable view of one of the recommendations made at the Bishkek Preparatory Conference and proposes that the OSCE give thought to the possibility of helping to offset carbon dioxide emissions released during travel connected with our activities. Other international organizations (the World Bank) have already established similar programmes, and perhaps the time may now be at hand to put the “carbon neutral” policy into practice at both the meeting in Zaragoza and the meeting in Prague.

As far as environmental governance is concerned, Spain would like the OSCE to lend its support to the implementation of measures to ensure proper management of natural resources and endorses the work we are doing to implement the Aarhus Convention. Similarly, we support the measures and projects to combat the illegal transport of hazardous waste and materials.

With regard to the social effects of environmental problems, today we have had the opportunity to view a number of very illuminating presentations. Spain is in favour of co-ordinating research methods to enhance our knowledge of environmentally induced migratory movements.

With regard to environmental security and sustainable economic development, Spain would like to promote the dialogue between civil society and the private sector, through the greater involvement of the latter in the prevention, management and resolution of environmental problems as a basis for sustainable economic development. We shall also give thought to the possibility of holding, in conjunction with the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, seminars or workshops on “clean production”.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I believe that we can honestly say that this first part of the Economic and Environmental Forum has been a success. I should like to congratulate everyone on their contributions. I trust that our work will continue in this splendid manner at the Preparatory Conference in Zaragoza, where we will await you with open arms, with hope and with the conviction that it will be a very productive meeting.

Thank you.

THE 15TH OSCE ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL FORUM

PART 1 / VIENNA, 22 - 23 JANUARY 2007

KEY CHALLENGES TO ENSURE ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE OSCE AREA: LAND DEGRADATION, SOIL CONTAMINATION AND WATER MANAGEMENT

REPORTS OF THE RAPPORTEURS

Opening Session

Moderator: Ambassador Carlos Sanchez de Boado, Permanent Representative of Spain to the OSCE, OSCE Chairmanship

Rapporteur: Mr. Alexander Verbeek, Permanent Representation of the Netherlands to the OSCE

In this session we heard reports on global efforts to combat land degradation and soil contamination and the role that the OSCE can play in these fields.

Mr. Marek Belka gave the perspective of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) on OSCE's activities in the field of environmental security. The UNECE hosts five major international environmental conventions and it stands ready to assist countries in the accession to, and implementation of, these conventions. It thereby makes good use of its extensive experience in preparing and managing environmental legal instruments. But it cannot do this alone and would be glad to enhance its cooperation with the OSCE. Mr. Belka also focused on the considerable accomplishments in the area of land and water management and good governance, where cooperation with the OSCE has already taken place on a number of successful initiatives. The UNECE also hopes to further develop the cooperation with OSCE in the context of the OSCE/UNDP/UNEP Environmental and Security Initiative (ENVSEC) and the "Aarhus Convention".

Mr. Grégoire de Kalbermatten spoke about the need to pay attention to the conditions of ecosystems. Desertification put at risk the livelihoods of more than a billion people, most of them poor, in 110 countries. This often led to large-scale uncontrolled rural to urban migration and could lead to social unrest, including inter-ethnic conflicts. It also leads to forced migration, for instance from sub-Saharan African countries to Europe. Land degradation and desertification constitutes a clear growing and global threat to economic sustainability, social cohesion and public security. Since 2003, the UNCCD secretariat had launched a process for the establishment of a Drought Management Center for South Eastern Europe. Many regional activities are planned and the countries that evolved these proposals would welcome partnership with the OSCE and the participation of OSCE in these events. A

similar initiative could be envisaged for Central Asia. The OSCE could also assist, be making use of the field presence in the possible conduction of field UNCCD country reviews.

Prof. J. Mc. Glade, Executive Director of the European Environment Agency (EEA) spoke on the Shared Environmental Information System for Europe. She gave an EEA perspective on tackling land-based issues and presented some conclusions of the Belgrade Report, which would be published later this year. It concludes that land abandonment has increased the risk of degradation, especially in mountain areas where anti-erosion measures have been discontinued. Inefficient irrigation schemes and industrial activities have caused major physical degradation of the soil in South Eastern Europe. The report also warns that an intensification of the impact on soil can be expected as economies recover. Another issue to be highlighted in the report is a lack of awareness by soil users and policy makers on the effects of their actions on the good status of soil. The report will further reflect on the need for better access to efficient equipment, cleaner technology and adequate knowledge. Her presentation also focused on the enormous increase in environmental data that is available and readily accessible. The sharing of this information was relevant from the environmental as well as the security perspective.

In the discussion that followed the presentations, a number of delegations welcomed the initiative of Spain in focusing on environmental security. Some of the activities already taking place were welcomed. One delegation (Russian Federation) spoke on the need to make environmental security a priority, while keeping in mind the need for a competitive economy. What was needed was a debate between all stakeholders, including the business community. A conference on this issue could be organized in Moscow later this year. This issue was also taken up by a group of delegations (GUAM) which spoke about the need for multilateral coordination between all stakeholders as well as the need for accession to the 200 international legal instruments in the field of environment and environmental protection. A partnership between the OSCE and other international organizations would be welcomed. The GUAM countries requested the donor countries to continue to support environmental projects. Serbia spoke on the Belgrade Ministerial Conference “Environment for Europe” in October 2007, which would provide a good opportunity to foster the environmental security concept. A number of delegations (US, RF) offered to share their experiences and some delegations called for the implementation of environmental principles that are under discussion. Another delegation (Canada) noted that the OSCE should focus on the niche where it can have added value; and in the field of environment this was especially environmental security. The ENVSEC Initiative was welcomed by several delegations (Canada, EU).

