



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe  
Economic Forum (Senior Council)**

EF.GAL/13/02  
24 June 2002

ENGLISH only

---

**Conference Services**

# **TENTH MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC FORUM**

**Prague, 28 to 31 May 2002**

## **SUMMARY**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Place, date and overall theme for the Tenth Meeting of the Economic Forum (Permanent Council Decision No. 429 (PC.DEC/429)) .....	1
Main subjects and organizational modalities for the Tenth Meeting of the Economic Forum (Permanent Council Decision No. 473 (PC.DEC/473)) .....	6
Agenda of the Tenth Meeting of the Economic Forum .....	8
Draft Annotated Agenda of the Tenth Meeting of the Economic Forum .....	11
Welcoming remarks by the Chairperson of the Economic Forum .....	19
Keynote speech by the Representative of the Chairman-in-Office. ....	21
Perceptions of the Chairmanship .....	24
Closing remarks by the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities.....	27
Report of the rapporteur on the review of the implementation of OSCE commitments in the economic and environmental dimension .....	30
Working Group A      Issues related to co-operation for the sustainable use and protection of the quality of water .....	34
Working Group B      Actors involved in co-operation for the sustainable use and protection of the quality of water .....	38
Working Group C      Instruments for co-operation for the sustainable use and protection of the quality of water .....	43
Session I:              Suppressing the financing of terrorism - International instruments and standards .....	48
Session II:             Suppressing the financing of terrorism - Co-ordination of technical assistance and the role of financial intelligence units.....	51
Log of contributions to the Tenth Meeting of the Economic Forum .....	53





**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe  
Permanent Council**

PC.DEC/429  
19 July 2001

Original: ENGLISH

---

**348th Plenary Meeting**

PC Journal No. 348, Agenda item 7

**DECISION No. 429  
PLACE, DATE AND OVERALL THEME FOR THE  
TENTH MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC FORUM**

The Permanent Council,

Taking into account the Chairperson's Summary of the Ninth Meeting of the Economic Forum,

- Decides that the Tenth Meeting of the Economic Forum will take place in Prague from 28 to 31 May 2002. The overall theme of the Forum will be "Co-operation for the sustainable use and the protection of quality of water in the context of the OSCE".

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

Moreover, taking into account its tasks, the Economic Forum will review the implementation of commitments in the economic dimension.

The organizational modalities, including the sub-themes of the Forum, will be further elaborated and submitted to the Permanent Council for adoption in due time.

PC.DEC/429  
19 July 2001  
Attachment 1

ENGLISH  
Original: RUSSIAN

**INTERPRETATIVE STATEMENT  
UNDER PARAGRAPH 79 (CHAPTER 6) OF THE  
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HELSINKI CONSULTATIONS**

By the Delegation of Turkmenistan:

“The Delegation of Turkmenistan has taken the floor to make an interpretative statement on the question under discussion. Our Delegation has frequently, both formally and informally, expressed to the Chairman-in-Office and to the Delegation of Portugal our objections and fears regarding certain aspects of the whole complex of problems relating to water.

Water problems, particularly in the Central Asian region, have traditionally constituted a very important factor for the development of various intra-regional processes over the centuries, and the same remains true today. For the peoples of our region, water and the distribution of water have been and still are one of the main instruments underpinning relations between our States. In our region water is regarded not only as a natural resource belonging in the ecological and economic category, but also as a political category in its own right. This being so, it is essential, when considering any initiative relating to water, to take into account, in an extremely cautious and balanced way, all nuances, new realities and geopolitical and other elements in order to forestall undesirable tendencies.

As regards individual water problems of an ecological nature, joint work among the countries of the region is already underway, in particular with a view to solving the problems of the Aral Sea Basin. Furthermore, in collaboration with individual countries, international organizations and funds, a number of projects designed to bring about a radical improvement in the utilization of water and other resources, as well as enhanced efficiency and an improved culture of environmental management, are in progress.

We feel that the most important and effective direction that activities aimed at the solution of water problems can take lies in active dialogue among the countries of the region themselves, including those which are not members of the OSCE. It is precisely this type of approach that will enable us to work out arrangements for specific activities and strategies which should lead to rational utilization of the region's water resources. In this context, discussion of water problems and, *a fortiori*, the adoption of any kind of decision within the framework of the OSCE or other international organizations without taking due account of the interests of the region, is bound to be counter-productive; international collaboration in solving such problems must be handled with extreme caution and precision and must take into account the interests of all and sundry.

We are prepared, on the whole, to support the theme of the Tenth OSCE Economic Forum as presented to us provided that the following questions are not raised and discussed:

1. Transboundary water management regimes;
2. Questions regarding the utilization of water resources in the basins of shared waterways;
3. Distribution and management of water resources.

We should like to stress once more that these questions are extremely sensitive and significant for the States of our region. Many of them have been solved or are in the process of being solved - quite successfully in fact - at the level of bilateral inter-State treaties and agreements. However, if such questions are to be solved on the regional plane it is essential that all States of the region should be aware of them and display the necessary political will, themselves devising the conceptual principles that are to underlie the solution of water problems. Only then can the various international institutions (political, financial and others) be drawn into the process in order to consolidate efforts to solve all of these water problems.

The Delegation of Turkmenistan reserves the right to revert once more, if necessary, to the discussion of these questions.

We request the Secretariat to attach this interpretative statement of the Delegation of Turkmenistan to the documentation relating to this meeting.

Thank you for your attention.”

PC.DEC/429  
19 July 2001  
Attachment 2

ENGLISH  
Original: RUSSIAN

**INTERPRETATIVE STATEMENT  
UNDER PARAGRAPH 79 (CHAPTER 6) OF THE  
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HELSINKI CONSULTATIONS**

By the Delegation of the Russian Federation:

“In connection with today’s decision adopted by the Permanent Council of the OSCE concerning “The location, date and theme of the Tenth Meeting of the Economic Forum”, the Russian Federation states the following.

We believe that the theme “Co-operation for the sustainable use and the protection of quality of water in the context of the OSCE” is of equal importance to all regions in the OSCE area, including Western Europe and North America. The Russian Federation trusts that this consideration will be taken into account during preparations for the forthcoming Forum and the establishment of its agenda.

The Russian Federation, not wishing to upset the consensus, gave its consent to the theme proposed by Portugal for the 2002 Economic Forum. At the same time, we believe that the issue of the socio-economic consequences of disarmament, which was earlier recommended as a theme for discussion, is extremely important and remains as topical as ever. We accordingly propose that the socio-economic consequences of disarmament should constitute the theme for the Economic Forum in 2003.

The Russian Federation requests that this interpretative statement be attached to the journal of the OSCE Permanent Council meeting.”



PC.DEC/429  
19 July 2001  
Attachment 3

Original: ENGLISH

**INTERPRETATIVE STATEMENT  
UNDER PARAGRAPH 79 (CHAPTER 6) OF THE  
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HELSINKI CONSULTATIONS**

By the Delegation of the Republic of Turkey:

“We have just adopted the decision on the place, date and overall theme for the Tenth Meeting of the Economic Forum, which foresees that the overall theme will be “Co-operation for the “Sustainable Use and the Protection of Quality of Water in the Context of the OSCE”.

As we have repeatedly stated earlier, Turkey is in principle against the notion of discussing water issues at the OSCE Economic Forum, since OSCE does not have the necessary expertise to deal with such issues. However, taking into consideration that trans-boundary water issues, which must be resolved by riparian countries, are not included in the theme and as such will not be addressed during the Forum, and in a spirit of co-operation, we have decided to join the consensus. It is our firm expectation that the conclusions of the Tenth Economic Forum will be prepared with this understanding. However, in any case, we will not be bound by such conclusions, since Economic Forums are not decision-making bodies.

I would like to request this interpretative statement be annexed to the decision just adopted.”



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe  
Permanent Council**

PC.DEC/473  
25 April 2002

Original: ENGLISH

---

**391st Plenary Meeting**

PC Journal No. 391, Agenda item 9

**DECISION No. 473  
MAIN SUBJECTS AND ORGANIZATIONAL MODALITIES FOR  
THE TENTH MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC FORUM**

28 to 31 May 2002

Pursuant to Chapter VII, paragraphs 21 to 32, of the Helsinki Document 1992, and

Recalling its Decision No. 429 of 19 July 2001,

The Permanent Council decides that,

1. Within the framework of the overall theme, “Co-operation for the sustainable use and protection of the quality of water in the context of the OSCE”, and with regard to the preparatory process, the Tenth Meeting of the Economic Forum will concentrate on the following main subjects:

- (a) Issues related to co-operation for the sustainable use and protection of the quality of water;
- (b) Actors involved in co-operation for the sustainable use and protection of the quality of water;
- (c) Instruments for co-operation for the sustainable use and protection of the quality of water.

2. Moreover, taking into account its mandate, the Economic Forum will:

- (a) Review the implementation of commitments in the economic and environmental dimensions and the recommendations of the Ninth Economic Forum, including the seminars held on subjects related to the economic and environmental dimensions since the last Economic Forum;
- (b) Discuss future activities for the economic and environmental dimensions in 2002/2003;

- (c) Discuss in a working session, in fulfilment of the Bucharest Plan of Action for Combating Terrorism (MC(9).DEC/1), as well as of the Programme of Action endorsed at the Bishkek Conference (SEC.GAL/32/02), issues related to suppressing the financing of terrorism.
3. 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 private sector in their delegations would be welcome.
4. As in previous years, the format of the Economic Forum should provide for the active involvement of relevant international organizations and encourage open discussions.
5. The following international organizations are invited to participate in the Tenth Meeting of the Economic Forum: Black Sea Economic Co-operation; Central European Initiative; Commonwealth of Independent States; Council of Europe; Economic Cooperation Organization; Energy Charter Secretariat; European Bank for Reconstruction and Development; European Environment Agency; European Investment Bank; International Atomic Energy Agency; International Labour Organization; International Monetary Fund; North Atlantic Treaty Organization; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development; Organization of the Islamic Conference; Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change; South-East European Co-operation Process; Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe; United Nations Development Programme; United Nations Economic Commission for Europe; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; United Nations Environment Programme; United Nations Industrial Development Organization; United Nations Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention; United Nations Secretariat of the Convention to Combat Desertification; World Bank Group; World Health Organization and other relevant organizations.
6. The Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation (Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Morocco and Tunisia) and the Partners for Co-operation (Japan, the Republic of Korea and Thailand) are invited to participate in the Economic Forum.
7. Upon request by a delegation of an OSCE participating State, regional groupings may also be invited, as appropriate, to participate in the Tenth Meeting of the Economic Forum.
8. 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 Meeting.
9. The Chairperson of the Forum will present his or her summary conclusions drawn from the discussions at the end of the Meeting. The Economic and Environmental Sub-Committee of the Permanent Council will further include the conclusions of the Forum in its discussions so that the Council can take the decisions required for appropriate follow-up activities.



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe  
Economic Forum (Senior Council)**

10-EF(SC).JOUR/1  
28 May 2002  
Annex

Original: ENGLISH

---

**1st Day of the Tenth Meeting**  
10-EF(SC) Journal No. 1, Agenda 1

## **AGENDA OF THE TENTH MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC FORUM**

### **Co-operation for the sustainable use and protection of the quality of water in the context of the OSCE**

Prague, 28 to 31 May 2002

1. Opening plenary (open to the press)
  - (a) Welcoming remarks by the Chairperson of the Economic Forum
  - (b) Welcoming remarks by a representative of the Czech Government
  - (c) Opening address by the representative of the Chairman-in-Office
  - (d) Welcoming remarks by the Secretary General of the OSCE
  - (e) Welcoming remarks by the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities
  - (f) Statement by the President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly
2. Keynote addresses
3. Discussion
4. Review of the implementation of OSCE commitments in the economic and environmental dimension
  - (a) Opening address by the Chairperson of the Economic Forum
  - (b) Remarks/report by the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities

- (c) General overview of the implementation of OSCE commitments in the economic and environmental dimension by the Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
  - (d) Discussion
5. Working Group A: Issues related to co-operation for the sustainable use and protection of the quality of water
- Socio-economic and security implications of sustainable use of water
  - The Aral Sea Basin. What role for the OSCE?
  - The Kura Araks Basin
  - The Sava River Basin
6. Working Group B: Actors involved in the co-operation for the sustainable use and protection of the quality of water
- Local and central authorities and organizations
  - Non-governmental organizations and civil society
  - Co-operation with the business community
  - International organizations: Partnership opportunities
7. Working Group C: Instruments for co-operation for the sustainable use and protection of the quality of water
- International legal instruments
  - Interstate water commissions
  - Technical co-operation/development assistance
  - Co-operation in water management as a confidence-building measure in situations of post-conflict rehabilitation
8. Special session on suppressing the financing of terrorism
- Session I: International instruments and standards
  - Session II: Co-ordination of technical assistance and the role of financial intelligence units

9. Closing plenary session (open to the press)
  - (a) Rapporteurs' reports on the Implementation Review Meeting, the three working groups and the special session
  - (b) Closing remarks by the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities
  - (c) Concluding remarks and reading of the Chairperson's summary

# TENTH MEETING OF THE OSCE ECONOMIC FORUM ON CO-OPERATION FOR THE SUSTAINABLE USE AND PROTECTION OF THE QUALITY OF WATER IN THE CONTEXT OF THE OSCE

