



IAI

Istituto Affari Internazionali

Towards "Helsinki +40": The OSCE, the Global Mediterranean, and the Future of Cooperative Security



ABSTRACT

This report provides a summary of the key issues raised in the international seminar "Towards 'Helsinki +40': The OSCE, the Global Mediterranean, and the Future of Cooperative Security", which was convened at the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Rome on 18 September 2014, with the aim of fostering a discussion about the prospects of Euro-Mediterranean cooperation from a politico-security, economic, environmental, and human perspective, at a time of great instability in the Mediterranean region. The seminar addressed the specific question of how the OSCE, in synergy with other international actors, can help promote a cooperative approach to Mediterranean security. The upcoming fortieth anniversary in 2015 of the CSCE Helsinki Final Act provided the context for a debate which focused both on how the decades-old OSCE-Mediterranean Partnership can be strengthened and on whether and in which ways the "OSCE model" can inspire cooperation-oriented initiatives and processes in the Southern Mediterranean.

*Mediterranean | Regional cooperation | OSCE | European Union |
Economy | Crisis management | Democracy | Migration*



Towards "Helsinki +40": The OSCE, the Global Mediterranean, and the Future of Cooperative Security

Summary report prepared
by the Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI)*

This report provides a summary of the key issues raised in the international seminar "Towards 'Helsinki +40': The OSCE, the Global Mediterranean, and the Future of Cooperative Security", which was convened at the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Rome on 18 September 2014, with the aim of fostering a discussion about the prospects of Euro-Mediterranean cooperation from a politico-security, economic, environmental, and human perspective, at a time of great instability in the Mediterranean region. The seminar addressed the specific question of how the OSCE, in synergy with other international actors, can help promote a cooperative approach to Mediterranean security. The upcoming fortieth anniversary in 2015 of the CSCE Helsinki Final Act - a landmark document for European peace and an exemplary instrument for cooperative security - provided the context for a debate which focused both on how the decades-old OSCE-Mediterranean Partnership can be strengthened and on whether and in which ways the "OSCE model" can inspire cooperation-oriented initiatives and processes in the Southern Mediterranean.

The seminar was promoted and supported by the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and co-organised by the OSCE Secretariat in Vienna and the Institute of International Affairs (IAI) of Rome. It took place under the joint auspices of the 2014 Swiss Chairmanship of the OSCE and the Italian Presidency of the European Union Council. The meeting served as the launch event of a new OSCE-related Mediterranean "track II" network: *New-Med*. The Compagnia di San Paolo foundation of Turin, as a partner in the *New-Med* network initiative, also generously provided support to the event and contributed to its preparation. The seminar brought together over a hundred participants, among whom were academics, researchers from international think tanks, civil society representatives, as well as governmental and international organisation officials from a plurality of OSCE, North African and Middle Eastern countries.

* Summary report of the international seminar "Towards 'Helsinki +40': The OSCE, the Global Mediterranean, and the Future of Cooperative Security", convened at the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation in Rome on 18 September 2014 and organised by the Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI) and the OSCE Secretariat under the auspices of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, the Swiss Chairmanship of the OSCE and the Italian Presidency of the EU.

The agenda started with opening speeches by Italian Undersecretary for Foreign Affairs Mr. Mario Giro and by the OSCE Secretary General Amb. Lamberto Zannier (both are included in the annexes). Mr. Mario Giro pointed out that the role the OSCE is playing in the Ukrainian crisis is a clear sign that the Organisation is not only a heritage of the Cold War era, but a key security provider in today's deteriorating security environment. The OSCE should remain committed to building a comprehensive, cooperative and indivisible security community on the European continent and beyond. The spillover effects of crises taking place in Europe's neighbouring MENA region, in Syria and Libya in particular, prove the growing interdependence between European and Mediterranean security. The dialogue between East-West is key not only to the preservation of European peace, but also for effectively addressing the crises that currently plague the Southern Mediterranean. Giro stressed that Italy is deeply convinced that it is necessary to strengthen the Euro-Mediterranean security dimension of the OSCE engagement to complete the traditional Euro-Asiatic dimension of the Organisation. Security issues that need to be tackled include not only traditional challenges such as arms control, but also transnational threats and growing phenomena such as the trafficking in human beings, all of which undermine state as well as human security. As security is a global topic that requires global answers it is unavoidable for Europe to develop an enhanced dialogue with its partner countries on the Southern shore, to which European countries are connected through the common Mediterranean Sea.