One delegation (Armenia) noted that environmental problems should not be tackled with a focus on disaster relief, a structural approach was needed involving both public and private actors. Several delegations (Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan) spoke on the need for the OSCE to coordinate its efforts with the UN. Several ideas were launched for workshops, for instance on the need for setting up proper databases on land use (Kazakhstan). One delegation (Turkey) expressed its appreciation of the attention given to the transport of hazardous goods at the Bishkek Conference and asked questions about environmental migration in the OSCE region and about the possible role of the OSCE.

Mrs. Mc. Glade spoke about the possible contribution of the OSCE to improving information distribution. A direct relationship at the technical level would be needed, with the political support of the participating States. The focus should be on capacity building, lessons learned, and the spread of knowledge.

Mr. Kalbermatten spoke about the need for more information on environmental migration and saw a possible contribution of the OSCE in this field. Environmental security is a good example of a niche where the OSCE can have added value, especially since the OSCE is part of a network involving other international organizations.

Mr. Belka spoke on the cooperation of the UNECE with the OSCE and the need to follow up after the review of commitments. Practical activities were needed, such as training courses and seminars, especially in countries with a need for expertise. These could for instance, focus on the implementation of international norms and conventions. UNECE is willing to help, for instance with water management and the Aarhus Convention.

Israel announced its willingness to share its expertise on desertification. This could be done by sending experts, or by sharing in a conference, or in another setting the conclusions of last year's international conference on desertification. Participating states could also consider sending students to study desertification at a university in Israel.

Specific areas for possible OSCE action:

- The OSCE could, by making use of the presence in the field, assist with the implementation of international legal instruments related to environmental security, for instance by focusing on water management and the Aarhus Convention. This should be done in cooperation with other international organizations;
- The OSCE could contribute to the collection and exchange of reliable international data on desertification and other aspects of environmental security;
- The OSCE could, in partnership with other international organizations, raise awareness on environmental security and contribute to capacity building in Central Asia and other regions to enhance legal cooperation and sustainable land management;
- The OSCE could promote better interaction between all relevant stakeholders, including the business community and civil society, on issues related to environmental security. The OSCE could function as a platform for the exchange of ideas and experiences;
- The OSCE could promote and participate in training activities and seminars on desertification and other relevant issues related to environmental security;
- The OSCE could cooperate with the European Environment Agency on promoting better information distribution and avoiding duplication of efforts.

Session I – Environmental security and the specific challenges of land degradation and soil contamination

Moderator: Dr. Deniz Yüksel-Beten, Head of Threats and Challenges Section,
Public Diplomacy Division, NATO

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

Dr. Christopher King presented a strategic view on how to get government action on creating a bridge between policy and science to promote environmental security. He argued that to create this bridge, environmental security should be viewed as a defence/security consideration and not only exclusively as a scientific/technical problem. Mr. King went on to say that environmental security was in fact a basic human need, which underscored the importance of attention and action. He noted there was a role for the OSCE in this area, given its regional scope and mandate. These variables formed the basis of Mr. King's definition of environmental security. Mr. King further presented an analytical model to help create a methodology for examining environmental security – examining variables, choosing measures of stability and then providing statistical modelling to quantify this concept, taking population growth and water scarcity and deforestation in the context of regional carrying capacity as an example. Mr. King reported he used this model when comparing environmental areas of concern and areas of tension. He found a 95 percent correlation between environmental health and stability. Mr. King was careful to note that this analysis was based on present conditions, but contended that it could assist planning and future analysis.

Ms. Claudia Olazabal stressed that soil was a non-renewable natural resource that was being degraded and lost. Given soil's crucial function in the survival of ecosystems and human activities, this was a matter for concern. Ms. Olazabal outlined the role of soil and examined its social, economic, and biological functions. She then went on to highlight the threats to soil, including desertification, erosion, salinization, contamination, sealing, compaction, biodiversity loss and landslides. The impacts of these threats could be devastating and having such results as famine, poverty, conflicts, migration and a general complication of living conditions and social stability. There is also greater risk of waterway damage (contributing to intra and international conflict) and intensified the adverse affects of storms and natural disasters. To combat this problem both prevention and restoration were necessary but there was a lack of awareness, inadequate legislation, limited expertise, poor cooperation at all levels of government and finite funding. Public and private actors at local, national and international levels needed to work to raise awareness and knowledge, utilize an integrated diagnosis and systematic approach, integrated approach, exchange best practices, create reproducible pilot projects, and improve financial mechanisms. Ms. Olazabal concluded by outlining the EU's thematic strategy on soil protection, which takes full account of both prevention and restoration.

Mr. Frits Schlingemann answered the Chair's call for forum discussion leading to recommendations. He cited documents that underscored the connection

between population growth and environmental problems. This equation included the factor of land, which could often contribute to violence due to the fact that it is a limited resource. He cited Darfur, Sudan, as example of land and water scarcity contributing to a humanitarian crisis. Mr. Schlingemann stressed the harmful effect of environmental degradation, a feature of conflict situations, on populations and peace processes. He went on to discuss a recent ENVSEC fire assessment mission in and around the Nagorno-Karabakh region as an example of a peace building environmental initiative. These fires had significant impacts on people, the economy and the environment, and he believed that the report and its implementation through ENVSEC could contribute to peace building, confidence building, and perhaps to reconciliation, should the Minsk Group wish to endorse this document.