## Draft Annotated Agenda

### Tuesday, 28 May

10 a.m.-6 p.m. Registration for the Economic Forum

3-6.30 p.m. Opening Plenary (open to the press)

Welcoming remarks by the Chairperson of the Forum,  
Mr. Rui Lopes Aleixo, Deputy Co-ordinator of the Portuguese  
Chairmanship of the OSCE

Welcoming remarks by the First Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of  
the Czech Republic, H.E. Mr. Pavel Telička

Opening address by the Representative of the Chairman-in-Office,  
Mr. Antonio Gonçalves Henriquez, Director General of the Ministry  
for Urban and Land Use Planning and the Environment, Portugal

Welcoming remarks by the Secretary General of the OSCE,  
Ambassador Jan Kubiš

Welcoming remarks by the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and  
Environmental Activities, Mr. Marcin Świącicki

Statement by the President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly,  
H.E. Mr. Adrian Severin

Keynote addresses:

- H.E. Mr. Miloš Kužvart, Minister of Environment,  
Czech Republic
- Mrs. Brigita Schmögnerová, UN/ECE Executive Secretary
- Mr. Fernando Valenzuela Marzo, Deputy Director General, DG  
External Relations, European Commission
- Mr. Anthony Wayne, Assistant Secretary for Economic and  
Business Affairs at the Department of State, USA - tbc
- Mr. Ion Bazac, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Water and  
Environment, Romania
- Mr. Toni Popovski, Executive Director, Regional Environment  
Centre

Discussion

**Wednesday, 29 May**

- 9 a.m.-3 p.m. Registration for the Economic Forum
- 10 a.m.-1 p.m. Review of the implementation of OSCE commitments in the economic and environmental dimension
- Opening address by the Chairperson of the Economic Forum
- Remarks/report by the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities
- General overview of the implementation of OSCE commitments in the economic and environmental dimension by the Executive Secretary of the UN/ECE
- Rapporteur: Mr. Gianluca Rampolla, OCEEA-OSCE
- Discussion
- 1-3 p.m. Lunch

**Wednesday, 29 May to Friday, 31 May**

- Working Sessions
- Programme attached



## **WORKING GROUP A**

### **Issues related to co-operation for the sustainable use and protection of the quality of water**

Moderator: Mrs. Ann Marie Bolin Pennegard, Permanent Delegation of Sweden to the OSCE

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

Rapporteur: Mr. Dusan Vasiljevic, OSCE Mission to FRY

Co-Rapporteur: Mr. Frank Evers, CORE OSCE Research Institute

#### **Wednesday, 29 May**

3-4.30 p.m.

First Session: Socio-economic and security implications of - sustainable use of water

Lead Speakers:

Prof. Aaron T. Wolf, Oregon State University, USA

Dr. Daniel Linotte, OSCE/OCEEA and Dr. Jean Michel Collette, International Consultant on the Sustainable Development and Natural Resources Management

Mr. Albert Fry, World Business Council on Sustainable Development

Dr. Olli Varis, Helsinki University of Technology, Finland

#### **Thursday, 30 May**

9-11 a.m.

Second Session: The Aral Sea Basin. What role for the OSCE ?

Lead Speakers:

Prof. Victor A. Dukhovny, Scientific Information Centre of the Interstate Co-ordination Water Commission of Central Asia

Mr. Andrey Aranbaev, Ecological Club CATENA, Turkmenistan

Mr. David Pearce, World Bank

Mr. Talbak Salimov, "Tajikistan and Aral Sea" NGO, Tajikistan

#### **Thursday, 30 May**

3-4.30 p.m.

Third Session: The Kura Araks Basin

Lead Speakers:

Mr. Armen Saghatelian, National Academy of Science, Armenia

Dr. Raul Israfilov, Geology Institute, Academy of Sciences, Azerbaijan

Mr. Vahtanq Gvakharia, Gamma Scientific Research Company,  
Georgia

**Thursday, 30 May**

5-6.30 p.m.

Fourth Session: The Sava River Basin

Lead Speakers:

Mr. Sinisa Sirac, Croatian Water, Croatia

Mr. Radivoje Bratic, Water Management Institute, RS/Bosnia and  
Herzegovina

Mr. Masato Kawanishi, Japan International Co-operation Agency  
(JICA)

Mr. Gabriele Martignago, Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe

**WORKING GROUP B**

**Actors involved in the co-operation for the sustainable use and protection  
of the quality of water**

Moderator: Mr. João Bernardo Weinstein, Ministry of Foreign  
Affairs, Portugal/CiO

Co-Moderator: Mr. Jos Schellaars, Permanent Delegation of the  
Netherlands to the OSCE

Rapporteur: Mr. Daniel Linotte, Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE  
Economic and Environmental Activities

Co-Rapporteur: Mr. Armand Pupols, OSCE Centre in Almaty

**Wednesday, 29 May**

3-4.30 p.m.

First Session: Local and central authorities and organizations

Lead Speakers:

Mr. Adem Bekteshi, University of Shkodra, Albania

Ms. Senka Bjekovic, Ministry of Urban Planning, Montenegro/FR  
Yugoslavia

Ms. Jutta Rothacker, Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (German Bank  
for Reconstruction)

Ms. Knarik Hoyhannisyan, National Assembly, Armenia

**Wednesday, 29 May**

5-6.30 p.m.

Second Session: Non-governmental organizations and the civil society

Lead Speakers:

Dr. Ilya Trombitski, Ecological Society “Biotica”, Moldova

Ms. Cordula Wohlmuther, OSCE Project Co-ordinator in Ukraine and Dr. Valentina Pidlisnyuk, Ecology Department, National Agricultural University of Ukraine

Mr. Samir Isayev, Ecolex Environmental Law Center, Azerbaijan

Mr. Ondrej Velek, Environmental Partnership for Central Europe, Czech Republic

**Thursday, 30 May**

11.30 a.m.-1 p.m.

Third Session: Co-operation with the business community

Lead Speakers:

Mr. Albert Fry, World Business Council for Sustainable Development

Mr. Vaclav Jirasek, Provodi Labe s.p., Czech Republic

**Thursday, 30 May**

3-4.30 p.m.

Fourth Session: International organizations: partnership opportunities

Lead Speakers:

Dr. Edmond Hido, Albania-EU Energy Efficiency Center (EEC), Albania

Prof. Dr. Janos J. Bogardi, UNESCO

Ms. Helen Santiago Fink, OSCE/OCEEA

Mr. Toni Popovski, Regional Environment Center (REC)

Mr. Andrej Steiner, UNDP

Mr. Hossein Fadaei, UNEP

## **WORKING GROUP C**

### **Instruments for co-operation for the sustainable use and protection of the quality of water**

Moderator: Mr. Jaroslav Kinkor, Ministry of Environment, Czech Republic

Co-Moderator: Mr. Geoffrey Hamilton, UN/ECE

Rapporteur: Prof. Branko Bosnjakovic, EST Consulting, University of Rijeka

Co-rapporteur: Mr. Riccardo Lepri, OSCE Mission in Ashgabat

#### **Wednesday, 29 May**

5-6.30 p.m.

First Session: International legal instruments

Lead Speakers:

Prof. Paulo Canelas de Castro, University of Coimbra, Portugal

Mr. Bo Libert, UN/ECE

Mr. Helmut Bloech, DG Environment, EU Commission

Mr. Aliev Kemali, State Committee on Water Management, Ukraine

Ms. Liliana Bara, Ministry of Water and Environment, Romania

#### **Thursday, 30 May**

9.30–11 a.m.

Second Session: Interstate Water Commissions

Lead Speakers:

Prof. Aaron T. Wolf, Oregon State University, USA

Mr. Joachim Bendow, International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River

Mr. Dumitru Dorogan, Ministry of Water and Environment, Romania (The Black Sea Commission)

#### **Thursday, 30 May**

11.30 a.m.–1 p.m.

Third Session: Technical co-operation/development assistance

Lead Speakers:

Mr. Manuel Mariño, World Bank, Washington DC

Mr. Bruno Frattini, Ministry for Environment, Italy

Mr. Peter Sedgwick, European Investment Bank (EIB)

Mr. Pradeep Aggarwal, International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

**Thursday, 30 May**

5-6.30 p.m.

Fourth Session: Co-operation in water management as a confidence-building measure in post-conflict rehabilitation

Lead Speakers:

Mr. Zoran Bosev, Ministry of Environment, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Dr. Syle Tahirsyli, Hydrometeorological Institute of Kosovo, Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning, Kosovo/FR Yugoslavia

Mr. Sharof Sharipov, Ministry of Melioration and Water Resources, Tajikistan

Dr. Gianfranco Cicognani, Central European Initiative (CEI)

Mr. Zdravko Tuvic, Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs, FR Yugoslavia

Amb. Muhyieddeen Touq, Hashemite Kindom of Jordan

Mr. Jacob Keidar, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Israel

**SPECIAL SESSION ON SUPPRESSING THE FINANCING OF TERRORISM**

**Friday, 31 May**

9-10.30 a.m.

First Session: International Instruments and Standards

Moderator: Mr. Rui Lopes Aleixo, OSCE Deputy Co-ordinator, OSCE CiO, MFA, Portugal

Rapporteur: Ms. Sabine Nölke, Permanent Delegation of Canada to the OSCE

Lead Speakers:

Mr. Walter Gehr, UN SC Counter Terrorism Committee

Mr. Patrick Moulette, FATF Secretariat

Mr. Gerald Staberock, OSCE/ODIHR

**Friday, 31 May**

11 a.m.-12.45 p.m.

Second Session: Co-ordination of Technical Assistance and the Role of Financial Intelligence Units

Moderator: Mr. Timothy Lemay, UN ODCCP Global Programme Against Money Laundering

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

Lead Speakers:

Mr. Timothy Lemay, UN ODCCP Global Programme Against Money Laundering

Mr. Boudewijn Verhelst, Belgian Financial Intelligence Processing Unit

**Friday, 31 May**

12.45-2 p.m.

Lunch

1.15 p.m.

Press Conference

2-4 p.m.

Closing Plenary (open to the press)

Rapporteurs' reports on the Implementation Review Meeting, the three working groups and the special session

Closing remarks by the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities

Concluding remarks and reading of the Chairperson's summary

**WELCOMING REMARKS BY THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE FORUM,  
MR. RUI LOPES ALEIXO, DEPUTY CO-ORDINATOR OF THE  
PORTUGUESE CHAIRMANSHIP OF THE OSCE**

Your Excellencies,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,  
Dear Colleagues,

It is with great satisfaction that the Portuguese Chairmanship acknowledges the longevity of the Economic and Environmental Forum. The progress of the Economic and Environmental Dimension is worthy of recognition. Although we are aware that much has yet to be done, we believe that the present system, based on seminars with carefully selected themes, and oriented towards the discussion and analysis of concrete problems that may affect the security of the OSCE region, has proven to be globally positive.

The recently established Informal Sub-Committee will serve as the setting for dialogue on economic and environmental issues and will certainly contribute to assuring the follow-up to previously defined policies. It should also become a forum for the exchange of new ideas and, eventually, the development of recommendations to the Permanent Council on specific issues, thus ensuring a better link between this dimension of the OSCE and our regular proceedings.

This tenth anniversary should also be an opportunity to reflect on new ways to improve this dimension, particularly in regard to follow-up action. If we do not have concrete means of carrying forward the matters discussed - and it is our view that the way to achieve this is through the implementation of sound, practical and viable projects - all our efforts will be in vain.

We believe that the OSCE has an important and valuable role to play as a facilitator and catalyst, both between participating States and through interaction with other specialized international organizations involved with water-related issues. The Organization can also provide added value in addressing international concerns related to water resources security, namely through the sharing of successful experiences and in the identification of existing instruments for the prevention and resolution of conflicts.

The Portuguese Chairmanship is satisfied with the way in which the preparatory seminars took place and with the support given by the Economic and Environmental Co-ordinator, Mr. Marcin Swiecicki, and his team, along with the then acting Co-ordinator, Mr. Marc Baltes.

It is our view that the results of the discussions held in the three preparatory seminars - namely Belgrade, Zamora and Baku - can help us to obtain a better outcome to the work which lies ahead during this week.

The first preparatory seminar, which took place in Belgrade, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, in 2001, was dedicated to the protection and use of watercourses and international lakes. This event highlighted, in particular, the various possibilities for strengthening stability in the Balkans, through the development of mechanisms for

co-operation related to the security risks originating from environmental threats to water resources.

In Zamora, Spain, in addition to the presentation and interesting debate on transboundary water resources experiences in different regions, subjects relating to the framework-directive of the European Union, on the enlargement and integration process, were also discussed. In this field, the work carried out by the NGOs on the promotion, adoption and implementation of this directive, was singled out.

The Baku Seminar in Azerbaijan, dealt mainly with aspects associated with different forms of regional co-operation and with international and technical assistance in the regions of the Caspian Sea and the Black Sea. The Baku seminar could also be regarded as being in itself a confidence-building measure, facilitating the sharing of ideas on good practices and co-operation on matters linked to water resources in that part of the world.

I would also like to draw attention to the Paris seminar, where the socio-economic impact of disarmament was discussed, allowing us to touch upon an essential issue and once again to demonstrate the multi-disciplinary nature of this OSCE dimension.