Emiliano Alessandri (left), Mario Giro (centre), Lamberto Zannier (right)

Amb. Zannier highlighted that the OSCE commitment to the Mediterranean dates all the way back to the 1975 Helsinki Final Act, which includes a chapter on Mediterranean security. Agreed upon during a time of East-West Cold War tensions, the Helsinki Final Act advanced the notion that the security of Europe is inextricably linked to security in the Mediterranean. Since then, this link has only become more apparent. From the ongoing Syrian refugee crisis to the threat of transnational terrorism and foreign fighters, from uncontrolled migration flows to the environment, Euro-Mediterranean interdependence is an inescapable reality. Amb. Zannier argued that the OSCE remains convinced that a comprehensive definition of security needs to stretch well beyond the military domain to include the political, economic, environmental, and human dimensions of security. Amb. Zannier reiterated the OSCE's support for the ongoing reform processes in Mediterranean Partner countries since 2011 and stressed that the OSCE "tool box" and the OSCE *acquis* remain available for Mediterranean Partner countries to draw on, according to their needs and preferences.

Amb. Zannier's speech also praised efforts made by the OSCE participating States and Partner countries to take the OSCE-Mediterranean Partnership to the next level by, if necessary, revising and reforming some of the existing instruments for cooperation. He offered a view of the OSCE as a suitable platform for an open, inclusive dialogue on Euro-Mediterranean issues. He underlined that as the largest regional grouping in the UN system, the Organisation can act as a bridge between multilateral and regional organisations from both Europe and the MENA region. The speech also launched the most recent OSCE-Mediterranean "track II" initiative, the *New-Med* network, whose aim is to stimulate and complement the ongoing diplomatic dialogue on how to strengthen Euro-Mediterranean cooperation at this difficult juncture. Amb. Zannier emphasised the added value of involving academics, researchers, and other civil society representatives in inter-governmental discussions.

Following opening remarks, the *New-Med* network project was presented. The presentation highlighted the following features and aims: *New-Med* is the first track II Mediterranean network to ever be linked to the OSCE; its aim is to leverage the expertise of researchers and academics from both the OSCE area and the MENA region to promote a truly "two-way dialogue" on Mediterranean cooperation beneficial to a plurality of actors, not only to the OSCE-Mediterranean Partnership. It was underlined that *New-Med* is particularly interested in featuring perspectives "from the South" and will aim to move beyond the traditionally Euro-centric format of Mediterranean cooperation dialogues and initiatives. Among key themes on which *New-Med* will be working is the "Global Mediterranean" and how European and MENA countries can work together to maintain peace and stability in this increasingly interdependent and plural space. As a "track II" initiative, *New-Med* aims at fostering dialogue "beyond diplomatic channels." However, the network will benefit from the input and feedback that OSCE participating States and Mediterranean Partner countries will provide. OSCE Mediterranean Partner countries will be able to task dedicated national focal points to engage with the network, which aims to remain light in structure and will be mainly a network of people rather than an association of institutions.

After the presentation of the *New-Med* network, participants were walked through the agenda of the seminar, explaining the selection of topics that were featured in the three main panels. It was emphasised that the seminar was meant to foster a broad reflection about the future of Mediterranean security as well as generate concrete proposals on how to move OSCE-Mediterranean cooperation forward. It was pointed out that the Southern Mediterranean region is currently facing a period of instability and is shaken by multiple conflict hotspots, the majority of which are intra-state conflicts. Therefore, it was suggested that domestic sources of Mediterranean instability be analysed together with external factors, with a particular focus on tensions that are caused by unmet social demands and denied human rights.

1. The new Global Mediterranean: key features and actors

The first session focused on the notion of a "Global Mediterranean," a concept that tries to capture two simultaneous and overlapping long-term dynamics: on the one hand, the growing interdependence between different areas of the Mediterranean at all levels, including the societal one; on the other, the multiplication and differentiation of "actors" operating in and/or with a stake in Mediterranean security, from extra-regional players such as the BRICS and the Gulf States, to the growing involvement of non-governmental groups. The role of private companies, private foundations, wealthy individuals, social and charitable movements is increasingly relevant to the emerging Mediterranean security equation. By the same token but in an opposite way, transnational, non-state actors such as terrorist groups and networks have become a primary threat to Mediterranean peace. The debate was driven by the following questions:



Silvia Colombo

- What are the major differences between the Mediterranean in the 1970s and the Mediterranean of the 21st century in politico-security, economic and human dimension terms?
- How do the recent Arab upheavals and transitions fit in this larger transformation?
- How do challenges related to human mobility in the Mediterranean, including irregular migration and trafficking, affect relations between the two shores, especially from a security perspective?
- How can a holistic approach, encompassing security, development and respect for human rights, be developed to address them?
- How is regional cooperation affected by the growing role of non-governmental actors and the expanding influence of extra-regional players in the area?
- What opportunity does increased engagement of youth and women in political and public spaces offer for regional and international collaboration?
- Is a more interdependent Mediterranean also a more integrated one, or will old and new divides continue to characterise the region, hampering regional and international cooperation efforts?