During the discussion one participant noted that the great impact made by the environment was made greater by those who exploited challenges in this field for political gains. The panel answered that while the environment should not be politicized, all policymaking actors should be involved in its protection. Another participant underscored the importance of practical solutions, knowledge transfers, and the limits on knowledge in some regions. The panel noted these points and stated that although knowledge might be limited, there was enough expertise and experience for effective action. A participant supported this view pointing out the dichotomy between knowing the right thing to do and having the right means of government to do something about it. Another participant noted that environmental security in a conflict zone required a cooperative approach with a solid basis in international law, and that policy should be looked at in the context of security. The panel agreed in part, but stressed the need for flexibility, citing the example of the Caspian Sea cooperation being carried on in spite of a lack of legal status. The last contributing participant asked the question of how to deal with conflicting priorities, and noted that expertise in enhancing environmental security did exist; a possible role for the OSCE was to build a toolbox of this knowledge and use it to find solutions. The panel suggested that evaluating challenges using the concept of carrying capacity was a possible way of putting challenges to environmental security into an order or priority.

Specific areas for possible OSCE action:

- The unique network of regional field missions in the OSCE region gives the Organization a framework in which it can contribute programmes to promote environmental security;
- The OSCE is currently active in promoting good governance, which is a key component in promoting environmental security. The OSCE should continue these efforts with a renewed focus on environment;
- The OSCE could promote environmental security in areas of tension as a tool for peacemaking, confidence building, and reconciliation between parties in conflict;
- The OSCE could assist the implementation of the proposals made in the report on the fires in and around the Nagorno-Karabakh region through ENVSEC;
- Soil degradation and contamination is a challenge that is aggravated by lack of cooperation, non-integrated approaches, and insufficient knowledge dissemination. The OSCE can play a role in filling these gaps;

- The OSCE can work to develop a toolbox of best practices incorporating existing expertise on promoting environmental security.

Session II – Environmental governance, in particular as it affects land degradation and soil contamination

Moderator: Ambassador Doulat Kuanyshhev, Permanent Representative of the Republic of Kazakhstan to the OSCE

Rapporteur: Ms. Louise Callesen, Mission of Denmark to the OSCE

This session discussed aspects of one of the OSCE's core tasks in the economic and environmental dimension, namely, good governance.

Mr. Jeremy Wates took as his subject the Aarhus Convention as an instrument for promoting good governance through its focus on the role of the public in the process of environmental decision-making. The three pillars of the Convention were concerned with public access to information, public participation in decision-making, and the right of access to justice in the environmental sphere. He pointed out that public input was justified both for idealistic reasons, because in democracies, people should have an opportunity to be involved in decisions affecting their lives, and also for pragmatic reasons, because broad public input improves the outcome and increases public support for it. Mr. Wates identified three potential areas for further efforts: better implementation of the Convention and its Protocol by States Parties; broadening the area of applicability through new ratifications; and expanding the obligations, notably by means of new protocols. While there was limited enthusiasm for the third area among States, the OSCE should continue its valuable support in the first two areas.

Dr. Friedrich von Bismarck focused on one example of good governance in a sector of the economy that can have a serious impact on the environment, through land degradation and soil contamination: namely mining. He drew his examples from the efforts to remediate closed lignite mining sites and uranium mines in East Germany. He underlined that the absence of successful governance would have accelerated the magnitude of the problems and their costs, whereas good governance structures in the shape of control mechanisms and regulation had contributed to significantly lowering the estimated costs of remediation and reclamation of land. One important conclusion of the East German experience was that a "simply green" strategy is not enough. Good use should be made of the opportunity to create new landscapes that can boost sustainable regional development. It should also be borne in mind that mining impacts might have transboundary effects and thus might entail security problems. The issue, therefore, was to be regarded as relevant to the OSCE's concept of comprehensive security. The OSCE could provide a useful platform for the sharing of information gathered and lessons learned by similarly affected participating States.

Mr. Sergio Alvarez focused on the potential of good governance and sustainable forest management for ensuring environmental security and sustainable development. Forest management was linked to a number of areas with environmental, social and

economic dimensions requiring governance at international, national and local levels. While so far no agreement had been reached on an international legal instrument in the area, pan-European regional approaches existed in the framework of the MCPPE, UNECE and FAO. The OSCE could consider initiating or deepening interaction with these organizations, with a particular view to introducing environmental security aspects into their efforts.

The ensuing discussion touched on soil contamination and land degradation, particularly in Central Asia, and their social and economic consequences. The need for regional cooperation to address these issues was underlined, as was the need for cooperation between state and local levels and between national and international organisations, including potential donors (Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan). It was suggested to set up a regional emergency centre in Central Asia (Uzbekistan). A particular focus was placed on deforestation and especially on illegal logging, where cooperation and assistance was needed to improve data collection and stocktaking on existing resources and related threats (Kyrgyzstan). On the subject of access to information, participation and justice in environmental matters, attention was drawn to the potential role of local authorities (including Mahallas) and to the possibility of involving young people through youth eco-parliaments (Uzbekistan). Furthermore, it was pointed out that the OSCE should focus on areas where there were gaps in environmental security; remediation of mining sites was an example of an area where the existing international efforts might not be sufficiently robust (US).

Specific areas for possible OSCE action:

- The OSCE could further intensify its cooperation with the Secretariat to the Aarhus Convention designed to improve implementation by States Parties of the Convention. This could be done, through OSCE supported Aarhus Centres or jointly organized workshops;
- The OSCE could work to expand the area of application of the Aarhus Convention by supporting participating States interested in ratifying the Convention;
- The OSCE could serve as a platform for exchange of information, best practices and lessons learnt for actors involved in the remediation industry, particularly among participating States with common legacies in the mining sector;
- The OSCE could consider increased cooperation with regional organizations involved in promoting sustainable forest management, including with a particular view to introducing aspects of environmental security to their work, notably by focus on combating illegal logging and other phenomena associated with it, such as corruption and organized crime, etc;
- The OSCE could assist participating States in the enforcement of forest law and governance through education, training and capacity building, with a focus on of local police services in rural areas;
- The OSCE could assist participating States in developing and implementing concepts for preventing land degradation and soil contamination, notably with regard to data collection;
- The participating States could integrate security aspects into their national forest programmes.