As a way of demonstrating this interdisciplinary spirit, we are pleased to have the opportunity to include in the Forum a working session dedicated to the prevention of and fight against terrorism, a topic which constitutes one of the main priorities in the programme of the Portuguese Chairmanship of the OSCE.

The three OSCE dimensions constitute a coherent framework that must be developed and strengthened in harmony. Only through this process can societies become more balanced, and extremist tendencies will have less success in emerging. We consider this to be one of the more effective ways of fighting terrorism and the various means of financing it.

The working plan ahead of us allows for the identification and a complex analysis of the many problems that affect our societies and are the source of tensions, such as the lack of confidence which can lead to possible conflicts. It was for this reason that the Portuguese Chairmanship chose the theme of water for this year's Forum. Water also serves as an instrument for co-operation, the sharing of good practices, and the exchange of valuable information. All of these elements coincide perfectly with the OSCE spirit.

Bearing in mind the preparatory work that has been accomplished, I am confident that the Forum will be a success. The outcome of this event very much depends on all of us. I therefore look forward to the lively debates which lie ahead and hope that this Forum will put forward a set of practical ideas and new proposals related to co-operation and protection of the quality of water and its impact on security in the OSCE area.



**KEYNOTE SPEECH BY  
MR. ANTÓNIO GONÇALVES HENRIQUES, DIRECTOR GENERAL,  
OFFICE FOR INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, MINISTRY FOR  
URBAN AFFAIRS, LAND USE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT  
OF PORTUGAL, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL  
ENGINEERING AND ARCHITECTURE OF THE TECHNICAL  
UNIVERSITY OF LISBON**

The compilation of decisions adopted by the CSCE/OSCE Negotiating Bodies in the field of water since 1975, provided for this Economic Forum by the Centre for OSCE Research, elucidates the importance attached to water issues by this intergovernmental organization.

It is relevant to note the evolution of concepts on water issues present in the political agenda of the OSCE, since 1975.

In the 1970s and 1980s transboundary water pollution, in particular risks associated with nuclear energy, hazardous chemicals and wastes, were identified as major areas of concern. The need to strengthen prevention and early warning systems as well as to ensure co-operation among the parties in the aftermath of industrial accidents were the issues at stake in the late 1980s, provoked in particular by the Chernobyl disaster.

The need to protect and enhance freshwater resources and to reduce water pollution was considered on several occasions by the OSCE. However, in the 1990s, these issues were addressed in the context of promoting security and preventing conflicts. The Seventh Economic Forum, in 1999, stressed that “good management of scarce freshwater resources is of utmost importance to security in the OSCE area”. This conclusion was driven mainly by security concerns in Central Asia, although it remains an important issue in other areas of the OSCE region.

More recently, issues related to scarce water resources and enabling the equitable use of water, particularly in international river basins, are of major concern. These issues cannot be addressed adequately by the traditional tools based on the principles of absolute territorial sovereignty of the States. However, the question of sharing sovereignty is a complex one, that must be explored within the framework of mutual benefits for all the parties involved.

To address the issues of transboundary water pollution, in particular the risks associated with hazardous chemicals and wastes, the 1992 UN/ECE Helsinki Convention on Transboundary Effects of Major Accidents was developed, based on the principle of causing no harm to health, to property and to the environment of neighbouring states. The protocol on liability, now being prepared under this convention, will provide an important legal instrument for preventing damages and for compensating for the effects of major accidents.

There are a few other international legal instruments that provide the basis for addressing transboundary water pollution in international river basins. The 1992 United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UN/ECE) Helsinki Convention on Transboundary Rivers and International Lakes provides the framework for addressing these problems by riparian States; it includes provisions to ensure the obligation to exchange

information and to co-operate in emergency situations. The provisions set out in this convention regarding water pollution and its effects on human health, are strengthened in the 1999 London Protocol on Water and Health, adopted under this Convention. This protocol addresses the important issue of protecting the water resources used or intended to provide water for human consumption, as well as to protect water resources used for recreation.

Questions concerning the transboundary environmental effects of water projects are addressed in the 1991 UN/ECE Espoo Convention on Transboundary Impact Assessment. This convention includes provisions stating the obligation of riparian States to develop environmental impact assessments for those projects with significant effects on the environment of other States, including the requirement to ensure public participation, particularly of potentially affected parties. This convention also includes provisions to develop *a posteriori* monitoring programmes on the transboundary effects on the environment caused by projects undertaken in the territory of a State which is a party to the convention. However, transboundary impact assessment should be anticipatory. A new Protocol for Strategic Environment Assessment is therefore now being prepared within the framework of the Espoo Convention, the importance of which must be emphasized when dealing with the development of water resources: before implementing a plan for developing the use of water resources in an international river basin, the transboundary impact of the planned measures must be evaluated in the early stages of the process, with the participation of the parties concerned.

Both Espoo and Helsinki UN/ECE Conventions include provisions for conflict resolution, based on fact-finding mechanisms, and for the compensation for damage caused by transboundary effects. The above-mentioned protocol on liability, which is also being developed within the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents, is a significant contribution towards ensuring proper compensation for transboundary damage.

In dealing with environmental issues the question of public participation is of major importance. This is particularly important when transboundary effects are involved. The 1998 UN/ECE Århus Convention on access to information, public participation in environmental decisions, and access to justice, provides the framework for ensuring public involvement in environmental matters.

However, the issues raised by the consumption of water are not satisfactorily dealt with in these UN/ECE conventions. The concept of the equitable use of water, which is of great importance in water-scarce regions, is absent from all these conventions.

A major attempt to address this question is provided by the 1997 UN Convention on the Law of Non-navigational Uses of International Water Courses. The convention aims to fill a significant gap in international law respecting the consumption of water in international river basins. This is the only relevant multilateral legal instrument to address this question consistently. However, despite the fact that this convention has been approved by a large majority of United Nations member States, 103 against only 3, the convention has not yet entered into force, possibly due to the lack of interest of member States in its ratification. In fact, to date, the convention has been ratified by less than 10 member States, a number far below the minimum required by the convention of 35.

I believe that it is necessary to investigate the reasons why the convention has not merited more attention by the States. The gap that the convention aims to address must be

filled urgently. The way forward is either to urge United Nations member States to ratify the convention, or to find an alternative legal instrument that addresses appropriately the issue of water use by the riparian States of the international river basins and that creates more extensive interest.

Within the OSCE I believe, in accordance with the compilation of the decisions already taken, that there is a clear political will to address the issues of equitable water use and water protection. This political will must now be put into practice.

A possible way forward is through the development of river basin management plans involving all the interested parties, be they riparian states or groups of water users. The development of such river basin management plans must be based on the clear identification of the most significant problems, regarding both water quality and water scarcity, in each river basin. These plans must set clear objectives on water uses and water protection, and must include programmes of measures to achieve these objectives within feasible time-frames. To ensure the adequate implementation of these river basin management plans, the competent authorities must develop monitoring programmes, provide an appropriate set of indicators of performance, and ensure the dissemination of relevant information to all parties involved.

In conclusion, the OSCE could facilitate the joint implementation of river basin management plans, for example, by providing for the exchange of experience concerning river basins. This process would boost the implementation of the international legal instruments already in place, including their updating, according to the lessons learned in practice.



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe  
Economic Forum (Senior Council)**

10-EF(SC).JOUR/4/Corr.1  
31 May 2002  
Annex

Original: ENGLISH

---

**4th Day of the Tenth Meeting**

10-EF(SC) Journal No. 4, Agenda item 9(c)

**PERCEPTIONS OF THE CHAIRMANSHIP**

This Forum represents the first stage of reflection dedicated to the co-operation for the sustainable use and the protection of the quality of water in the OSCE area.

It also signals the highest point in a process which we took upon ourselves to develop in order to evaluate and define the international preoccupations related with water issues, which itself is a fundamental factor for the security and co-operation in the twenty-first century.

Today we can ascertain, conscious that the sharing of information and of experiences between the participating States, as far as water is concerned, constitutes a valuable contribution to the identification of instruments, which are at our disposal and that can be used to prevent and resolve conflicts. This clearly demonstrates the role of the OSCE in the promotion of values and responsibilities, such as stability and peace amongst peoples.

We believe that the variety of subjects addressed by this Forum will contribute to the strengthening of the political dialogue in the OSCE and to the balancing of the three dimensions of the Organization as put forth by the Bucharest Ministerial. In this sense, the Economic and Environmental Subcommittee has an important task in assuring the follow-up of our deliberations.

We are convinced that the debate on matters so complex such as the use and the protection of water and its further discussion in a positive and co-operative spirit, constitute factors of fundamental importance for the definition and promotion of environmental and economical policies in the OSCE area. Such policies are potential confidence-building instruments, which can generate good-neighbourly relations and can be utilized as means for the implementation of the broad and co-operative concept of security upon which the OSCE is based.

A range of proposals and considerations were made by a number of delegations with a view of intensifying the OSCE economic dimension. The enhancement of the review process of implementation of the economic and ecological commitments of participating States will be assured by means of the development of closer contacts between the OSCE and major international, regional economic and financial organizations and institutions. Some delegations mentioned the possibility of elaborating a new comprehensive pan-European

document on new principles of economic, scientific and technical co-operation in Europe (following the example of the Bonn Document 1990).

The Chair noted the initiative by the Swiss and German delegations to elaborate an environmental code of conduct, that could take the form of a document on principles, best practices and potential measures. Various views were expressed on this issue. The Chair intends to propose to discuss in the Economic and Environmental Subcommittee in depth the link between security, co-operation and environmental issues, taking into account and avoiding duplication of existing international instruments and action by other international for in the environmental sphere, including United Nations Environment Programme, United Nations-Economic Commission for Europe and the European Union.

At the end of this Forum it is the understanding of the Chair that there is good ground for further reflection on a possible decision on the “Financial Action Task Force (FATF) Self-Assessments on Terrorist Financing”. This matter will be further discussed in Vienna, in view of its inclusion in the agenda of the Permanent Council in the weeks to come.

With a view to the organization of the Eleventh Forum, as from 1 June this year, the responsibility for the preparations of this event is delegated by the Chairman-in-Office to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands. There was general agreement that the next Economic Forum will take place in Prague. A number of suggestions and proposals were submitted in this context, including one by the Russian Federation. The Netherlands delegation has proposed as a theme for next year’s Forum: “Trafficking in human beings, drugs, small arms and light weapons: national and international economic impact”. Consultations so far have shown a broad support in favour this proposal. A final decision will be taken by the Permanent Council in conformity with existing practices.

The Forum should be thoroughly prepared, *inter alia*, by seminars, focused both geographically and thematically. Preparations should be undertaken by the incoming chairmanship. They should take place at an early point, so that a decision may be taken with regard to the sub-themes of the Economic Forum.

We noted with great satisfaction the active presence of the representatives of such a large number of international organizations and institutions.

The participation of the academic, scientific and business community, brought the civil society to our proceedings and will increase the visibility of the OSCE. In this context, we would like to single out the systematic and valuable contributions of NGO representatives.

Let us express our gratitude for the presence of the Mediterranean and Asian Partners for Co-operation and thank them for their contribution to the improvement of the economic and environmental dimension.

Translation and interpretation services, as well as the Secretariat deserve our greatest appreciation for their work these past days.

10-EF(SC).JOUR/4/Corr.1  
31 May 2002  
Annex (continued)

We would like to thank the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities and his staff for the very precious support given to us during our chairmanship.

It is particularly important to underline that most of the work is being done without the support of a regular budget, requiring from all of us a lot of imagination and effort.

And, before leaving, we thank once again the Czech authorities for their much-appreciated hospitality.

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

At the end of our Forum let me share with you some of my impressions. The topic of water management, introduced with a certain amount of apprehension, turned out to be very fruitful in security related aspects. The abundance of issues surpassed my expectations and I think those of many of us.

Within the OSCE region we have 104 river basins that extend over the territory of more than one country. It is evident that such a number results in part from the increase of the number of countries within the OSCE region from 35 to 55 in the span of the last 15 years. Rivers once governed by the authority of one single country are now subject to the sovereignty of two, three or more countries.

Our discussions, whether in plenary gatherings or in working groups, have made it clear that water can contribute to serious tensions between countries if proper management is not in place.

There are regions which are threatened by shortages of clean drinking water. Wasteful use of water can cause secondary desertification of regions populated by hundreds of thousands of people. Agriculture can be damaged. Interstate pollution can contribute to diseases, diminishing revenue from tourist services, and there may be a lack of water for certain industries. In some regions the supply of electric power relies heavily on water supplies. Stoppages in the power supply can ruin, and has actually ruined, many businesses.

We discussed several ways to ensure good water management: international treaties and conventions, bilateral agreements, the EU water framework directive, and national legislation. We looked at organizational solutions: a variety of joint water commissions, forums, and interstate or regional or national monitoring institutions. Interestingly enough, it was brought to the attention of the Forum that 90 per cent of fresh water reserves are underground waters, which are not covered by any convention.

Our discussions indicated how many actors are interested in good water management: national and local governments, consumer organizations, the business community and environmentalists.

Water turned out to be a multidimensional theme with innumerable security related interactions.

A number of follow-up measures, some of them already initiated during preparatory seminars, were proposed, developed and discussed. Let me mention some of them.