The discussion was kicked-off by the presentation of a paper drafted by Ambassador Anis Salem of Egypt as a representative of the Egyptian Council on Foreign Relations, which highlighted some of the key features of the post-Arab spring context from a strategic and security perspective. The paper-giver argued that the Mediterranean has reached a point where the old order has vanished but it is still too early to discern the features of the new since a defining logic still seems to be missing.



First session panelists

Concretely, it was argued that two key strategic shifts have taken place in the Mediterranean region: one related to the international level and one to the regional context. While the old international order had been defined by the regional influences of US hegemony, the uncontested character of US dominance has been challenged in recent years. As the US is perceived to rebalance engagement and resources from the Middle East towards Asia, Russia has re-entered the region with an approach that

seems to have shifted from the previous co-management with the US towards a more independent and at times confrontational approach. At the regional level, the state system has become increasingly fragmented and relations between states have changed, with an overall tendency towards intensified competition in the economic as well as political, security and also cultural fields. Several powers such as Iran, some Gulf States, and Turkey are seeking to increase their influence, while Iraq, Egypt, and Syria remain important players in the region but have been increasingly focused on preserving domestic stability.

Fragmentation and the growing risk of failing states can also be connected to the erosion of governance that globalisation is causing in the Mediterranean context. Fragmentation has increased the insecurity prevailing in the region. This applies to the external level where the situation has shifted from one characterised by well-defined threats to a situation marked by a multitude of unstructured threats that may undermine states and governments from within or through ever more porous borders. The same dynamics also apply to the domestic level, where governments in the region are facing greater demands than before while they seem less able to provide answers to these challenges. Structural constraints such as poverty, high unemployment, or low levels of literacy continue to plague the region, while an absence of vision - and means - in formulating effective policies has been notable in various contexts. Ensuing frustration has fuelled tensions and provided a fertile ground for the formation or expansion of extremist movements. With the exacerbation of tensions and the spreading of violence, hopes for democratisation processes, which had been spurred by the popular movements of 2011, have often given way to pessimism or disillusionment, while nurturing a desire for stability, even when at the expense of positive change. Against this backdrop, it was noted, however, that societal activism, particularly among the youth, continues and should be acknowledged as a new, hard-to-reverse dynamic. In this context, major structural drivers for change in the future will be the continuing demographic shift, urbanisation, the dire economic situation facing some countries in the region, education challenges, and other domestic factors which will keep interplaying with external conditions and influences.

In terms of reacting to these challenges, it was pointed out that a strategy should be designed which finds a balance between a global vision, or a "strategic vision," and one adjustable to specific situations on the ground. The globalisation of the Mediterranean does not necessarily mean global or Mediterranean-wide solutions. A more promising approach, on the contrary, should be able to take into account the important differences across the region, which external observers often regrettably neglect and which, on the contrary, often explain the different trajectories of individual local actors. Root causes of the current conflictual situation in the region should be addressed in their respective contexts, leveraging on the possible added value that external actors could bring to local solutions. Efforts should also be put towards coping with overarching security issues such as the risk of nuclear proliferation, or the instability generated by the unsuccessful Middle East peace process. For these, leadership from traditional actors such as the US and Europe remains necessary but looks like an increasingly insufficient ingredient. Involvement of extra-regional players and a more proactive role of MENA countries should also be sought.

Panelists agreed that a priority should be regional cooperation, with or without deeper "integration" - a prospect that may be unrealistic at this stage. Cooperation in the new, post-Arab uprisings Mediterranean context requires the initiative and determination of local actors. These self-standing efforts could be fostered by the active contribution of organisations that are aiming at strengthening their partnerships with southern Mediterranean countries, such as, for example, the OSCE, and could be underpinned by a new EU approach. The new approach of international organisations should build on "inspiring" rather than "exporting" external models. Both the OSCE and the EU have "experiences" that could be shared with Mediterranean Partners. When it comes to the utilisation of new resources, a win-win process would put economic development at the centre, as economic and social imbalances within countries and across the region explain much of the current instability.