Session III – Social effects of land degradation and soil contamination

Moderator: Ambassador Taous Feroukhi, Representative of Algeria to the OSCE

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

Mr. Fabrice Renaud, Section head, Environmental Assessment and Resource Vulnerability, Associate Director of UNU Institute for Environment and Human Security, gave a talk entitled “Impact of Land Degradation on Human Security: A major Push Factor for Migrations?” Mr. Renaud highlighted some of the main issues in the current debate on environmental migration. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment showed that dry lands were already degraded; dry land ecosystems were having greater difficulty providing commodities such as food and water for humans and livestock. Climate change was likely to exacerbate this detrimental effect. Land degradation was likely to increase migration, due to loss of livelihoods; however, there was a difficulty in quantifying migration induced by environmental factors. The difficulty lay in the fact that there was not always one root cause: other factors might include social, economic, and degraded security situations. There was also no real definition the term environmental migrant.

Mr. Renaud made five 5 policy recommendations: strengthening the scientific basis (availability of long term sustained funding for research, development of proper definitions, research cooperation, rigorous quantification of fluxes); increasing awareness (raising knowledge-based public and political awareness), improving legislation (to give adequate protection individuals displaced by environmental degradation processes), giving the means for adequate humanitarian aid (empowering relevant bodies to provide aid to environmental refugees), and strengthening institutions (new concepts and institutions that are able to assist environmental migrants/refugees).

He suggested that the OSCE contribute to general advocacy, focusing the debate and raising political awareness (conferences/workshops on the subject). He also called on the OSCE to bring the discussion to the Common European Union Immigration Policy debate & UN Consultative Forum on migrations and sustainable development. On the scientific side he suggested supporting research aimed at the development of assessment methodologies and/or case studies.

Mr. Falk Schmidt, Scientific Officer, International Human Dimensions Program on Global Environmental Change, spoke on land use and land cover change-the LUCC example. This project has a threefold mission: the development of a compendium of information about local to global land use and land cover change dynamics, the identification of a small number of robust principles for prediction and fostering the development of a common models or an overarching, integrated land change theory. Mr. Falk highlighted two research findings: Firstly, there is a frequent causal chain in desertification (policies aimed at modernizing agriculture, destruction of land-use institutions); Secondly, major causal syndromes of land use change (pressures stemming from resource scarcity, changing incentives in markets, loss of

adaptive capacity of communities, institutional changes, outside policy interventions). Population growth is not a major factor, not among the top five factors. In terms of the future outlook, he pointed out the need to improve the predictive power of models and their scientific basis and also the need to understand land use and land cover transitions and regime shifts and collapses. Furthermore we need to understand the impact of globalisation better and to engage in cross-sectoral research.

Ms. Anna Platonova, (ODIHR) Migration and Freedom of Movement Officer, presented the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement. Millions of persons remain internally displaced throughout the OSCE region as a result of armed conflicts, outbreaks of violence, and natural or human made disasters. Unlike refugees, who have an internationally established system of protection under the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, and can look to the UN High Commissioner for Refugees for support, internally displaced persons have no comparable protection system to respond to their needs. When the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement were published by the UN in 1998, they were the first international standards specifically tailored to the needs of the internally displaced, and constituted a normative framework for their protection and assistance. The Guiding Principles take the doctrine of “sovereignty as responsibility” as the most suitable conceptual framework for dealing with internal displacement. Given that the OSCE participating States have committed themselves to the principle that matters related to human rights are of direct and legitimate concern to all participating States, issues related to the plight of internally displaced persons may be and have been discussed in the Permanent Council of the OSCE in the context of discussions of situations in various parts of the OSCE area. In 2003, the Maastricht Ministerial Council adopted Decision No 4/03 on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination stating that the UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement are to be taken as a “*useful framework for the work of the OSCE and the endeavours of participating States in dealing with internal displacement*”. The ODIHR has held a number of IDP-related activities in the past years. In particular, a workshop for high-level government officials from Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia was held in Tbilisi, Georgia in May 2000, jointly with the Brookings Institution Project on Internal Displacement and the Norwegian Refugee Council.

The participants of the 2004 Supplementary Human Dimension Meeting (SHDM) urged the OSCE to continue mainstreaming the issue into all relevant activities of the organization. For example, special attention is now paid to the voting rights of IDPs in the OSCE election observation work, the monitoring IDP’s ability to vote and the promoting of reforms to ensure the full exercise of their right to political participation. The OSCE could support the participating States in the development of national laws, policies and programmes on internal displacement, including ones related to issues of property restitution and compensation.

The moderator of the session, the Ambassador of Algeria, stated that the environmental problems addressed and the consequences leading to environmentally induced migration were transboundary and should also be dealt with within the Mediterranean dimension.

The International Organization for Migration (IOM) stated that it was happy that climate concerns were being integrated into foreign and security policy. Indeed,

the link between involuntary migration and development policies was very interesting. The IOM had a strong research and policy department committed to putting the conclusions of the EEF into practice.

The ECOSAN/Uzbekistan representative suggested doing more research on environmental migration in the Aral Sea region and Central Asia in general. He also highlighted the importance of investment in degraded regions in order to keep jobs in the region. One possibility might be eco-tourism.

The representative of Turkey asked how one could define environmentally internally displaced persons and if ODHIR had identified such a category in the OSCE area. He also asked what the criteria defining the term 'adequate protection', were.