There are two initiatives, already quite advanced, to monitor water pollution, one in respect of the surface waters of the Kura Araks Basin, the other concerning underground waters in the Caucasus region.

We continued to develop the initiative already announced at the Belgrade seminar concerning Sava River Basin.

Another issue with potential stability implications, is the desertification in the Aral Sea Basin, which threatens the livelihood of large populations and may result in their displacement. My office, together with the field presences, will consider a possible OSCE role in this regard.

The OSCE can be instrumental in promoting United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UN/ECE) regional conventions, protocols and guidelines, as well as the EU water framework directive. These will provide guidance for participating States in developing their institutional capacities for coping with transboundary water issues and preventing related conflicts. Given the strong link between legal commitments, political behaviour, and economic and environmental performance, recommendations were made to promote the accession, signature, ratification and implementation of these legal instruments, in particular the Aarhus Convention.

Water was not the only topic discussed at the Forum. Against the background that this Tenth Economic Forum was the first held after 11 September 2001, a special working session addressed economic aspects of new security challenges, namely the suppression of the financing of terrorism. A number of recommendations by competent international organizations, which may be considered for further OSCE activity in this area, were presented. I would like to draw your attention to just two specific areas:

- First, following further discussions by relevant OSCE bodies on the proposed initiative of the United States on the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) self assessment on terrorism financing, my office will explore how it could support the implementation of such a decision, when taken, within the framework of its mandate;
- Second, utilizing the Platform for Co-operative Security, the Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities (OCEEA) will continue with, and further develop, constructive co-operation with the United Nations Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention (ODCCP) global programme against money laundering. the proposed “national workshops on combating money laundering and suppressing the financing of terrorism” are a first practical step offered by ODCCP and OCEEA for co-operation with interested participating States.

I also welcome a USA initiative to strengthen the skills of young entrepreneurs and to improve the environment for the development of small and medium enterprises (SMEs), first in Central Asia and then in other regions.

These are very practical starting points for OCEEA activities, which can of course be further developed on the basis of guidance we receive from our participating States.

With regard to the review session, delegations recommended the inclusion of a more systematic analysis of the implementation of commitments, and I subscribe to this idea.

I would also like to mention the idea of developing an environmental code of conduct that was discussed here in Prague. I believe we will be able to consider such a proposal further within the framework of the Economic and Environmental Subcommittee of the Permanent Council. I also welcome the fact that the Romanian Delegation informed participants about, and invited them to, the follow-up seminar to the Ninth OSCE Economic



Forum to be held in Bucharest on 11 and 12 July 2002, on the theme of “Co-ordinating regional efforts to increase transparency and facilitate business”.

This week has served as a starting point from which we can further evaluate and consider new avenues for beneficial partnerships and activities.

The Tenth Economic Forum will close today, but these issues remain on our agenda and we will follow them up in the Economic and Environmental Subcommittee of the Permanent Council.

In all these sessions, the role of field presences has been recognized as crucial for the implementation of the OSCE mandate. Their active and valuable contributions to the discussions demonstrated that field presences can be a key tool for the Organization in enhancing its conflict prevention and early warning capacity in the economic and environmental dimension.

Back in Vienna, we will continue our efforts towards implementing our challenging mandate in order to strengthen the economic and environmental dimension of the OSCE and thus enable our organization to enhance the stability, security and ultimately the wellbeing of future generations.

Before concluding these remarks, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you personally, as well as your team, for your co-operation in the preparation of this Forum. The task was a challenging one, and I believe that we can look back to a successful meeting this year in Prague. This would of course not have been possible without all, that is some 400, participants in the event, and I would like to thank all of you for your invaluable support and your contributions. I would especially like to thank our lead speakers, moderators, co-moderators, rapporteurs and other participants for engaging all of us in most stimulating discussions.

The contributions from and co-operation with international organizations, and in particular the UN/ECE and UN ODCCP, are of paramount importance in achieving our objectives. The same applies to the OSCE Missions, as well as NGOs, who have provided us with their perspective on these complex issues and have thus been of immense value in our discussions, and I thank them for that. I would also like to thank the OSCE conference services and our technical team from Vienna, as well as Mr. Venera and his dedicated team here in the Prague OSCE office. I am especially grateful to the team of my office, to whom a great deal of the success of this Forum has to be attributed. And last, but not least, I am grateful to our interpreters and translators for their excellent work, their patience and their dedication.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it was an honour and a great pleasure to be with all of you at this Tenth Economic Forum and I am looking forward to our continuing co-operation. I am also looking forward to seeing you at the next event our office is organizing in co-operation with the Romanian delegation, the follow-up seminar to the Ninth Economic Forum, to be held in Bucharest in July. Thank you again and I wish all of you a safe journey home.

## **CO-OPERATION FOR THE SUSTAINABLE USE AND PROTECTION OF THE QUALITY OF WATER IN THE CONTEXT OF THE OSCE**

29 May 2002

### **Report of the Rapporteur of the Implementation Review Meeting**

#### **Agenda item 4: Review of the implementation of OSCE commitments in the economic and environmental dimension**

---

##### **(a) Remarks by the Chairperson of the Economic Forum**

In his opening remarks, Mr. Lopes Aleixo recalled the important steps towards enhancing the economic and environmental dimension (EED) made since the previous session of the Economic Forum. The Chairperson highlighted, *inter alia*, the Bucharest ministerial decision establishing the Economic and Environmental Subcommittee of the Permanent Council, the appointment of the new Co-ordinator and the elaboration of a strategy, currently under discussion among delegations, for strengthening the EED in Central Asia. Mr. Aleixo expressed appreciation for the successful preparatory process leading up to the Tenth Economic Forum and underlined the wealth of ideas, proposals and recommendations that had stemmed from the three preparatory seminars. Mr. Aleixo stressed that the Chairmanship was committed to supporting the follow-up to the initiatives that emerged and offered full support to the incoming Chairmanship in the preparations for the Eleventh Economic Forum.

##### **(b) Remarks by the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities**

In his remarks, Mr. Swiecicki argued that economic and environmental threats to security are difficult to overlook. He stressed that early warning signs with regard to economic sources of conflict were increasingly clear and that there was a need for a more pragmatic and action-oriented focus in order to address these challenges.

Close co-operation with the OSCE field missions constituted an important part of the work of the Office of the Co-ordinator in supporting their objectives related to economic and environmental matters, which included topics such as good governance, anti-corruption efforts, terrorism, decentralization, institution and civil society building, legislative reform, etc. OCEEA's access to extrabudgetary contributions assisted missions in organizing training, courses, workshops, conferences and other events that fostered dialogue and catalysed action by local (and international) stakeholders on specific issues.

The Bucharest Plan of Action for Combating Terrorism, as well as the Programme of Action endorsed at the Bishkek Conference, identified primarily two areas for action in the economic and environmental dimension: the first priority would consist in elaborating and promoting instruments to cut the financing of terrorism; the second priority would address core reasons for terrorism: underdevelopment, unemployment and wide gaps in human living conditions among countries of the OSCE area.

The Co-ordinator reported on the follow-up activities to the Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Meetings of the Economic Forum and on the preparatory process for the Tenth Economic Forum. Over 100 activities had been developed in the field, some of which had been instrumental in creating such institutions as the Ministry of the Environment of Albania, environmental institutional and legislation structuring in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the establishment of an Aarhus Centre in Yerevan. Attention was given by the Co-ordinator in his report to activities developed by the OSCE in co-operation with partner organizations.

**(c) General overview of the implementation of OSCE commitments in the economic and environmental dimension by the Executive Secretary of UN/ECE**

The most substantive and most recent declaration of commitments of OSCE participating States is found in the 1990 Bonn Document. Mrs. Schmögnerová recalled that this Document reflected to some extent the uncertainty of the period but overall made a strong statement in favour of economic reform and the market economy.

There were numerous commitments, both macroeconomic and microeconomic, made by OSCE participating States in the Bonn Document. Among the most salient were: (i) macroeconomic stabilization and the commitment to prudent anti-inflationary policies and fiscal and monetary credibility; (ii) commitment to international investment and the rights of establishment of foreign companies; and (iii) a conducive environment for new enterprise development and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs).

Mrs. Schmögnerová reported that the majority of transition economies, in the year 2001, had shown a good economic performance which demonstrated their achievements in implementing existing commitments in the OSCE economic dimension.

Nevertheless, Mrs. Schmögnerová pointed out that the performance of these countries in meeting their commitments did not necessarily mean that the region was more secure. Other sources of tensions, which were not covered by OSCE's economic and environmental commitments, had emerged since 1990. These were the growing disparities within the OSCE region: the increasing economic differences amongst States - between Central and Eastern European States, the countries of South-East Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). Additional threats to security not referred to in the Bonn Document included increasing income inequalities within States, poor governance and weak institutions, the increase in poverty and environmental degradation.

The Executive Secretary then argued that in the light of these new threats to security, it would now be timely to consider the elaboration of new norms and commitments. UN/ECE strongly supported the review of commitments as an instrument for the work in the economic dimension and expressed the view that interest in this segment of OSCE work could be improved by incorporating some new issues into the review.

This year's report prepared by UN/ECE also included a review of the implementation of UN/ECE environmental conventions.

Of the numerous UN/ECE conventions on the environment, two in particular stood out as contributing directly to conflict prevention.

The UN/ECE Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes (Helsinki, 1992)

Mrs. Schmögnerová stressed that overall the Convention was being well implemented and was universally recognized. It had proved to be a useful tool for institutional co-operation on transboundary waters and a platform for the exchange of experience among parties and non-parties. The Convention had been adopted in Helsinki on 17 June 1992, and had entered into force on 6 October 1996. As of mid-May 2002, 32 countries and the European Union were Parties. The following countries had not yet acceded to the Convention:

(a) European Union countries - Ireland and the United Kingdom; (b) Balkan countries: Bulgaria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia; (c) newly independent States of the former Soviet Union (NIS): Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan, (d) other countries - Andorra, Canada, Monaco, San Marino, Turkey and the United States.

The UN/ECE Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters

Mrs. Schmögnerová reported that the Convention had been signed by 39 countries and the European Commission. The Convention had entered into force on 30 October 2001 and the first meeting of the Parties would take place in October 2002 in Italy. To date, 20 countries had become Parties to the Convention, most of these being from Central and Eastern Europe or the Commonwealth of Independent States. Several Western European countries, as well as the European Union itself, were actively working towards ratification.

In recognition of this, many activities had been carried out to support States not only in becoming Parties to the Convention but, more important, in effectively implementing it. These had included a series of subregional multi-stakeholder workshops, aimed at bringing together government officials, NGOs and others to discuss the requirements for effective implementation. Many of these activities had involved close co-operation between UN/ECE, UNEP and OSCE.

## **Discussion**

Delegates noted with satisfaction the latest developments towards a rebalancing of the three OSCE dimensions by enhancing the economic and environmental dimension. Most delegations agreed that much still needed to be done in order to render the work in this dimension more result-oriented, efficient and effective.

Delegations generally agreed that OSCE commitments were the common basis for the security of participating States and that non-compliance might represent a risk to security. The consequent importance of the regular review of the implementation of commitments was highlighted.

The importance of macroeconomic stability and sustained structural reforms for economic recovery and growth was also underlined, as well as the need for improved conditions for attracting foreign direct investment (FDI) and fostering the development of SMEs.

## **Recommendations**

Delegations recommended improving the implementation review exercise, including a systematic analysis of implementation and a systematization of commitments. A number of delegates also recalled that unlike other OSCE documents on the human and politico-military dimensions which were periodically reviewed and updated, the Bonn Document had never been re-evaluated. A review and update of the Bonn Document was recommended by a number of delegations.

Several delegations underlined the key role to be played by the Economic and Environmental Subcommittee, and it was suggested that the Subcommittee could be tasked with the evaluation and elaboration of a draft proposal for the review of the Bonn Document.

Given the strong link between legal commitments, political behaviour and economic and environmental performance, recommendations were made for promoting among countries that were not yet parties to the UN/ECE Conventions the signature and ratification of these legal instruments.

The Swiss and German delegations invited OSCE delegations to consider the possibility of formulating a recommendation of the Forum inviting the Economic and Environmental Subcommittee to include in its work programme the elaboration of an environmental code of conduct. Two delegations expressed reservations, and requested that the issue be further considered in Vienna.

## **Information**

The Romanian delegation to the OSCE informed participants about, and invited them to, the Follow-Up Seminar to the Ninth Meeting of the OSCE Economic Forum that will be held in Bucharest in July 2002 on the theme of "Co-ordinating regional efforts to increase transparency and facilitate business".

## WORKING GROUP A

29 and 30 May 2002

### Report of the Working Group Rapporteur

#### **Agenda item 5: Issues related to co-operation for the sustainable use and protection of the quality of water**

---

Discussions in Working Group A were focused on socio-economic and security implications of the sustainable use of water resources. Security-related problems in this field were debated using the examples of (a) the Aral Sea Basin, (b) the Kura Araks Basin and (c) the Sava River Basin. Recommendations were elaborated on political and technical measures that national and regional players, as well as international organizations, should take to avoid a further deterioration of the water situation in these regions. Corresponding steps were seen as part of a framework for supporting social and economic recovery, confidence-building and conflict prevention. Special recommendations were addressed to the OSCE, its regional field representations and other international organizations. The following report tries to reflect individual standpoints and proposals delivered by representatives of delegations and non-governmental, international and academic organizations at four working sessions.