In this context, the issue of migration could be seen as an opportunity for economic development and growth, not just a challenge. Migration shows that from a human mobility perspective the Euro-Mediterranean area is already a common space and could potentially become a more unified market. Regional integration would also involve assisting countries in areas such as governance reform, but by focusing on specific priorities rather than overly ambitious reform plans, which can only be undertaken when an alignment of interests and preferences is found in the individual country. In some cases the added value of international organisations could be shown in working with Mediterranean partners in improving governance at the local level, where the impact would be immediately felt by the population.

Principles should continue to inspire development policies of external actors in the region, but there is a growing consensus that strict forms of conditionality may not work in the new context. Indeed, they may increasingly clash with the urgency that is needed to solve ongoing crises and also conflict with local expectations about co-development and co-promotion of guiding principles and norms, as opposed

to the traditional north-south transfer. A key aspect of any new external approach to the region would be the recognition that local ownership is not only a necessary ingredient, but often a prerequisite to any cooperation initiative. Dialogue should first start among local actors and build on a progress that could initially be achieved at a more limited sub-regional level. Any revival of Mediterranean-wide integrationist/regionalist schemes will have to be anchored to the local realities of the Southern Mediterranean.

2. The evolution of OSCE's Mediterranean engagement

The second panel focused on the evolution of OSCE's Mediterranean engagement and was driven by the following questions:

- What are the major features and areas of evolution in OSCE's Mediterranean Partnership?
- What are the existing fields of cooperation?
- What have been so far the most effective instruments of cooperation?
- Is there sufficient awareness of existing cooperation arrangements?
- What issues identified in the Mediterranean chapter of the Helsinki Final Act remain unaddressed and why?
- Should the relationship between the OSCE and Southern Mediterranean countries be reframed in the context of "Helsinki +40" or just updated?
- Should the focus be on practical cooperation projects or on larger political initiatives?
- How can "track II" activities help towards making progress in future cooperation?

The panel opened with the discussion of the paper presented by Professor Monika Wohlfeld, arguing forcefully that the 1975 CSCE Helsinki Final Act vision for the Mediterranean ("Questions relating to Security and Cooperation in the Mediterranean") has not been implemented to its full potential. This has been a result of prioritisation of other areas, but also the product of internal divisions among the OSCE participating States, as well as of the diverse perspectives the involved actors have held and still hold about the Mediterranean. While there has been a visionary discussion in the OSCE about "security in the Mediterranean," concrete follow-up has remained limited and the OSCE-Mediterranean Partnership has so far been mainly confined to a dialogue which has delivered important yet limited results in terms of concrete cooperation projects. While over time, a structure for dialogue, access as observers to deliberations of the participating States and some operational activities were set up for a number of States from the



Loic Simonet (left), Monika Wohlfeld (right)

region (the six so called Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation), frustrations with the dialogue were expressed occasionally by both these Mediterranean Partner and participating States. Undeniably, despite its achievements, the dialogue seems to be more process-driven rather than result-driven, and ritualized rather than responsive to events on the ground. Calls for an upgrade of the OSCE Mediterranean engagement, also in light of the failures of other organisations operating in the region, should be welcomed but tempered by a sense of realism about what the organisation can realistically achieve.

The OSCE has some comparative advantages for creating regional dynamics that are based on cooperation and not conflict: its mode of working, its broad and diverse membership including several Muslim-majority societies, a comprehensive approach to security that well fits with the growing set of threats posed by globalisation, the flexibility of its relatively light institutional structure, a long-standing relationship with civil society and people (the OSCE "third basket" or human dimension), as well as its long-accumulated experience in supporting transition and democratisation processes in the European context. The so-called Helsinki +40 process - a review of the OSCE mission and tools as the 40th anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act in 2015 approaches - could provide a useful venue for discussion, but relevant documents generally mention an Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian Security Community, with no explicit reference to the Mediterranean. Partnership-related issues have been included in the so-called Cluster VIII of "Helsinki +40", but Mediterranean Partner countries are still seeking clarification about what type of involvement is expected and what the final outcome of discussions is supposed to be. A key question, for instance, revolves around whether expectations are about expanding the content of cooperation, in part blurring the divide between participating States and Partners, or more limitedly about fine tuning the tools for existing dialogue and cooperation. In the development of the OSCE-Mediterranean Partnership (currently including six Mediterranean Partners for Cooperation (MPC): Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Morocco, Tunisia), dialogue has too often been driven by procedural rather than content-oriented priorities. Is this going to change? Is such change needed? Are views of OSCE participating States and Mediterranean Partner countries aligned on this issue?