Ms. Platonova responded by saying that the definition still needs further research. Despite problems with definition it was still mentioned in international documents on IDPs. Since armed conflicts were no longer so prominent in the OSCE region maybe it would be useful to look into other factors causing internal displacement. The criteria for 'adequate protection' are outlined in the IDP Guiding Principles.

A representative of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) introduced its work on refugees, how it works on camp environments and takes into account the return of refugees. The UNHCR did not protect environmental refugees. However, the UNHCR sent a note during tsunami requesting displaced persons should not be returned. Subsidiary protection on humanitarian grounds was nevertheless in place.

The Moderator asked if there was any cooperation with North African countries on research and policy development. Mr. Renaud responded by outlining a case study that was to be developed by Tunisia later in the year.

Specific areas for possible OSCE action:

As a cross-dimensional organization, the OSCE could:

- Facilitate more scientific research on the link between environmental degradation and migration, not only in the OSCE area but also perhaps in collaboration with the Partners for Cooperation;
- Assist in raising political awareness on the issue of environmental migration and the other social effects of environmental degradation;
- Continue its work on preventing environmental degradation for the benefit of those populations at risk of being displaced;
- Assist in bringing about economic recovery in areas affected by land degradation to reduce migratory pressures;
- OSCE participating States could, as already mentioned at various meetings of the OSCE, for example the Maastricht Ministerial Council in 2003 and Supplementary Human Dimension Implementation Meetings, implement the Guiding Principles on

Internal Displacement more thoroughly, in order to make sure that internally displaced people are given adequate protection as outlined in the Guiding Principles.

Session IV – Environmental security and sustainable economic development

Moderator: Ambassador Christian D. Falkowski, Head of Delegation of the European Commission to the OSCE

Rapporteur: Ms. Shelly Han, Senior Adviser, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, USA

This session was an opportunity for the Forum to discuss the symbiotic relationship between the environment and economic development. Specifically, the panel discussed the impact of the environment on economic development and also the importance of sustainable development to healthy economic development. The moderator, Ambassador Christian Falkowski, began the panel by reminding the participants that the OSCE was not a scientific forum, but that we could learn valuable information from our scientific presenters that would then assist the OSCE in dealing effectively with the global issue of environmental change.

Dr. Rubio focused his remarks on land degradation and its impact both on other environmental issues, and on security. He noted that about 90 percent of food comes directly from the soil. Soil also performs crucial ecological functions: it is important for the maintenance of a healthy water cycle for greenhouse gas regulation, etc. The soil is a live interface: the living skin of the earth. Spain is the driest area on the European continent. A number of factors contribute to desertification, such as poor soil, concentration of economic activity in coastal areas, unsustainable water resources, and forest conditions. Factors involved in the relationship between desertification and environmental security include water scarcity, reduced food production, flooding, increased forest fires, land slides, and a decrease in the ecological functions of the soil.

Dr. Rubio commented that there was a continuing lack of awareness of this problem despite the fact that 2006 was declared the “year of desertification”. There was currently a negative trend in water availability, due to a permanent increase in demand, a reduction in precipitation, and the loss of soil regulation capacity. Two scenarios result: pessimists estimate that by 2050 up to 70 billion people will suffer water scarcity; while optimists estimate that up to 20 billion people will suffer water shortages. The cost of inaction means worsening of impact of desertification: increases in poverty, social instability, migration, and illegal activities. Dr. Rubio reminded the audience that “people are an integral part of ecosystems” and the loss of soil as a buffer would have a significant impact on human systems.

In conclusion he said that these problems in Europe affect 10 percent of the area depending on the region. There is a lack of social awareness, and we need more

cooperation. The OSCE can assist in increasing public awareness of desertification and also encourage adoption and implementation of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification.

Mr. Mitvol stated that the amount of arable land in Russia had declined by 13 percent due to the irrational use of land for non-farming purposes. There was a similar problem in other OSCE countries. There was serious soil contamination in industrialized areas. For example in metal processing areas the lead content was 300 times higher than normal. Soil contamination by petrochemical products was another example. He noted that Russia was still struggling to clean up oil spills by tankers; the size of these oil lakes had not been equalled in other parts of the world.

Given the impact on the environment of transnational business projects, Mr. Mitvol suggested a need to pool efforts in order to be successful and welcomed help from business. For example, appropriate legislation on mining and petrochemicals was a constant concern. Russia would like to have a mutually beneficial relationship and it welcomed participation by others to help it achieve this goal. Mr. Mitvol stated that the transport of petrochemicals, particularly across the Caspian Sea, was always a hazardous prospect and that he would like to see analysis of the environmental impact of this process. Spain had good experience of the impact on the transportation of oil.

This was an important area for people's livelihood and Mr. Mitvol stated that he wanted to make sure that the environmental impact was measured. There had been a reduction in military threats, but the global environment was still under threat. He stated that the OSCE should devote more attention to these new global challenges in the environmental area. Russia would like to see more tangible measures, and it welcomed the opportunity to participate.

Mr. Clark noted that this was one of the first times that sustainability had been under discussion in the Economic Forum. The EBRD's key focus was the promotion of democracy and market economies, and was working with the OSCE in the political dimension. He also noted that the EBRD was the only international institution "to promote environmentally sound and sustainable development." The EBRD is doing so in the following ways: integrating environment and social consideration in investments; promoting environmental investments, and financing environmental projects partnerships. The EBRD had invested in projects in 27 countries and would add Mongolia to its list of countries this year in 2007. The EBRD tried to build environmental and social aspects into its projects. For example, in Kyrgyzstan a snow leopard reserve was supported alongside a mining site.