**Socio-economic and security implications of the sustainable use of water resources.** Regional scarcity of water resources, limited or unbalanced access to water as well as its sustainable or non-sustainable use influenced a whole scale of environmental, economic, demographic and social developments. In a number of regions in the world, these issues turned into sensitive political matters. Increasingly, they put regional stability under danger. In this context, it was understood that the concept of environmental security was closely linked with water quality and access to water resources. Water treaties and other legal regulations were an essential part of international policy aimed at avoiding or overcoming tensions over water resources. Making water issues more transparent was a part of general democratization efforts.

**The Aral Sea Basin.** Attention was drawn to the difficult water situation in Central Asia, which was understood to increasingly hamper economic recovery and social well-being. Doubling of the overall irrigated area, the increase in water consumption, growing losses and ineffective use of water, over-age water infrastructures and their inappropriate technical maintenance, along with ineffective water management, were seen as main sources of worries over water resources which, in reality, could meet current regional water demands. Lack of corresponding political dialogue was seen as additionally complicating the situation in the region, particularly between upstream and downstream countries. The abolition of previously unified regional water-management systems caused new deficiencies in co-ordination and led to controversial developments at national levels. A consideration of the wide range of neighbouring countries' interests in solving water-related problems were a necessary prerequisite for bringing stability to the region. In this context, discussions on the use of regional energy resources (including fossil fuels) were also seen as important.

The signature of a Water Treaty in 1992 and the establishment of the Interstate Commission for Water Co-ordination (ICWC) were welcome steps towards reaching consensus on water-related issues. The Aral Sea Basin Programme (ASBP) of the five Central Asian States followed the objective of stabilizing the environment, rehabilitating the disaster zone around the Aral Sea, improving management of international waters and developing the capacities of regional institutions. International organizations like the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the World Bank and the European Union (EU), along with a number of national agencies and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), were actively involved in providing assistance in these areas. The international donor community supported regional water-related endeavours represented by institutions like the Executive Committee of the International Fund to Save the Aral Sea. The OSCE had been playing a helpful role in establishing cross-border contacts and hosting regional dialogues.

### **Recommendations on Aral Sea Basin developments**

1. To successfully target water problems in the Aral Sea Basin, partnerships had to be institutionalized between governments, non-governmental organizations, academic institutions, international organizations and beneficiaries. In particular, co-operation between governments (as the water owners) and water users and their associations had to be developed. International assistance had to be provided in the sphere of improving water management capacities. Meanwhile, corresponding endeavours were to be understood as support for self-support. Initiatives had finally to grow at national levels and then be brought to regional levels. Existing regional and international negotiation networks in Central Asia needed to be developed. Corresponding assistance work would be a task for the OSCE and its field representations.
2. It was proposed to develop national and regional water information systems. Information on the use and quality of water had to be made more transparent. The OSCE was asked to keep promoting these initiatives.
3. Water/energy trade-offs were recommended by various participants as possible ways of considering mutual interests in solving regional water-related issues.

**The Kura Araks Basin.** With respect to the South Caucasus and the Kura Araks Basin, issues like (a) the pollution and (b) the uncontrolled use of water resources, (c) large deficiencies in water monitoring, (d) gaps in the adoption and implementation of water-related international law as well as (e) elaborating national legal regulations were seen as problems significantly affecting social and economic stability in the region. A range of regional projects was reported to be in preparation or already to be focused on monitoring water and water quality. An overview was given on intended activities concerning water data and transboundary water-management infrastructures. National endeavours and international assistance in addressing the needs of various social groups (including refugees) were seen as indispensable. Attention was drawn to the necessity of legally regulating access to and the use of internationally shared aquifers. They should become subject to treaties and other regulations of international law. The attention of the Working Group was drawn to European Union endeavours in supporting transboundary water-quality endeavours in the South Caucasus. Moreover, other national agencies and international organizations such as the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the World Bank (WB) or UNDP were reported to be providing assistance in related endeavours on national and regional levels. The Regional Environmental Centre for the Caucasus, as a unique trilateral

intergovernmental regional organization, was on the way to getting involved in transboundary water-management issues.

The Working Group participants once again took note of strong concerns existing in the South Caucasus region about the close links between territorial and regional matters and their influence on the use and quality of common water resources and sustainable development throughout the region. The Working Group, as part of the Tenth Meeting of the Economic Forum, had provided an excellent platform for addressing these issues.

### **Recommendations on Kura Araks Basin developments**

1. For the Kura Araks Basin, it was proposed to overcome gaps in unified water standards and bring about a consistent application of international standards throughout the region. It was recommended to re-establish regional water-monitoring systems and databases.
2. It was proposed to pay particular political attention to the use of regional aquifers. Inventories of transboundary aquifers should be established. Related endeavours could be absorbed within ongoing international projects. Also, it would be useful to implement the UN/ECE guidelines on monitoring of transboundary aquifers.
3. It was proposed that the OSCE should promote the establishment of international transboundary water-quality monitoring.
4. The OSCE was requested to provide assistance in awareness-raising on the issue of saving and/or recovering freshwater sources. In this context, OSCE field representations could play a very visible role but would need to develop their environmental expertise.
5. OSCE assistance in regional conflict mediation was seen as a measure to create prerequisites for bringing solutions to other regional problems such as those in the field of use and quality of water.

**The Sava River Basin.** The Sava River Basin as a Danube River Sub-Basin connected four riparian countries of the former Yugoslavia. The catchment area covered 60-70 per cent of the land and contained more than 80 per cent of available water resources of the territory. The 2001 Sarajevo Letter of Intent on an integrated Sava River management represents the result of concerted regional and international endeavours which had also been reflected and further developed at the First Preparatory Seminar in Belgrade. The Sava Initiative was providing a good opportunity for Sava River Basin countries to address individual interests and bringing them into a common context with the interests and needs of neighbouring countries. Within the Stability Pact process, two Working Groups had been established on (a) an International Framework Agreement (IFA) and (b) Rehabilitation and Development. OSCE engagement in these and other efforts had played a most helpful role. The efforts of international organizations (such as the EU, the World Bank and the United Nations) and national agencies (such as the Japan International Co-operation Agency) met with high appreciation. Various countries (including the Czech Republic) had offered technical support that could be integrated into existing development co-operation activities and co-ordinated or politically supported by the OSCE. A pilot project developed by the Environmental Crime Prevention Programme (ECPP) and OSCE on multi-physics analyses of water quality could be regionally expanded. The EU had offered legal expertise in elaborating further legal regulations.



### **Recommendations on Sava River Basin developments:**

1. With respect to Sava River Basin developments, it was recommended to put more emphasis on bilateral co-operation and make them components of forthcoming regional solutions. OSCE field representations could play a helpful role in this area.
2. It was emphasized that efforts to come to an integrated, multilateral approach towards Sava River Basin management would send positive signals to the public and international donors as well. The developments should be based on international legal tools such as the Aarhus Convention.
3. It was recommended to support the elaboration of a Sava River Master Plan.
4. Developments in the Sava River Basin should continue to be an essential part of OSCE security concerns in the region.

### **General recommendations**

1. It was proposed that the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities (CEEAA) should analyse the fulfilment of recommendations made at earlier meetings of the OSCE Economic Forum and other economic and environmental events of the OSCE calendar. Moreover, follow-up activities should put the process of OSCE decision-making and implementation on more consistent grounds.
2. Specific water-related issues that were of security relevance in specific countries or regions had to be targeted by the OSCE. With respect to this, the OSCE and its field operations would fulfil their tasks of early warning.
3. The OSCE should keep promoting political solutions in water-related dialogues. It was proposed that the OSCE should continue to assist in attracting interested donors for various water-related initiatives. In particular, international help in programmes on the sustainable use of transboundary water resources would be highly welcome.
4. It was suggested that the OSCE should play a co-ordinating or promoting role in elaborating regional agreements on the use of regional water resources. Campaigning for the adoption and implementation of international conventions like the Aarhus Convention or the Helsinki Convention was seen as an essential task for the OSCE.
5. The OSCE should continue to promote the adoption and implementation of legal regulations. The OSCE was requested to provide assistance in establishing regional contacts and developing cross-border activities on targeting problems in water-related fields.
6. The implementation of international conventions and other regulations of international law had to be utilized for the purpose of supporting general democratization processes in the region. In forthcoming bilateral, regional and international talks, previous bilateral and regional agreements were to be taken into account.
7. In regard to water-related issues, an integrated “baskets of benefits” approach could become a solid tool of successful OSCE preventive diplomacy.

## **WORKING GROUP B**

29 and 30 May 2002

### **Report of the Working Group Rapporteur**

#### **Agenda item 6: Actors involved in co-operation for the sustainable use and protection of the quality of water**

---

Group B addressed the role of key-actors in the field of water resources.

Broadly speaking, the four sessions concentrated on:

- Central and local authorities;
- NGOs and civil society;
- Co-operation with businesses; and
- International organizations.

In the following text, we summarize lead-speakers presentations as well as the most salient ideas expressed during the discussions that followed, session by session. In a final section, we present relevant proposals - i.e., "recommendations" - that may help to shape future activities in the economic and environmental dimension.

#### **Session 1: Central and local authorities**

The approach of the Ministry of Environment and Urban Planning in Montenegro/FRY towards ecological issues was explained. The speaker stressed that the importance of the ecology is so big that even the Constitution proclaims the Republic of Montenegro/FRY as a democratic, civic and ecological State. A special importance is given to compliance with EU directives in the process of monitoring the trans-boundary Skandar lake. The OSCE (in Podgorica) initiated international co-operation on the monitoring of the lake, which resulted in joint activities between Universities from Montenegro/FRY, Albania and Germany.

A speaker from KfW (Germany) provided information about German financial co-operation with Serbia/FRY, within the framework of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe. The main fields of KfW activities are investment financing, export and project financing, and co-operation with developing and transition countries. In Serbia/FRY, KfW's main focus is on emergency programmes, investment projects focusing on energy, water and sewage, and support to SMEs.

In Albania, a project concentrates on the monitoring of the Shkodra/Skadar Lake, which lies between Albania and Montenegro/FRY, and can serve as a good example of co-operation on water quality monitoring. The Universities of Montenegro/FRY, Shkodra (Albania), Heidelberg, Graz, Dresden and Hamburg are working together to: (1) improve the infrastructure for the analysis of water quality, (2) determine the ecological status of the lake and (3) set a computerized data system to store and manage water quality data.

A speaker from Armenia underlined that most countries should move towards EU water quality standards. The 'basin water management concept' is extremely useful from an operational perspective. The unification of legislation in the Caucasus region is also an important tool towards basin management. [N.B. Within the framework of Partnership and Co-operation Agreements concluded with the EU, the three South Caucasus countries are engaged in a process of approximation of EU legislation. This exercise is supported by EU-funded Policy and Legal Advice Centers - 'PLACs'.]

## Discussion

During the discussion, the participants reaffirmed the significant responsibility of the local communities in the promotion of regional co-operation and raising awareness on legal aspects of water protection. The role of NGOs is very important in the process of public awareness as well as the easiest way of bringing interested parties together. A participant recommended to the OSCE to support the monitoring of the quality of transboundary waters in the South Caucasus.

The Lake Ohrid Conservation Project was mentioned as an example, where non-governmental and governmental organizations participate in order to have harmonized legislation and joint scientific research. Participation of students in joint projects was mentioned as part of the monitoring of the Shkodra/Skadar Lake. It was suggested that the OSCE could promote scientific networking and water related transboundary tourism development. The River Basin Committee was mentioned as a well functioning body in Romania.

## **Session 2: Civil society (NGOs)**

Two speakers addressed the mobilization of civil society in Ukraine. Public hearings are practical steps in the implementation of the Aarhus Convention, but so far it has been difficult to establish them as a permanent system for decision-making. The Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine created a special web page where all documents related to the environmental legislation in Ukraine are available. Annual national reports on water quality will also be a step towards the implementation of the principles of the Aarhus Convention.

In the Czech Republic, the Pollutant Release and Transfer Register is considered as a very efficient and transparent system, which allows to have environmental related information on industrial companies.

A representative of the BIOTICA Ecological society in Moldova, described the Dniester River, which is a central part of the Pan-European Ecological Network, as a good example of trans-boundary co-operation between NGOs from Ukraine and Moldova, since at least 1995.

A member of the NGO "Ecolex" in Azerbaijan explained that, despite an uneasy political situation, NGOs from Azerbaijan, Georgia and Armenia are closely co-operating on issues related to the ecological situation in the Southern Caucasus. At least 65 NGOs from these countries form the coalition "Kura-Araks" in order to promote a rational utilization of water, develop a unified legal framework, stimulate interdisciplinary co-operation on the basin of the Kura-Araks, and raise awareness on issues related to trans-boundary waters.

## Discussion

So far, co-operation on water issues in the South Caucasus has been at the level of NGOs. At this stage, water-related agreements can be reached only within the frameworks offered by international organizations, but not directly between the South Caucasus countries. It was also proposed to create a group of independent experts for monitoring trans-boundary rivers in the South Caucasus under the aegis of the OSCE.