Another key issue is the relevance of the OSCE experience to the MENA region. Differences between the two regions abound. At the same time, instruments and practices developed over the decades by the OSCE in Europe to prevent and/or contain conflict are much needed in today's increasingly unstable and conflict-ridden Mediterranean. While it does not currently appear viable to put forward new multilateral frameworks based on the CSCE/OSCE model for the Mediterranean, it would be useful as a minimum to restate the value of the trust-building, peace-fostering process that led to the Helsinki Final Act during the Cold War and explore whether similar initiatives could in the future take place, perhaps at the sub-regional/local levels, under the leadership of Southern Mediterranean countries, and with only an external supporting role played by OSCE participating States.

When it comes to reinforcing the OSCE-Mediterranean Partnership, there seems to be a strong need to make the dialogue less "Euro-centric" and more balanced by ensuring ownership of the Partner States in the process of cooperation, for example by reforming the role and modus operandi of the OSCE Mediterranean Contact Group, assigning chairing or co-chairing roles to Mediterranean Partners in some aspects of the dialogue and possibly assigning some limited possibilities for them to have a role in decision-making, for example when the MPCs and the Contact Group are directly concerned. This would have to be done in a transparent manner and in agreement with Mediterranean Partner countries. The dialogue must be made more operational and relevant by simplifying the rules on activities in Partner States and providing some seed money in the OSCE unified budget. There also has to be a better link between the Contact Group and the OSCE Permanent Council,



Monika Wohlfeld (left), Sharon Pardo (right)

and better follow-up, organization-wide, to events and activities with Partner States. There should be better follow-up to Contact Group meetings and Mediterranean conferences within the Organisation, for example in the context of Permanent Council meetings, in order to make these events the launching pad for concrete cooperation projects that could be then developed and executed by the OSCE Secretariat and the OSCE institutions.

How to extend the reach of dialogue in the Mediterranean was a key question discussed during the panel. Since Jordan became a Mediterranean Partner for Cooperation in 1998, there have not been new additions, even if the Palestinian National Authority and Libya have requested to become MPCs. Although decisions about new partnerships will be of a political nature in the end, several measures should be taken to extend the reach of dialogue. Firstly, the process of becoming an MPC could become more transparent and the formal criteria that countries should fulfil in order to gain this status should be spelled out more clearly. Also the goal of the partnership and its model could be better identified to incentivise countries to apply and to effectively engage with the OSCE after becoming partners. This would be important specifically as governments in the Southern Mediterranean region may be currently less willing to cooperate in light of a general scepticism towards international involvement in internal affairs. The idea of working out more individualised partnerships with each of the MPC has some attractiveness. One of the positive aspects in the recent evolution of the OSCE-Mediterranean Partnership is growing engagement and rising expectations on the part of the MPCs, which have been more forthcoming in sharing their priorities with OSCE participating States. As these priorities and preferences do not always fully align, individualised partnerships or separate action plans could be considered as a promising development.

Furthermore, the reach of the OSCE dialogue with the Mediterranean could also be extended by working more closely with other multilateral and regional organisations - a development which should be prioritised in the future especially with a view to avoid duplication of efforts while maximising much-needed synergies at a time of scarce resources. As the largest regional organisation under Chapter VIII of the United Nations (UN) Charter, the OSCE could act as the platform for a security dialogue involving other regional and sub-regional actors. The OSCE already works closely with organisations such as the Council of Europe and the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, among others. The Platform for Co-operative Security could be the basis for calling one or a series of conferences with partner organisations aimed at reviewing both the needs in the Mediterranean region and the various responses to them, should partner organisations be interested in such a coordination. These relationships could be complemented by growing engagement with organisations that have a broad membership in the south, such as the League of Arab States or the Organisation for Islamic Cooperation (OIC). At some stage, loose associations in aspects of the dialogue of other types of relevant regional actors such as the Gulf States and Iran should be considered. Also, the pursuit of closer relations with regional organisations such as the African Union under the chapeau of the UN is a venue that could bring added value to the participating states in the OSCE, and could be elaborated more clearly.

The weak institutional framework in the Mediterranean has led initiatives such as the Union for the Mediterranean (UfM) to focus on rather specific projects of cooperation which often leave out security altogether as a topic of discussion and an area of action. This has opened a niche for the OSCE. The OSCE added value could be to work out a closer relationship with the UfM and other multilateral organisations operating in the region, based on complementary efforts as well as a division of responsibilities.

In this context, the OSCE could facilitate security discussions that other organisations could find it more difficult initiating. In particular, the OSCE could frame a security dialogue in the region based not on the idea of transferring principles from Europe to the MENA region but on learning from positive and negative lessons that can be drawn from the OSCE experience in European security. This indirect approach is already being tested through specialised training and workshop activities in which experiences are shared, rather than taught. These activities already often take place in partnership with other organisations.