Mr. Clark stated that there was a need to deal with social issues as well as core labour standards, involuntary resettlement, cultural property, indigenous peoples. The EBRD had focused on early transition countries and the western Balkans. In addition to projects in Russia, it had also run the global compact aid to a project Ukraine to prevent the collapse of the Chernobyl plant by building a new shelter over the existing structure.

One of the ways that the EBRD worked with the OSCE was by improving the investment climate in OSCE participating States.

Following the presentations, Mr. Manfred Schekulin, Chairman of the OECD's Investment Committee, presented the OECD guidelines for multinational enterprises, which constitute the only international code of conduct negotiated by governments. The application of the code is voluntary but governments are bound to promote the guidelines. One chapter of the guidelines focuses on the environment: one unique feature is that they have an effective implementation mechanism. There is a national contact point (the government offices responsible for implementation), enabling for parties to report specific instances of non-compliance to these contact points. Environmental NGOs can use this mechanism to influence the behaviour of multinational companies.

Key Suggestions for the OSCE:

- Assist in increasing public awareness of desertification;
- Encourage adoption and implementation of the UN Convention on Combating Desertification;
- Place emphasis within the OSCE on the importance of improved ecological governance (this might include assisting parliaments of participating States to develop appropriate legislation);
- Work with the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development and others to improve the investment climate in transition countries, to ensure the availability and improve the effectiveness of investment funds for specific environmental projects in these countries;
- Bring civil society into the dialogue and specifically seek their expertise on sustainability.

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

Moderator: Mr. Marc Baltés, Senior Economic Adviser, Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities

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

The Panel's main goal was to present possible areas for OSCE action and the role of the OSCE in the follow-up to the Forum.

Mr. Bo Libert noted that environmental management had not improved in many of the non-EU countries. He stressed that environmental issues were seen as unimportant by political leaders, leading to a shortage of capacity within the national administrations. Nonetheless, through the international community frameworks (treaties, protocols, guidelines, and recommendations), international organizations such as the UNECE could help those countries by filling the gaps still existing. In this sense ENVSEC could be seen as a positive example of cooperation between international organizations, donor countries and recipient countries. In particular, Mr. Libert underlined that as neither the UNECE nor the OSCE were implementing agencies, they needed frameworks for cooperation such as ENVSEC. Mr. Libert

stressed two value adding features of the OSCE: 1. its political nature/mandate and 2.the network of its field offices. Nevertheless the need to make action a priority was seen to be of primary importance. Examples of possible further cooperation between UNECE and OSCE were also presented, such as:

- The Chu Talas bilateral commission on managing water rivers in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan;
- Environmental impact assessment projects between Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan;
- Dams safety projects aiming at establishing national legislation and institutions;
- Trans-boundary water cooperation between Ukraine and Moldavia in the Dniester river basin;
- The promotion of UNECE conventions.

Finally, it was suggested that there was a need for a large-scale involvement of NGOs.

Mr. Andreas Bicher noted that the “Introductory Note” prepared for the 15th EEF, Part 1, was sometime too comprehensive and ambitious. He considered that there was a need for concrete and focused proposals. He expressed the readiness of Germany to support the medium and long term implementation of some of the recommendations listed in the note. Mr. Bicher also offered Germany’s experience in restoring the military lands, in waste disposal, and in minefields through the ENVSEC. Mr. Bicher identified three possible areas of cooperation where the OSCE could provide its comparative advantage offered by the field presences:

- The OSCE could support the DE/EC conference on environmental security;
- The OSCE could promote the implementation of the principles of access to information, public participation and access to justice in environmental matters;
- The OSCE could cooperate with other actors on projects dealing with cross border water management.

Dr. Deniz Yuksel-Beten presented some of the activities carried out by NATO’s Science for Peace and Security Committee. She stressed that the operational areas of project implementation went beyond NATO members and that NATO had a comparative advantage and that its agenda was not driven by environmental policy, and in the voluntary participation of the countries in the implementation of the projects. Dr. Yuksel-Beten stressed that some of the projects implemented by the Science for Peace and Security Committee were also being implemented in countries in transition where frozen conflict still existed. Toxic waste issues and military land restoration were identified as possible areas of cooperation between NATO and the OSCE.

Mr. Leonid Ivanchenko pointed out that environmental, social and economic problem could lead to instability and environmental insecurity. The need for action on the ground to restore the environment was underlined. In this sense the role and the involvement of decision makers (MPs) was crucial. Environmental protection went hand in hand with technical and technological developments, and investments were

needed to tackle environmental problems. Mr. Ivanchenko suggested that the 15th EEF should work on raising awareness, in particular in the private sector. The OSCE and the OSCE PA should work together to find ways of tackling environmental security challenges, by giving priority to legal frameworks

Ms. Petra Schwager presented the UNIDO activities carried out by the Energy and Cleaner Production programme. She underlined the growing demand for UNIDO National Cleaner Production Centers in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, and also the need for capacity building and awareness-raising at national level on green technologies from the supply point of view (industries). From the demand point of view (governments), Ms Schwager informed participants that UNIDO was working with governments on developing national policies and legislations as well as on information dissemination. Ms Schwager presented the intention of UNIDO to foster more environmental technological transfer in particular in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Promoting the implementation of Multilateral Environmental Agreements, energy efficiency and restoring lands affected by mercury were identified as possible areas of cooperation between UNIDO and the OSCE.

In the discussion that followed the presentations it was generally agreed that the EEF had produced some practical recommendations and had indicated areas where the OSCE should and could play a role in the field of environmental security. One delegation (US) underlined the need to avoid overlapping and duplication of efforts of international actors. It called for a focused approach by the OSCE and requested a “to do list”.