### **Session 3: Co-operation with the business sector**

The needs in terms of access to fresh water are tremendous. More than one billion people have no access to drinkable water, which has disastrous consequences to health. Meeting these needs cannot only rely on official development assistance (ODA). It requires a strong participation of the private business sector, which implies that the economic environment must become more conducive. For that purpose, privatization may help. Regulation is essential because it protects both public welfare and private investors. The design of adequate price policies is also important.

A representative of Provodi Labe s.p. (Czech Republic) made a quite comprehensive presentation on the sustainable use and water quality protection of the Elbe River, underlining the complexity of related activities and the need for adequate equipment and expertise.

## Discussion

A delegate underlined the importance of regional co-operation for improving both energy and water conditions. In that respect, the countries of Central Asia have already gained a considerable experience and the OSCE is also playing a leading role in facilitating the permanent dialog and co-operation in the region. An international meeting will be soon organized in Bishkek. A scientist also indicated the benefits of international co-operation in the field of monitoring international watercourses.

### **Session 4: Co-operation with international organizations**

A representative of the Albania-EU Energy Efficiency Center (EEC) underlined the role of the EU in promoting new institutions, such as the EEC, within the framework of the Energy Charter Treaty. The project was initiated by the OSCE in co-operation with UNDP and aims at a more efficient use of energy resources, which is important in the context of Albania where there is a severe energy crisis. EEC is facilitating the transfer of knowledge and know-how, promoting co-operation with foreign partners, and also initiating the use of solar energy in Albania.

The UNESCO "Water for Peace" initiative was presented. It was underlined that water has a potential for co-operation between communities and countries. In that respect, UNESCO is working with an international NGO, *Green Cross*. Different tracks are being used for defining and preventing tensions: (1) case studies, (2) education and (3) scientific contributions (from various disciplines). An international conference on water will also take place in Delft, the Netherlands, in November this year.

A collaborator of the OCEEA underlined the importance of the platform concept and comprehensive security for the OSCE. Such an approach is well illustrated by the solar energy projects in Albania. The OSCE can also provide expertise on mediation and negotiation techniques. It helps create forums for dialogs within and between countries. For that purpose, the OSCE will continue working with others and, especially, strengthen contacts with IOs, including UNESCO, UNDP, UNEP, etc. The new co-ordinator of EEA will be present at the Delft international conference. Joint efforts will continue to be supported, especially with UN organizations and REC.

A representative of the Regional Environmental Centre (REC) insisted on the importance of the environment, particularly water, for security. Public participation is essential and should still be supported more. For that purpose, the promotion and the full implementation of the "Aarhus Convention" is essential. The EU Water Framework Directive is also a good reference because it allows for public participation, includes strict deadlines and favours an economical use of water with pricing.

UNDP aims at promoting sustainable development, preventing future crisis and enhancing the quality of governance. For reaching these aims, it relies on pilot projects, policy advice, capacity building, etc. Moreover, it facilitates dialog between parties, promotes resources sharing, with a permanent focus on poverty alleviation. Considering water, it manages a major project on the Tisza river basin, involving 5 countries. It is also involved in other regions.

UNEP is providing analyses, key-information and data for managing water better and, therefore contribute to social stability and collective security. In that respect, working at local levels is seen as essential. Designing an environmental security framework requires interacting with both regional and global organizations.

All three last speakers expressed their wish to further consider joint activities with the OSCE.

## Discussion

Considering water issues, a representative asked what could be a niche for the OSCE and how it could better co-operate with other organizations.

The reactions indicated that the OSCE is above all a political organization that can mobilize support in its participating States. Field missions can play a major role in mobilizing local civil society, supporting participative democracy and also facilitating the adoption of common standards between countries. UN institutions can also provide important background information to the OSCE to assess security aspects.

Another participant also raised an important question in the field of governance. In that respect, ownership is essential. We must not only respond to demands, but we must also help authorities to identify needs and priorities.

Local governance is often the weakest point of organized societies and must be addressed accordingly, within the process of decentralization. OSCE field missions can act as a link between the various levels of government, communities and countries.

## **Recommendations**

1. In is essential to promote the role of local communities and civil society in environmental matters.
2. It is also important to involve the private and business sector in the management of water resources.
3. Using the information provided by other International Organizations, the OSCE could better assess tensions between communities and countries, and react accordingly.
4. The OSCE must not only respond to requests. It must help beneficiary countries to identify their needs and priorities.
5. According to the wish of some delegations, more assistance must be provided in the field of capacity and institutional building, particularly to cope with environmental issues, including water. [In that respect, complying with international commitments requires both expertise and adequate infrastructure, including equipment.]
6. The monitoring of the quality of water of South Caucasus rivers should be supported.

## **WORKING GROUP C**

29 and 30 May 2002

### **Report of the Working Group Rapporteur**

#### **Agenda item 7: Instruments for co-operation for the sustainable use and protection of the quality of water**

---

##### **Introduction to the Working Group**

Working Group C addressed four themes: international legal instruments, interstate water commissions, technical co-operation/development assistance and co-operation in water management as a confidence-building measure in post-conflict rehabilitation.

Speakers and participants were invited to consider three general questions as a framework for discussion.

- How effective are the existing instruments?
- How can they be improved?
- What can be the role of OSCE in developing, improving and implementing existing instruments?

##### **First session: international legal instruments**

A unique legal framework existed within the ECE/OSCE region. The CSCE (Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe) process in the late 1980s had played a key role in accelerating the adoption of a number of legally binding instruments under the auspices of the ECE, such as the Helsinki Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes, the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in the Transboundary Context and the Convention on Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents. Besides their substantive focus, these instruments covered issues such as dispute prevention and settlement, public information and participation in decision-making. In addition, the Protocol on Water and Health had introduced access to safe drinking water and safe sanitation, particularly for the socially disadvantaged. The majority of ECE member States had become Parties to the Helsinki and other ECE conventions.

A major implementation goal was the establishment and functioning of joint bodies for transboundary water basins. In addition, instruments for dispute prevention and settlement, such as civil liability for transboundary accidents and strategic impact assessment in the transboundary context, were under development. Essential was also the ongoing development of guidelines on compliance and enforcement of conventions.

The ECE Aarhus Convention had been recognized by the OSCE as of prime importance for the economic and environmental dimension. In addition to ongoing co-operation with the ECE on this instrument, the OSCE could play an important role in

facilitating ratification and implementation of the other ECE conventions as a tool for confidence-building throughout its region, particularly in post-conflict areas. A suggestion was made that the Council of Europe, through its Parliamentary Assembly, play a catalytic role in accelerating ratification.

The regional conventions were also supported by supranational law, the most advanced example being the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD). The WFD was a comprehensive tool to protect all waters by applying the principle of basin management. It required introduction of strict economic instruments to support environmental objectives and the principle of public participation.

The WFD was an unprecedented effort that was reshaping water management across Europe by creating a long-term and predictable technical, financial and political basis for decision-making. Its implementation in the fringe areas of the EU, where water basins stretched across EU member States, candidate States and non-member States, called for co-operation with both the ECE and the OSCE.

There seemed to be general agreement on the adequacy of existing instruments. Remarks were made, however, on the fact that implementation was sometimes the weak point of an otherwise adequate legal landscape.

### **Second session: interstate water commissions**

There were several hundred bodies of water in the world that crossed the political boundaries of two or more countries. In a large majority of cases, international waters offered opportunities for co-operation. However, there was a likelihood for conflict when institutional capacities were inadequate to absorb changes within the basin, both at the national and international level. A study of approximately 1,000 cases of water conflict resolution had concluded that the international community should encourage riparian States to settle issues through preventive diplomacy and institutional capacity-building.

Patterns of institutional capacity for transboundary water co-operation had developed at four levels: bilateral interstate agreements; basin agreements involving all riparian States; inter-basin agreements, including co-operation between river basins and receiving sea basins; and multilateral (i.e. regional and global) conventions.

Basin agreements were currently at the centre of interest, as they were instrumental in achieving very substantial progress in environmental protection, as had been demonstrated in the case of the Elbe river basin. One important lesson was that parties should establish clear objectives and means to achieve them.

The International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR), serving the Danube River Protection Convention (DRPC), was a unique example of an interstate water commission. It had the most member States (13) worldwide. The area it covered was characterized by a large diversity of languages, ethnic and religious groups, social and political systems and economic conditions, and by a history of population movements and armed conflict. The DRPC was the first “legitimate” offspring of the Helsinki Convention, which had been used as a blueprint when setting up its provisions. The ICPDR also provided a platform for the implementation of the EU WFD and the preparation of a River Basin Management Plan. The ICPDR co-operated with “sister organizations” like



the Danube Commission on Navigation and the Black Sea Commission, as well as development organizations and international financial institutions (IFIs). Serving as a vehicle for dialogue and sustainable development, the ICPDR was committed to co-operation with the OSCE.

The Black Sea Environment Programme was an example of a multilateral and comprehensive system of mechanisms and institutions. The presentation highlighted a number of results achieved as well as ongoing and planned activities covering a wide range of water issues.

The economic consequences of environmental damage and the subsequent importance of environmental rehabilitation were also highlighted with respect to this framework. The conclusion that could be drawn from this presentation corresponded to that of the first session on the adequacy of existing instruments and difficulties in implementation.

Where water allocation agreements were concerned, the situation became more complicated. The United Nations Convention on Non-navigational Uses of International Waterways (New York, 1997) contained a number of basic principles, which however did not form an operational blueprint for concrete conflict situations. Conflict resolution required negotiations, which tended to result in very different institutional models, often depending on local factors. It could be concluded that the integrated water-management model was an ideal solution; however, it was rarely achieved in practice. A less perfect solution would be well-managed co-ordination, while unilateral decision-making bore the highest risk of escalating conflict situations.

### **Third session: technical co-operation/development assistance**

World Bank experience in technical co-operation and development assistance on water was based on policy objectives including poverty reduction, rational allocation of investment, efficient demand management and sustainability. The World Bank project pipeline covered issues such as waste-water management and municipal infrastructure, utility reform, targeted interventions in rural areas, water supply and regional initiatives. With respect to basin agreements and other instruments, the Bank emphasized that instruments without investments did not solve problems. In this context, the Bank saw the OSCE as a partner able to raise the water issue at the political level, in particular by involving and committing national economic institutions.

A key objective of the European Investment Bank (EIB) was financing environmental protection activities on the basis of conditions such as a key role for the private sector, concessional finance, involvement of politicians, ownership by local communities and financial synergies with other agencies. A basic precondition for investments was consistency with EU standards.

Two examples were given of very practical technical assistance programmes.

A joint project of Italy and the World Health Organization (WHO) addressed environment and health risk assessment in secondary rivers of the Middle and Lower Danube Basin in connection with possible accidents in the chemical processing industries. One recommendation deriving from the project results was to extend assessment methodology by developing a “sabotage/terrorism” risk index.

The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) provided technical assistance on the use of isotopes for finger-printing the global water cycle. The applications ranged from dam leakages and dam safety to the mapping of submarine ground waters as freshwater resources in coastal zones and a pathway to marine pollution.

Representatives of technical assistance programmes stated their interest in co-operating with the OSCE. They emphasized the need to develop and improve co-ordination among donor agencies in a basin, a conclusion shared by other participants.

The Government of Japan welcomed the OSCE initiatives in the field of water and security, and proposed that contacts between OSCE field missions and the bilateral donors be strengthened.

The EU was preparing to launch a Global Water Initiative at the World Summit on Sustainable Development to be held in Johannesburg the same year. The focus of the initiative was Africa. Denmark had offered to take up the role as leading country in developing a EU-NIS Water Initiative. Hope was expressed that follow-up activities to the Tenth Meeting of the OSCE Economic Forum would broaden the international foundation of this initiative.

#### **Fourth session: co-operation in water management as a confidence-building measure in post-conflict rehabilitation**

The fourth session addressed water-management issues in post-conflict situations. Examples of co-operation at the national and international level were drawn from regions within and outside the OSCE area.

Regional co-operation on water issues was certainly a key element of post-conflict rehabilitation in South-East Europe. It was also an essential part of larger political processes within South-East Europe, on the one hand, and between South-Eastern and Western European States on the other. The recently adopted Declaration on the Co-operation Process on the Danube had been indicated as a framework for establishment and reinforcement of co-operative relationships on water issues within a river basin that encompassed vast parts of Europe. The Declaration complied with other ongoing efforts such as the Stability Pact, the South-East Co-operation Process, and others. The OSCE played and still could play a positive role within such processes by supporting international co-operation, on the one hand, and the development of civil society on the other.

Rehabilitation activities in Federal Republic of Yugoslavia/Kosovo, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the basins of the Sava, Begej and Tisza rivers, as well as the remediation of the Modrac Lake in the Tuzla region of Bosnia and Herzegovina, were brought to the attention of the Working Group as examples of practices where the aforementioned elements of the OSCE process combined with technical and financial assistance could contribute to confidence-building in post-conflict regions. Particularly the Modrac Lake case had been presented as a replicable example of synergy between an international framework such as the Commonwealth of Independent States and research institutions, IFIs and local authorities.

The consequences of conflict on the water situation in Tajikistan were also presented. Rehabilitation problems in that country had been recently aggravated by three consecutive years of drought. Against this framework, increased co-operation with international agencies was essential at the national level. At the regional level, in addition to the existing framework, the adoption of economic mechanisms of co-operation based on compensation was proposed.