Participants also agreed that the new OSCE-Mediterranean dialogue should include not only governmental and inter-governmental actors, but also academics, journalists, parliamentarians, youth, teachers and civil society representatives thus providing for more ownership and visibility, making the Organization better known and its potential contribution more appreciated. The New-Med Research Network initiative, a track II effort which aims at active participation of research and academic institutions and foundations and wants to bring together individuals from both sides of the Mediterranean for a dialogue on security and co-operation in the region may help overcome the problem of lack of awareness and provide the

right kind of impulses. The OSCE PA is already reaching out to Parliamentarians in the Mediterranean. Track I and track II initiatives should accompany and support each other. Without track II initiatives, there might be the risk that the process will become solely political, ultimately falling short of expectations in a similar way as its predecessors.

Issue-wise, OSCE assistance in democratisation processes in the South was widely praised. The key role that ODIHR has played in supporting elections and other democratic practices, especially in Tunisia, was highlighted and analysed in detail during the panel. In the field of democratic transitions, it is felt that the OSCE has a plurality of success stories to share and Mediterranean Partner countries recognise the added value that the OSCE can bring to an already active international engagement in this area. The wish was expressed by some panelists to see this engagement grow to include other countries of the OSCE-Mediterranean Partnership. Some pointed out that in a comprehensive definition of security, political stability through political reform is a key element of the security equation. Panelists also recognised the role that the OSCE is playing in sharing expertise in a growing range of sectorial and/or technical areas from women's empowerment to migration policy, from the fight against trafficking to counter-terrorism, from water management to environmental security. The desire was expressed to more firmly anchor existing "practical cooperation" to a better defined and laid-out "strategic vision" of the OSCE-Mediterranean Partnership for the long run.

3. The future of regional cooperative security

The third session turned to the issue of regional cooperative security and the role of international organisations therein. It was driven by the following questions:

- What is the future of cooperative security in the more interdependent but also more plural Mediterranean of the 21st century?
- Can relevant regional and international organisations, such as the EU, the UN, the Council of Europe, the League of Arab States, as well as regional initiatives, such as the Union for the Mediterranean and the "5+5 Dialogue," and the OSCE, cooperate more closely in regional security, and how?
- What other actors or organisations could be involved in new initiatives?
- What are the prospects for new regional security arrangements to emerge?
- Has the idea of a Conference for Security and Cooperation in the Mediterranean (CSCM) become more or less attractive in the post-Arab Spring context?
- Does the recurrent vision of a Mediterranean security community still have some relevance for policy debates or should more limited aims be set going forward?

Panelists in the third session, spanning a variety of disciplinary and geographic perspectives, agreed that insecurity is prevailing in the Mediterranean at all levels: at the regional, state, and domestic-internal levels. States in the region are facing growing security challenges, but have become weaker to address them. International

organisations tasked with security have lost some of their internal cohesion and have often fallen short of their self-declared goals. This applies to the European as well as to the Southern Mediterranean space. A regional cooperative security strategy should therefore take into account deteriorating realities on both shores of the Mediterranean.



Eduard Soler i Lecha (left), Ian O. Lesser (right)

In light of the turmoil and fragmentation the region is currently facing, it seems increasingly unrealistic to build a global Mediterranean security community, especially one based on formal, institutionalised structures. Nonetheless, it is very important to re-launch regional dialogue on key issues, focused on limited but fundamental objectives such as containing the spread of violence and neutralising actors whose very objective is Mediterranean conflict, such as terrorist groups currently operating in Iraq and Syria, among other countries.

The equality and ownership of all partners involved in this process and the need for an inclusive approach was also raised in this panel. The exact forms of civil-society engagement should be part of a discussion on how to extend the security dialogue beyond state actors. It was mentioned that track II initiatives have proven to be particularly effective in not only stimulating but broadening the scope and agendas of inter-state dialogue.

In terms of existing international actors promoting Mediterranean cooperation, panelists agreed that the OSCE can be a facilitator and could be seen as an honest broker. Organisations from the South are expected to play a more direct if not a leading role in tackling some of the ongoing crises. For its part, the EU continues to represent a crucial partner of Southern Mediterranean countries. The deteriorating security situation, however, poses challenges to the traditional EU approach, which was premised on the expectation of Mediterranean regional integration. While security has always been a focus of the EU's Mediterranean policy, the persistence of conflicts in the area has rendered the effective implementation of policy instruments such as the Barcelona process, and later on the UfM, increasingly difficult. The globalisation of the Mediterranean and the growing diversity of the region's experiences also seem to clash with one-size-fits-all approaches to Euro-Mediterranean cooperation that remain Euro-centric. Panelists seemed to agree that the European Neighbourhood Policy has to become more diversified and can no longer be modeled after the EU Enlargement policy.