One delegation (Germany/EU) stressed the importance of transparency and good governance for the achievement of sustainable development, and praised the EEF for its contribution towards this understanding. It also reiterated its appreciation of the involvement of field operations, and of participation in the EEF of several international organizations, a clear sign that cooperation was of fundamental importance when dealing with transboundary issues such as environmental security. One delegation (Turkey) was pleased to note that environmental security had been put at political level and suggested that OSCE should promote and make more public what it does in the Economic and Environmental Dimension. The importance of funding to transform words into deeds was emphasized. Furthermore, the targets for future OSCE actions in the field of environmental security should not be limited to those participating States where OSCE field missions are in operation. It was suggested that OSCE activities should be demand-driven and that the OSCE second dimension should be further strengthened.

One delegation (European Commission) suggested that the OSCE should concentrate on what it can do in the field of environment to achieve stability and security. The OSCE should not concentrate on restoring the environment but should identify what is really urgent in terms of threats to security and stability and the areas where environmental issues can create tensions between and within countries. Several delegations underlined the need for the OSCE to focus and to establish clear priorities in its overall programme. Furthermore, the OSCE should cooperate with other international organizations on avoiding duplications and overlapping. ENVSEC was presented as a concrete positive example of such focus and cooperation.

One delegation (Switzerland) recommended that the OSCE should be active in promoting capacity-building and training programmes

Recommendations:

- The OSCE could promote the accession and implementation of UNECE conventions and projects (e.g., Dniester river basin project);
- The OSCE could promote the implementation of the principles of public participation, access to information and access to justice in environmental matters (Aarhus Convention);
- The OSCE could promote cross boarder water cooperation;
- The OSCE could work on awareness raising, in particular in the private sector, by promoting environmentally sound technologies and fostering transfer of technology;
- The OSCE could cooperate with other international organisations (e.g.. NATO and UNIDO) on promoting the implementation of Multilateral Environmental Agreements, energy efficiency, and on restoring lands affected by mercury;
- The OSCE should concentrate on identifying what is really urgent in terms of threats to security and stability and the areas where environmental issues can create tension between and within countries.

LOG OF CONTRIBUTIONS to the 15th ECONOMIC and ENVIRONMENTAL FORUM

Ref. No.	Date	Country	Title	Lang.
I. OPENING PLENARY SESSION D:\15EF_Part1\Opening\				
EF.DEL/11/07	23.01.07	Cio-Spain	Opening Statement by Ambassador Carlos Sanchez de Boado, Chairman of the Permanent Council	English, Spanish
EF.GAL/5/07	22.01.07	OCEEA	Opening Remarks by Mr. Bernard Snoy, Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities	English
EF.DEL/5/07	22.01.07	Germany/EU	EU Opening Statement	English
EF.DEL/7/07	22.01.07	Canada	Statement by Canada	English
EF.IO/2/07	19.01.07	UNCCD	Keynote Address by Mr. Gregoire Kalbermatten, Deputy Executive Secretary, UNCCD	English
EF.DEL/17/07	29.01.07	Russ Fed	Statement by Mr. Oleg L. Mitvol, Deputy Director of the Federal Service for the Oversight of Natural Resources, Russian Federation	English, Russian
EF.DEL/21/07	30.01.07	GUAM	Statement of the GUAM Member States	English
EF.IO/4/07	21.01.07	EEA	Keynote Address by Ms. Jacqueline Mc Glade, Executive Director, European Environment Agency (EEA)	English
EF.IO/6/07	22.01.07	UNECE	Keynote Address by Mr. Marek Belka, Executive Secretary, UNECE	English
EF.DEL/22/07	07.02.07	Israel	Statement by Ms. Galit Ronen, DCM, Israeli Mission to the OSCE	English
II. PLENARY SESSION I ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY AND THE SPECIFIC CHALLENGES OF LAND DEGRADATION AND SOIL CONTAMINATION D:\15EF_Part1\Plenary I\				
EF.DEL/1/07	17.01.07	USA	Keynote Address by BG (R.) Christopher King, Dean of Academics, US Army Command and General Staff College	English
EF.DEL/6/07	22.01.07	Turkey	Preliminary Views by Turkey on the 'Introductory Note' (EF.GAL/2/07)	English

Ref. No.	Date	Country	Title	Lang.
EF.DEL/19/07	29.01.07	EC-EU	Presentation by Ms. Claudia Olazábal, Agriculture and Soil Unit, Environment Directorate-General, European Commission.	English
III. PLENARY SESSION II ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE, IN PARTICULAR AS IT AFFECTS LAND DEGRADATION AND SOIL CONTAMINATION D:\15EF_Part1\Plenary II\				
EF.DEL/2/07	18.01.07	Tajikistan	Contribution by Mr. Nursratullo Nozaninov, Head of the Department of External Relations and Co-operation of the Agency for Land Management, Cartographie and Geodesy	English, Russian
EF.DEL/3/07	19.01.07	Germany	Keynote Address by Mr. Friedrich von Bismarck, CEO for the Governmental Program for the Rehabilitation of East-German Lignite Mines	English
EF.DEL/4/07	19.01.07	Spain	Keynote Address by Mr. Sergio Alvarez, Head of Area, International Affairs Department, Ministry of Environment, Spain	Russian
EF.DEL/9/07	23.01.07	Kyrgyzstan	Statement by Kyrgyzstan	English, Russian
EF.DEL/9/07/Ad d.1	23.01.07	Kyrgyzstan	Presentation by Kyrgyzstan	English, Russian
EF.IO/5/07	22.01.07	UNECE	Keynote Address by Mr. Jeremy Wates, Secretary to the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, UNECE	English
EF.DEL/20/07	29.01.07	Germany	Keynote Address by Dr. Friedrich von Bismarck, CEO for the Governmental Program for the Rehabilitation of East-German Lignite Mines.	English
IV. PLENARY SESSION III SOCIAL EFFECTS OF LAND DEGRADATION AND SOIL CONTAMINATION D:\15EF_Part1\Plenary III\				
EF.DEL/8/07	22.01.07	Uzbekistan	Contribution by Mr. Shawkat Primov, Head of Department of Land Reclamation, Ministry for Agriculture and Water Resources of Uzbekistan	Russian