Two presentations described the water-related issues between Israel and Jordan, and the process that had occurred over the last decade in the direction of a win-win situation in their joint management.

During the discussion, participants presented several proposals on initiatives that the OSCE could undertake in order to develop, implement and improve existing instruments.

Two delegations supported a proposal that the Economic and Environmental Subcommittee of the Permanent Council of the OSCE consider possible international developments of the “Project on Rapid Environmental and Health Risk Assessment in the Danube Basin” presented during the third session of the Working Group.

It was proposed that the OSCE play a catalytic role in providing expertise and financial resources to elaborate programmes for sustainable use and protection of water resources.

The OSCE could also facilitate assistance from relevant international organizations on implementation of international water conventions in low-income countries.

### **General conclusions and recommendations**

A general conclusion of Working Group C was that institutional capacity was one of the main factors in avoiding the likelihood of water-related conflict. Whereas there were few examples of water-related issues causing armed conflict, water could play a destabilizing role and contribute to the development of other conflict situations, both internally and internationally. Equally, water issues could promote co-operation where strong institutions were in place. Co-operation in water management was an important confidence-building tool in post-conflict rehabilitation, as it was essential in order to satisfy basic livelihood needs of the victims of conflict. Technical and development co-operation should always include institutional capacity-building.

UN/ECE instruments, as well as the EU WFD, could provide orientation for assistance to States in developing the institutional capacity to cope with water issues as well as to prevent and settle related conflicts. Equally, experience with several existing interstate basin commissions both within and outside the OSCE region could serve as blueprint for establishing new structures or improving existing ones.

Post-conflict rehabilitation activities based on co-operation between humanitarian, health, environment, development and other agencies would also be a useful instrument for fostering co-operation in water management, both in general and among conflicting parties.

## **SPECIAL SESSION ON SUPPRESSING THE FINANCING OF TERRORISM**

31 May 2002

### **Report of the Rapporteur for Session I**

#### **Agenda item 8: Suppressing the financing of terrorism**

##### **- International instruments and standards**

---

The session was characterized by very full presentations and interventions, to which justice cannot possibly be done in the short time my colleague and I have had to prepare our respective reports. In the interests of time and with your indulgence, this report will focus on remarks that established the context of the discussion as well as on concrete recommendations for future action.

Introductory remarks by the Moderator placed the discussions in the context of the OSCE's comprehensive concept of security and the international legal framework. The principal objectives were for the Organization to contribute to the universal acceptance and implementation of the International Legal Framework, namely the 12 United Nations Counter-Terrorism Conventions and relevant Security Council resolutions, together with the full implementation of commitments contained in the Bucharest Declaration and Action Plan and the Bishkek Programme for Action. The Moderator noted that OSCE engagement had so far not focused on economic security risks beyond corruption, and that both the Bucharest and Bishkek documents called for more concrete work in this area.

Presentations were initiated by US Assistant Secretary of State Anthony Wayne, who, like subsequent speakers, highlighted the role the OSCE could play as a part of the international coalition against terrorism. In this respect he noted both the credibility and the political influence of the Organization, and the capabilities present in field missions.

Mr. Wayne briefed participants on concrete achievements in designating and blocking the assets of organizations suspected of terrorist links, achievements that were the result of increased co-ordination between government departments and agencies at a national level as well as from increasingly co-ordinated efforts by the international community. Mr. Wayne drew attention to the security implications of ensuring the successful economic reconstruction of Afghanistan, and invited participating States to continue devoting resources to this effort.

Mr. Wayne outlined a proposal that all OSCE States should submit, by 1 September 2002, a national self-assessment on their implementation of the eight special recommendations on the financing of terrorism of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF). He urged the Permanent Council to adopt a decision to this effect as soon as possible.

This proposal subsequently enjoyed wide and strong support among delegations who spoke during the discussion period of the session.

Mr. Wayne stressed the importance of the rule of law as a front-line defence against terrorism. He also noted the need for the Economic Co-ordinator's Office to participate in efforts to enhance economic growth, including work on improving conditions for small and medium enterprises and identifying impediments to business development.

Walter Gehr of the United Nations Security Council's Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) briefed delegations on the mandate and working methods of the CTC, which had benefited from unprecedented engagement by United Nations Member States. Reports submitted by States pursuant to Security Council Resolution 1373 concerning implementation of the obligations in Article 1 showed that the necessary distinctions between measures to combat money laundering and those needed to combat the financing of terrorism were not yet universally appreciated.

Mr. Gehr noted three particular issues that needed to be addressed in the context of implementation: (1) that the criminalization of terrorist financing was not necessarily achieved through reference to ancillary offences such as conspiracy and aiding and abetting; (2) that reporting of suspicious transactions must not be limited to banks, but should include professionals such as lawyers and notaries; and (3) that preventive measures on financing of terrorism could not be limited to traditional financial institutions but had to address alternative remittance systems.

The CTC had noted on its website the OSCE's willingness to take on a catalytic role, especially in the area of training, and hoped that this offer would reach countries that needed assistance.

Patrick Moulette of the FATF briefed participants on the recent expansion of the FATF's mandate to include financing of terrorism, and on the substance of the eight FATF recommendations. He noted that standard-setting was useful but needed to be backed up with plans of action that would ensure measures to comply with them were in place. The FATF's self-assessment questionnaire and analysis of responses would serve this purpose.

Gerald Staberock of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) noted that without the rule of law, States could not effectively fight terrorism. Measures taken in the context of this fight required appropriate checks and balances. For example, any legislative definition of terrorism had to be drafted so as to avoid political exploitation; lists of designated groups and rules on freezing assets had to be made with full transparency both in the drafting and implementation stage; safeguards had to be in place against arbitrariness; and decision-making bodies had to be accountable.

Interventions from delegations were universally supportive of an OSCE role in the fight against the financing of terrorism, a role that many stressed should draw on the Organization's particular strengths and be complementary to the global effort led by the United Nations. In the latter context, several delegations stressed the benefits of continuing and increased co-operation between the OSCE and the Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention (ODCCP), including at the operational level and in project work. Speakers briefed participants on measures and steps taken at domestic or intergovernmental level concerning implementation of United Nations and OSCE commitments, in particular on the position and progress on ratification of the United Nations Convention.

As noted above, the US proposal that the OSCE Permanent Council pass a decision calling on all participating States to submit to the FATF a self-assessment report concerning implementation of its eight recommendations was endorsed by virtually all delegations that took the floor, and encountered no opposition.

Additional comments and recommendations made by individual delegations included the following: that the OSCE deal with the infrastructure of drug trafficking and other forms of transnational crime, in order to deprive terrorists of sources of financial support; that attention be paid to the relationship between conflicts and terrorism; that the OSCE develop a set of standards and commitments in line with international law and United Nations obligations; that the efforts of the Special Police Adviser and the Chair's Special Representative on Anti-Terrorism Issues be combined; that the OSCE should compile a list of organizations and individuals in the OSCE area with links to terrorist networks, with a view to developing common denominators and shared views; and that this Special Session provided a useful link with the topic proposed for next year's Economic Forum. One delegation cautioned that any work on definitional issues could lead to undue politicization.

As you will appreciate this report has been produced in a rather short time, and necessarily sums up in somewhat general terms issues of considerable complexity and importance. I would invite any speaker who feels that important elements of their interventions have not been adequately reflected to provide me with these, in form of bullet points, so that they can be incorporated in the final written version of this report.

## **SPECIAL SESSION ON SUPPRESSING THE FINANCING OF TERRORISM**

**31 May 2002**

### **Report of the Rapporteur of Session II**

#### **Agenda item 8: Suppressing the financing of terrorism**

##### **- Co-ordination of technical assistance and the role of financial intelligence units**

---

Following on from the previous session, this session focused on practice-oriented measures to suppress money laundering and the financing of terrorism. It was addressed by Mr. Timothy Lemay, representing the Programme against Money Laundering of the United Nations Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention (UNODCCP), and by Mr. Boudewijn Verhelst of the Belgian Financial Intelligence Processing Unit.

Mr. Lemay pointed to the increased call on bodies dealing with money laundering to focus also on measures to combat the financing of terrorism after 11 September 2001. There were differences between the two problems, mainly because financing for terrorism does not necessarily originate in illegal activities, but at the same time it was possible to use similar means in combating both phenomena. Over recent months, new international standards had been set in the area of suppressing the financing of terrorism, including through United Nations Security Council resolution 1373, the eight Special Recommendations of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) and the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. The increase in relevant norms and bodies made co-ordination of efforts even more important.

Regarding co-ordination between donors and providers of technical assistance, Mr. Lemay gave information about the establishment of an international mechanism for optimizing the use of resources, preventing duplication of efforts and covering gaps. FATF-style regional bodies had been set up in a number of regions, and new bodies, covering e.g., Central Asia and the Middle East, were under development. The purpose of the bodies was to identify States' needs and exchange information on supply and demand for technical assistance. Mr. Lemay invited States that had such needs or required assistance in identifying needs to contact his group.

Mr. Verhelst focused on the functions and role of financial intelligence units (FIUs) in countering money laundering and the financing of terrorism. FIUs received disclosures, analysed them and disseminated the resulting information to law enforcement and prosecution bodies. Mr. Verhelst emphasized that the need to trace and follow money trails required international co-operation between FIUs. Also, the increased focus on financing of terrorism had made new or amended legislation necessary in many cases. It was mentioned that FIUs could be centres of expertise on money laundering and the suppression of the financing of terrorism, thus providing assistance to other authorities.

During the following discussion, a number of participating States provided information about measures taken to create an institutional and legal framework to suppress terrorism, including through initiatives to identify, disrupt and dismantle terrorist financial networks and through ratification of international instruments. It was repeatedly emphasized that steps were needed at both national and international levels. The national level included both legislation and ratification of international instruments, whereas international action could be taken both through organizations such as the United Nations, the OSCE, the EU, the Council of Europe and the FATF and through co-operation among FIUs. Some delegations called for additional commitments to international co-operation. One delegation specifically mentioned multilateral joint designations of facilitators or perpetrators of terrorism as a further step towards information-sharing and collaboration in this field. Willingness to examine proposals for further improving national legislation was announced, and readiness to offer bilateral or multilateral assistance was indicated.

One delegation referred to a proposal for setting up an international fund under the auspices of the United Nations to assist in countering terrorism.

Regarding OSCE action, a number of recommendations were made:

Information was provided on a joint OSCE-UNODCCP initiative to hold national workshops on combating money laundering and the financing of terrorism. This initiative, which was a follow-up measure to the Bishkek Conference in December 2001, aimed at identifying legislative and administrative measures to be developed and assisting participating States in defining their needs. Interested delegations were invited to request further information from the Office of the Co-ordinator of Economic and Environmental Activities.

It was recommended that the OSCE serve as a clearing-house to assist participating States through the exchange of expertise and assistance on developing legislation or setting up FIUs. The OSCE should facilitate information exchange on means of implementing international obligations and should help States in identifying their needs.

Training for law enforcement officials was mentioned as an area of activity.

Several delegations made reference to the suggestion that the OSCE help carry forward the FATF self-assessment procedure regarding the eight Special Recommendations, and expressed support for further examining this idea as soon as possible.



## LOG OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE TENTH MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC FORUM

**Theme: Co-operation for the sustainable use and protection of the quality of water  
in the context of the OSCE**

Ref. No.	Date	Author	Title/Subject	Language
<b>I. Plenary sessions</b>				
EF.DEL/22/02	27.05.02	Romania	Statement by Mr. I. Bazac (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/23/02	27.05.02	European Commission	Statement by Mr. F. Valenzuela Marzo (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/29/02	27.05.02	REC for Central and Eastern Europe	Statement by Mr. T. Popovski (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/38/02	28.05.02	Portugal	Opening address by Mr. A. Goncalves Henriques (Representative of the Chairman-in-Office)	E
EF.DEL/39/02	28.05.02	Holy See	Opening statement	E
EF.DEL/41/02	28.05.02	OSCE Parliamentary Assembly	Statement by Mr. A. Severin (President of the Parliamentary Assembly)	E
EF.DEL/42/02	28.05.02	Czech Republic	Welcoming remarks by Mr. P. Telicka	E
EF.DEL/43/02	28.05.02	Czech Republic	Statement by H.E. Ms. M. Motlova (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/45/02	28.05.02	Spain-EU	Opening statement	E
EF.DEL/46/02	28.05.02	USA	Opening statement	E
EF.DEL/48/02	28.05.02	Switzerland	Opening statement	E
EF.DEL/49/02	28.05.02	Canada	Opening statement	E
EF.DEL/55/02	28.05.02	Turkey	Opening statement	E
EF.DEL/56/02	28.05.02	Azerbaijan	Opening statement	E
EF.DEL/58/02	29.05.02	Russian Federation	Opening statement	E,R
EF.DEL/59/02	28.05.02	Tajikistan	Opening statement	E,R
EF.DEL/60/02	29.05.02	Switzerland	Review of Implementation statement	E
EF.DEL/61/02	29.05.02	Turkey	Review of Implementation statement	E
EF.DEL/63/02	29.05.02	Azerbaijan	Review of Implementation statement	E,R
EF.DEL/66/02	29.05.02	Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe	Review of Implementation statement	E
EF.DEL/72/02	29.05.02	Liechtenstein	Review of Implementation statement	E,G
EF.DEL/75/02	29.05.02	European Commission	Review of Implementation statement	E
EF.DEL/81/02	28.05.02	Ukraine	Opening statement	E
EF.DEL/84/02	30.05.02	Italy	Opening statement	I
EF.DEL/85/02	29.05.02	Russian Federation	Review of Implementation statement	E,R
EF.DEL/89/02	28.05.02	Armenia	Opening statement	E
EF.DEL/90/02	29.05.02	Czech Republic	Review of Implementation statement	E
EF.DEL/105/02	31.05.02	Portugal	Concluding remarks by Mr. R. Lopes Aleixo (Chairperson)	E
EF.DEL/107/02	06.06.02	Romania	Review of Implementation statement	E
EF.GAL/4/02	28.05.02	OCEEA	Welcoming remarks by Mr. M. Swiecicki (Co-ordinator of OSCE EEA)	E
EF.GAL/5/02	29.05.02	OCEEA	Remarks/Report by Mr. M. Swiecicki (Co-ordinator of OSCE EEA)	E
EF.GAL/6/02	28.05.02	SG	Welcoming remarks by Amb. J. Kubis (Secretary General of the OSCE)	E
EF.GAL/7/02	31.05.02	Rapporteur	Review of Implementation report	E
EF.GAL/8/02	31.05.02	Rapporteur	Working Group A Report	E