Furthermore, panelists concurred that extra-regional actors should now be expected to play a more proactive role. Together with the US, Russia and China are important Mediterranean actors with a growing stake in Mediterranean security.

They should be engaged in a dialogue that can no longer remain Europe-driven. In this context, a panelist argued that post-Cold War international relations are heavily influenced by a worldwide imbalance between two opposite trends: the trend of multilateral cooperation on urgent global and regional issues like counter-terrorism, on the one hand, and the opposite trend of a new bipolarity between liberal and majoritarian regimes, on the other. In terms of principles, a tension remains between traditional norms presiding over the inviolability of borders and state sovereignty and the right to self-determination. The position of Russia has and will remain crucial in settling or limiting the negative effects of some of these tensions. Russia can be either a precious ally of Europe or an obstacle to multilateral cooperation in the Mediterranean and much will depend on the way in which it will be engaged in the future dialogue. The outcome of the Ukrainian crisis will be critical for the future not only of European security but also for the success of any multilateral initiatives in the MENA region. From a Russian perspective, security interdependencies are, therefore, not only south-north bound. The resolution of ongoing crises in Europe could be seen as a condition for closer collaboration between Russia and other OSCE countries in the Middle East.

The **concluding session** of the seminar revisited the issues discussed in the three panels. The OSCE can be a valuable source of inspiration because its principles, practices, and experiences have a lot of lessons to offer to Mediterranean regional cooperation in a period in which the shortcomings of the Euro-Mediterranean model have become increasingly apparent and in which conflict seems, unfortunately, the new normal in areas of the Southern Mediterranean. What the OSCE should continue doing is to share rather than to transfer its experience. This applies to principles as well as to instruments and practices of cooperation. The OSCE can also play an important role in fostering the establishment of private-public partnerships and promoting the role of civil society organisations in Mediterranean dialogue. It will be crucial to develop synergies between the diplomatic process taking place in institutional contexts and the track II initiatives developed together with think tanks.



Concluding session panelists

The complex crisis in the Mediterranean provides also an opportunity to develop productive diplomatic talks between the main actors in the region and to upgrade and enhance paradigms of cooperation in the Mediterranean region, including through the OSCE. Looking to next year to the fortieth anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act, there is a need for new ideas about how European Security can be revitalised and how a new European divide can be avoided. However, the focus should not be crises in the post-Soviet space only, but should also include a more proactive approach to the Mediterranean.

During the conference, it also became clear that security is indivisible: there is a close interdependence among areas of the Mediterranean and a growing interplay between state and non-state actors. There is also a growing role of extra-regional actors in the Mediterranean security equation. This should lead to broaden the strategic perspective. The notion of a "Global Mediterranean" may capture some of the new key trends and key actors, but will have to be further analysed and operationalised as a concept. One of the key points emerging from the discussion has been that the links between different actors have to be better understood with a view to identifying possible new venues and schemes for cooperation.

Furthermore, a pressing question is "Mediterranean public goods" that have come under direct threat. These are a number of common issues that should become shared priorities for all the countries that are part of the Mediterranean including: maritime safety and security, the management of sea-based resources, Mediterranean energy and the Mediterranean environment, human and personal security related to migration flows, and food security, among others. How to protect Mediterranean public goods in the new "Global Mediterranean" setting will be one of the key elements of the future Mediterranean agenda.

Annex I

Introductory Speech

by Doctor Mario Giro, Undersecretary of State for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation¹

Ambassador Zannier, Secretary General of the OSCE,

Friends of the Istituto Affari Internazionali,

Dr. Emiliano Alessandri, Mediterranean Focal Point of the OSCE,

Distinguished Guests,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a pleasure for me to inaugurate today the seminar *Towards "Helsinki +40": the OSCE, the Global Mediterranean and the Future of Cooperative Security*.

I would like to thank the Istituto Affari Internazionali and the OSCE Secretariat for having organised this important event with us, the Swiss Presidency of the OSCE for having guaranteed its patronage, along with the Italian Presidency of the European Union.