Ref. No.	Date	Country	Title	Lang.
EF.IO/1/07	17.01.07	UNUEHS	Keynote Address by Mr. Fabrice Renaud, Associate Director of UNU Institute for Environment and Human Security, Bonn, Germany	English
EF.NGO/2/07	29.01.07	Germany	Keynote address by Dr. Falk Schmidt, Scientific Officer, International Human Dimensions Program on Global Environmental Change, Bonn, Germany	English
EF.GAL/4/07	19.01.07	ODIHR	Keynote Address by Mrs. Anna Platonova, Migration Officer, OSCE/ODIHR	English

V. PLENARY SESSION IV

ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY AND SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

D:\15EF_Part1\Plenary IV

EF.DEL/10/07/ Corr.1	23.01.07	Croatia	Statement by Mr. Zdravko Krmek, State Secretary in the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management of Croatia	English
EF.DEL/13/07	23.01.07	Belarus	Statement by Mr. Stanislav Matuk, Director of Department of Regional Development and Environment, Ministry of Economy, Belarus	English, Russian
EF.DEL/18/07/	29.01.07	Russ Fed	Keynote Statement by Mr. Oleg L. Mitvol, Deputy Director of the Federal Service for the Oversight of Natural Resources, Russian Federation	English, Russian
EF.IO/7/07	22.01.07	OECD	Contribution by Mr. Manfred Schekulin, Chairman, OECD Investment Committee	English
EF.IO/9/07	29.01.07	Spain	Dr. Jose Luis Rubio, European Society for Soil Conservation, Research Centre on Desertification, University of Valencia, Spain: Implications of land degradation on socio-economics aspects and environmental security.	English
EF.IO/10/07	29.01.07	EBRD	Keynote address, Mr. Alistair Clark, Director of the Environment Department, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.	English

VI. PANEL DISCUSSION

THE ROLE OF THE OSCE IN FOLLOW-UP TO THE FORUM

D:\15EF_Part1\Panel I

Ref. No.	Date	Country	Title	Lang.
EF.DEL/15/07	25.01.07	Germany	Contribution by Mr. Andreas Bieber, Head of Division, Federal Ministry for the Environment of Germany	English
EF.IO/8/07	22.01.07	UNIDO	Contribution by Ms. Petra Schwager, Industrial Development Officer, UNIDO, Panellist Speaker	English
EF.IO/11/07	29.01.07	UNECE	Mr. Bo Libert, Regional Adviser, Environment and Human Settlements Division, UNECE.	English
EF.NGO/1/07	19.01.07	ECOSAN	Mr. Yusufjon Shadimetov, President of the International Organization of Ecology and Health ECOSAN	English, Russian
VII. CLOSING PLENARY SESSION D:\15EF_Part1\Closing\				
EF.DEL/12/07	23.01.07	CIO-Spain	Closing Statement by Amb. Sanchez de Boado, Chairman of the Permanent Council	English, Spanish
EF.DEL/14/07	23.01.07	Germany/EU	EU Closing Statement	English
EF.DEL/16/07	25.01.07	Switzerland	Statement by Switzerland	English
EF.GAL/6/07	23.01.07	OCEEA	Closing Remarks by Mr. Bernard Snoy, Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities	English
IX. GENERAL CONTRIBUTIONS D:\15EF_Part1\General contributions\				
EF.FR/1/07/	23.01.07	Miss to BiH	Contribution by the Deputy Head of the OSCE Mission Bosnia and Herzegovina	English
EF.GAL/2/07/	15.01.07	OSCE OCEEA	Introductory Note	English
EF.GAL/3/07/Re v.1	19.01.07	OSCE OCEEA	Updated Annotated Agenda	English
EF.IO/3/07/	22.01.07	UNCCD	Contribution by the UNCCD on Carbon Offsetting, Climate Change, Desertification, Biodiversity and Security, a Synergies Project	English
EF.IO/12/07	31.01.07	IOM	IOM's Approach to Combating the Social Effects of land degradation and soil contamination	English

Ref. No.	Date	Country	Title	Lang.
EF.INF/1/07	23.01.07	OSCE OCEEA	Logistical Modalities	English
EF.INF/2/07/Rev .2	23.01.07	CS	Final List of participants	English
EF.NGO/1/07/	19.01.07	ECOSAN	Report: 'Central Asia- Regional Problems of Environment Security and Sustainable Development', by Mr. Shadimetov, President of the International Organization of Ecology and Health ECOSAN	English Russian
	05/06	OSCE OCEEA	OSCE OCEEA Activity Report June 2005 - May 2006.	English Russian
	2004	OSCE OCEEA	OCEEA Fact Sheet on the OSCE Economic and Environmental Dimension.	English Russian
	2005	OSCE OCEEA	Fact Sheet on the Aarhus Center Model - Supporting people's rights in environmental matters.	English Russian
	2005	OSCE OCEEA	Fact Sheet on the OSCE Economic and Environmental Dimension & the Private Sector – Market expand with peace and security.	English