Ref. No.	Date	Author	Title/Subject	Language
EF.GAL/9/02	31.05.02	Rapporteur	Working Group B Report	E
EF.GAL/9/02/ Rev.1	03.06.02	Rapporteur	Working Group B Report	E
EF.GAL/10/02	31.05.02	Rapporteur	Working Group C Report	E
EF.GAL/10/02/ Rev.1	31.05.02	Rapporteur	Working Group C Report	E
EF.GAL/11/02	31.05.02	Rapporteur	Special Session I Report	E
EF.GAL/12/02	31.05.02	Rapporteur	Special Session II Report	E
<b>II. Working Group A - Issues related to co-operation for the sustainable use and protection of the quality of water</b>				
EF.DEL/4/02	22.05.02	REC for Central Asia	Decision-making in sustainable development in Central Asia	E
EF.DEL/5/02	22.05.02	CAREC	International Conference of Stockholders on Establishment of Water Partnership in Central Asia	E
EF.DEL/6/02	22.05.02	CAREC	Sustainable development concept	E
EF.DEL/7/02	22.05.02	RECCA	World sustainable development	E
EF.DEL/8/02	22.05.02	USA	Statement by Mr. A. T. Wolf (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/10/02	22.05.02	Tajikistan	Statement by Mr. T. Salimov (Keynote speaker)	E,R
EF.DEL/28/02	27.05.02	World Business Council	Statement by Mr. A. Fry (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/31/02	27.05.02	OCEEA	Statement by Mr. J. M. Collette and Mr. D. Linotte (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/37/02	28.05.02	Azerbaijan	Water-related issues in the Eastern Caucasus	E
EF.DEL/51/02	29.05.02	Azerbaijan	Statement by R. Israfilov (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/52/02	29.05.02	Armenia	South Caucasus co-operative river monitoring	E
EF.DEL/76/02	29.05.02	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Statement by Mr. R. Bratic (Keynote speaker)	E,R
EF.DEL/86/02	30.05.02	Azerbaijan	How to provide sustainable water use	E
EF.DEL/101/02	31.05.02	CATENA	Statement by Mr. A. Aranbaev (Keynote speaker)	E,R
EF.DEL/104/02	30.05.02	Czech Republic	A proposed Czech contribution to the co-operation on the Savsa River Basin	E
<b>III. Working Group B - Actors involved in the co-operation for the sustainable use and protection of the quality of water</b>				
EF.DEL/3/02	22.05.02	Romania	Principles of sustainable use of water resources	E
EF.DEL/14/02	24.05.02	BIOTICA	Statement by Mr. I. Trombitsky (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/30/02	27.05.02	Ukraine	Statement by Ms. V. Pidlisnyuk (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/33/02	28.05.02	UNEP	Statement by Mr. H. Fadaei (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/44/02	28.05.02	Albania	Statement by Mr. A. Bekteshi (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/47/02	28.05.02	Ukraine	Statement by Ms. C. Wohlmuther (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/50/02	28.05.02	Armenia	Statement by Ms. K. Hovhannisyan (Keynote speaker)	R

Ref. No.	Date	Author	Title/Subject	Language
EF.DEL/53/02	29.05.02	UNESCO	Statement by Mr. J. J. Bogardi (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/57/02	29.05.02	Azerbaijan	Water saving and utilization of water resources	E
EF.DEL/65/02	29.05.02	Bank for Reconstruction	Statement by Ms. J. Rothacker (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/71/02	29.05.02	Yugoslavia	Regional co-operation on management and protection of the Skadar Lake	E
EF.DEL/79/02	30.05.02	Azerbaijan	Statement by Mr. S. Isayev (Keynote speaker)	E
<b>IV. Working Group C - Instruments for co-operation for the sustainable use and protection of the quality of water</b>				
EF.DEL/2/02	22.05.02	Romania	Statement by Ms. L. Bara (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/9/02	22.05.02	Tajikistan	Statement by Mr. S. Sharipov (Keynote speaker)	E,R
EF.DEL/16/02	24.05.02	UN/ECE	Statement by Mr. B. Libert (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/19/02	24.05.02	Jordan	Statement by Amb. M. Touq (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/20/02	24.05.02	Romania	Statement by Mr. D. Dorogan (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/27/02	27.05.02	World Bank	Statement by Mr. M. Marino (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/32/02	27.05.02	CEI	Statement by Mr. G. Cicognani (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/32/02/ Add.1	30.05.02	CEI	Addition to Keynote statement	E
EF.DEL/34/02	28.05.02	Czech Republic	Statement by Mr. J. Kinkor (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/35/02	28.05.02	Yugoslavia	Statement by Mr. Z. Tuvic (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/54/02	29.05.02	Israel	Statement by Mr. J. Keidar	E
EF.DEL/62/02	29.05.02	ICPDR	Statement by Mr. J. Bendow (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/64/02	29.05.02	Azerbaijan	Conservation and rational use of water resources as a major aspect of efforts	E,R
EF.DEL/77/02	30.05.02	Czech Republic	Statement by Mr. V. Jirasek (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/80/02	30.05.02	Yugoslavia	Statement by Dr. S. Tahirsyli (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/83/02	30.05.02	Japan	General statement	E
EF.DEL/87/02	30.05.02	Ukraine	Working paper on flood prevention in Western Ukraine	E,R
EF.DEL/94/02	30.05.02	the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Statement by Mr. B. Boshev (Keynote speaker)	E
<b>V. Special Session - Suppressing the financing of terrorism</b>				
EF.DEL/88/02	31.05.02	Romania	Measures implemented by the Romanian Government	E
EF.DEL/93/02	30.05.02	USA	Proposed draft decision on terrorist financing	E
EF.DEL/95/02	30.05.02	UNSC CTC	Statement by Mr. W. Gehr (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/95/02/ Rev.1	31.05.02	UNSC CTC	Statement by Mr. W. Gehr (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/96/02	31.05.02	Tajikistan	General statement	E,R

Ref. No.	Date	Author	Title/Subject	Language
EF.DEL/97/02	31.05.02	Belgian Financial Intelligence Processing Unit	Statement by Mr. B. Verhelst (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/98/02	31.05.02	Russian Federation	General statement	E,R
EF.DEL/99/02	31.05.02	FATF	Statement by Mr. P. Moulette (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/100/02	31.05.02	USA	Statement by Mr. A. Wayne (Keynote speaker)	E
EF.DEL/102/02	31.05.02	Turkey	General statement	E
EF.DEL/103/02	31.05.02	Azerbaijan	General statement	E
EF.DEL/106/02	03.06.02	Canada	General statement	E
<b>VII. Other relevant documents</b>				
CIO.GAL/30/02	10.05.02	CIO Portugal	Preliminary draft agenda and letter by the Chairperson of the Permanent Council	E
CIO.GAL/33/02	21.05.02	CIO Portugal	Revised annotated draft agenda, introductory note and background document	E
CIO.GAL/37/02	27.05.02	CIO Portugal	Draft annotated agenda	E
EF.DEL/1/02	16.04.02	Azerbaijan	Statement of the Third Preparatory Seminar	E
EF.DEL/11/02	23.05.02	Russian Federation	Food-for-thought on the Eleventh Meeting of the Economic Forum	E,R
EF.DEL/12/02	24.05.02	Switzerland	Joint statement by Switzerland and Germany	E
EF.DEL/13/02	24.05.02	Switzerland	International Seminar on Strengthening the OSCE Role in the Realm of Environment and Security	E
EF.DEL/15/02	24.05.02	BIOTICA Ecological Society	General statement	E
EF.DEL/17/02	24.05.02	Armenia	Internationally-shared aquifer resources management in Armenia	E
EF.DEL/18/02	24.05.02	International Association of Hydrogeologists	Background information	E
EF.DEL/21/02	24.05.02	Kazakhstan	General statement	E
EF.DEL/24/02	27.05.02	Council of Europe	Report on the Second Intergovernmental Conference 'Biodiversity in Europe'	E
EF.DEL/25/02	27.05.02	Council of Europe	European Landscape Convention	E,F
EF.DEL/26/02	27.05.02	Council of Europe	European Conference of Ministers responsible for regional planning	E,F
EF.DEL/36/02	28.05.02	ECCP	Danube River Project	E
EF.DEL/40/02	28.05.02	PI Center for Ecotoxicological Research	Project proposal	E
EF.DEL/67/02	28.05.02	Moldova	The international association of the river keepers	E
EF.DEL/68/02	29.05.02	Netherlands	Theme for the Eleventh Meeting of the Economic Forum	E
EF.DEL/69/02	29.05.02	Yugoslavia	Implementation of the Sava River Project	E
EF.DEL/70/02	29.05.02	OHRID	Background information	E
EF.DEL/73/02	29.05.02	Ukraine	General information	R
EF.DEL/74/02	29.05.02	Ukraine	Report on the inaugural meeting of the International Center on Water Research	E,R
EF.DEL/78/02	30.05.02	REC for Central Asia	Public participation in transboundary water management issues	E
EF.DEL/82/02	30.05.02	DAI	Water management in the South Caucasus	E
EF.DEL/91/02	30.05.02	Tajikistan	General statement	E,R

<b>Ref. No.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Title/Subject</b>	<b>Language</b>
EF.DEL/92/02	30.05.02	Azerbaijan	Proposals by Azerbaijan on issues of the sustainable use and protection of water	E
EF.DEL/108/02	06.06.02	Armenia	Proposals to the Third Preparatory Seminar and to the Tenth Meeting of the Economic Forum	E
EF.FR/1/02	27.05.02	OSCE Mission to Tajikistan	Report on the International Conference on 'Water resources in Central Asia and their rational utilization'	E
EF.FR/2/02	28.05.02	OSCE Mission to Yugoslavia	Pollution demands solution	E
EF.FR/3/02	28.05.02	OSCE Mission to Uzbekistan	OSCE Centre in Tashkent on sustainable water use and protection	E
EF.FR/4/02	20.05.02	OSCE Mission to Kyrgyzstan	Report prepared by the OSCE Centre in Bishkek	E
EF.FR/5/02	28.05.02	OSCE Spillover Monitor Mission to Skopje	The state of water	E
EF.FR/6/02	28.05.02	OSCE Mission to Albania	Water issues in Albania and OSCE activities	E
EF.FR/7/02	28.05.02	OSCE Mission to Armenia	Water resources in Armenia	E
EF.FR/8/02	29.05.02	OSCE Mission to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia	OSCE Office in Montenegro, overview on the water situation	E
EF.FR/9/02	29.05.02	OSCE Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina	Selected issues regarding the water sector in Bosnia and Herzegovina	E
EF.FR/10/02	29.05.02	OSCE Mission to Albania	Skadar Lake - Transboundary water management	E
EF.GAL/1/02	22.05.02	CORE	The CSCE/OSCE and the Environment 1975-2000	E
EF.GAL/2/02	24.05.02	UNECE	UN/ECE review of the commitments of OSCE participating States	E
EF.GAL/3/02	28.05.02	CIO Portugal	Agenda	E
EF.INF/1/02	23.05.02	Czech Republic	Information on a spouses' programme on the margin of the Economic Forum	E
EF.INF/2/02	28.05.02	CS	Provisional List of Participants	E
EF.INF/2/02/Rev. 1	30.05.02	CS	Final List of Participants	E
PC.DD/11/02	22.04.02	CIO Portugal	Draft decision on the main subjects and organizational modalities for the Tenth Meeting of the Economic Forum	E
PC.DD/11/02 Rev.1	23.04.02	CIO Portugal	Draft decision on the main subjects and organizational modalities for the Tenth Meeting of the Economic Forum	E
SEC.INF/78/02	26.02.02	CS	Information Circular No. 5	E
SEC.INF/238/02	07.05.02	CS	Information Circular No. 10	E
SEC.INF/274/02	23.05.02	PPIS	Press Release 236/02: quality and sustainability of water high on OSCE agenda	E
SEC.INF/286/02	29.05.02	PPIS	Press Release 250/02: 2002 OSCE Economic Forum focuses on water and security	E