



**EUROPEAN UNION
OSCE 71st Joint FSC/PC Meeting**

Vienna, 14 November 2018

EU Statement on the Structured Dialogue

The European Union and its Member States would like to thank the Swedish FSC Chairmanship, as well as the Italian Chairmanship-in-Office, for convening this Joint FSC/PC meeting on the Structured Dialogue. We highly value the Structured Dialogue, which we are ready to develop further in accordance with the Hamburg Declaration, as a transparent, inclusive process, owned and driven by participating States, without prejudging the outcome and of high relevance for the EU.

As this is the last FSC/PC meeting on the Structured Dialogue this year, we would like to take this opportunity to commend the Chairman of the Informal Working Group, Ambassador Huynen, and his able team for the valuable work that has been done in the framework of the Structured Dialogue in 2018 and hope that you, Ambassador Huynen, will continue in this position next year. We thank you for your informative presentation and fully support the methodology followed throughout 2018 by developing the process of the Structured Dialogue alongside the tracks of threat perception and risk reduction. We appreciate the thorough preparation of the meetings, as well as the Chair's perception papers circulated after the 6th and 7th IWG meetings and the 3rd Expert Level Workshop. We look forward to your overall assessment report for 2018.

Chairperson, during our discussions we and several other participating States have repeatedly reminded of the clear violations of the rules based international order. We remain deeply concerned over Russia's aggression against Ukraine and the illegal annexation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol. We reiterate that it is essential to restore full respect for international law and fundamental OSCE principles by all participating States. Furthermore and against this background, we share concerns about large scale and snap military ex-

ercises, the risk of unintended escalation stemming from hazardous incidents of a military nature, military activities in the vicinity of international borders without adequate transparency, as well as a selective approach to the implementation of OSCE's politico-military commitments.

The IWG Structured Dialogue is a meaningful platform for in-depth exchanges on the current and future challenges and risks to security in the OSCE area and we are convinced we should continue in this endeavour. Honest and genuine engagement by all participating States is key to this end. We also value the potential to discuss improved compliance, also within the Structured Dialogue. We once again emphasize the need to work towards creating an environment conducive to reinvigorating Conventional Arms Control and CSBMs. We reiterate our strong commitment to full implementation in letter and spirit of the existing principles and commitments in the politico-military dimension, which is essential for enhancing military transparency, predictability and political stability in the OSCE area. Important agreements in this area, including the Vienna Document, the Open Skies Treaty, and the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe have provided us with important security gains for many years. We remain strong supporters of the Vienna Document modernisation.

We support the focus put on threat perceptions and risk reduction in 2018, and we remain committed to increasing military transparency and predictability and political stability in the OSCE area. We expect the same commitment from all pS. The 6th and 7th IWG Structured Dialogue Meetings encouraged more open and meaningful dialogue and allowed for an initial reflection on security concerns related to modern warfare and hybrid warfare as well as on the aspect of intent, the latter through the prism of military exercises. The 3rd Expert Level Workshop provided further opportunities for a deeper exchange of views at the expert level on risk reduction related to military incidents as well as on threat perceptions and risk reduction related to military exercises and activities.

With regard to threat perceptions, we continue to favour focusing on cluster one -“Challenges to a rule-based European security order” - and three - “Interstate tension of a politico-military nature”. Moreover, we share the view that a lack of transparency and verification, including in the so-called “grey zones”, can make understanding threat perceptions more difficult. We also look forward to further discussions on threat perceptions, including those resulting from conflicts, given their rel-

evance. Future discussions should continue with a focus on risk reduction. The discussion on the aspect of intent proved useful and we support follow-on discussions on other parameters of intent.

We support the continued examination of relevant trends related to military forces, major equipment, expenditure, deployments and exercises. We confirm the added value and importance of expert level exchanges and military-to-military contacts. We are grateful for the Chair's Perception Papers and the ideas contained therein for further work in the Structured Dialogue in due time. These include: the aspect of intent, military doctrines, best practices on how to fill in the AEMI and/or GEMI reports on military data, best practices in the existing arrangements on the prevention and management of military incidents, voluntary briefings on exercises below and above threshold for notification, updating and operationalising the list of contacts on military incidents, updating the list of major weapon and equipment systems. This list is by no means exhaustive. We look forward to examining these ideas further and working with the Chair in 2019.

Finally, we welcome the opportunity for the Ministers to discuss, inter alia, the Structured Dialogue during the informal ministers' lunch organized at the Ministerial Council Meeting in Milan. We look forward to engaging constructively in the FSC in the negotiations on the MC draft decision on risk reduction and incident prevention.

The Candidate Countries the FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA*, MONTENEGRO* and ALBANIA*, and the EFTA countries ICELAND and LIECHTENSTEIN, members of the European Economic Area, as well as UKRAINE, the REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA and ANDORRA align themselves with this statement.

* The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Albania continue to be part of the Stabilisation and Association Process.