As you know, a process of transformation is under way in order to re-launch the role of the OSCE by 2015, forty years after the Conference of Helsinki: the *"Process of Helsinki +40"*. As a member of the Italian Government, thus representing the rotating Presidency of the European Union, I wish to underline the full support of Italy and EU for the activity of the OSCE, which we deem a pillar of the European security architecture. The role that the OSCE is playing in the Ukrainian crisis and in Georgia is a clear *sign that the Organisation is not only an heritage of the Cold War era, but a key actor in building a comprehensive, cooperative and indivisible security community throughout our Continent and beyond*. We strongly sustain its efforts and we hope that the OSCE will be successful in its attempt of facilitating the achievement of a sustainable political solution in Ukraine.

Within the framework of the *"Process of Helsinki +40"*, Italy is deeply convinced that it is necessary to strengthen the Euro-Mediterranean security dimension also. Indeed, our country has always considered that as an essential step for completing the traditional Euro-Asiatic dimension of the Organisation. The recent developments in that area, Syria and Libya in particular, prove the strong connection existing between issues related to the security in the Mediterranean

¹ The speech is also available in the OSCE website: <http://www.osce.org/networks/124613>.

and the dialogue between East-West in this field.

When we talk about security aspects, we are not considering only military security and arms control, but also issues related to the fight against trafficking in human beings and illegal immigration, to the safeguard of human rights, and so on. We must be aware that security is a global topic that requires global answers.

Starting from this perspective Italy firmly believes that it is necessary to develop an *enhanced dialogue with the Partner Countries of the Southern Shore of the Mediterranean*, within the framework of the OSCE and not only. We welcome the decision of Switzerland to consider *the OSCE-MED dialogue a priority of the next Ministerial Council of the Organisation*, which will be held in Basel on 4-5 December, and the intention of putting into the agenda of the Meeting the formal request presented by Libya *of becoming a Partner for Cooperation of the OSCE*. We strongly support the Libyan initiative because we believe in the country's need of international support, now even more than ever, in such a delicate transition period of its history.

The Seminar we inaugurate today in Rome is our little, but significant contribution to the open dialogue between the two shores of the Mediterranean, in a spirit of shared responsibilities and engagement in a better future.

Let me *conclude* this welcoming speech by *praising* an interesting achievement of recent months that will be presented in the course of the Seminar, that is the *New MED Research Network*, an OSCE-related Mediterranean "track II" initiative that brings together researchers, academicians and think-tanks from the two shores of the Mediterranean. The project was launched with the support of the Italian Ministry for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, the Istituto Affari Internazionali and the Compagnia di San Paolo (a successful example of "public-private partnership") and it is aimed at sharing experiences and analyses on the security cooperation in the Mediterranean region from a comprehensive perspective. As an informal and a non-institutionalised research community, the network can generate ideas, options and proposals for the policy-makers outside the traditional governmental and intergovernmental schemes and thus offer an added value in framing strategies to face the common challenges of the region. To give relevance to this work, I think it is of utmost importance to attract independent analysts from all countries, particularly from the Southern shore and beyond. Being an innovative way of conducting foreign policy, the Network is certainly one of the main outcomes of today's seminar, a path on which we intend to keep walking in the future.

I wish you all a fruitful work and I thank you for your attention.

Annex II

Welcoming Remarks

by Ambassador Lamberto Zannier, OSCE Secretary General²

Excellencies,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a pleasure to welcome you to this seminar on cooperative security and the Mediterranean. Let me start by thanking the *Institute of International Affairs* and the Italian Foreign Ministry for hosting this event, which has been organized under the auspices of the Swiss OSCE Chairmanship and the Italian Presidency of the Council of the European Union. I would also like to thank the *Compagnia di San Paolo* Foundation for their support for the broader "OSCE-Mediterranean track II initiative".

Dear Colleagues,

At a time when the OSCE has been primarily focused on the situation in Ukraine - a crisis threatening European security as a whole, and presenting significant challenges to us as an organization - we have nonetheless continued to follow developments in the Mediterranean with great attention, not least because the challenges in this region are extremely serious too. This seminar is a testament to our dedication to peace and security dialogue in the Mediterranean region.

This commitment dates all the way back to the 1975 Helsinki Final Act, our founding document, which includes a chapter on Mediterranean security. Agreed upon during a time of East-West Cold War tensions, the Helsinki Final Act advanced the notion that the security of Europe is inextricably linked to security in the Mediterranean. Since then, this link has only become more apparent. From the ongoing Syrian refugee crisis to the threat of transnational terrorism and foreign fighters, from uncontrolled migration flows to the environment, Euro-Mediterranean interdependence is a reality that we see in action every day. Even as the Mediterranean has gone through cycles of change, our goal has remained the same: to foster stability and reduce the risks of conflict while maximizing the many opportunities that interdependence creates for co-operation and co-development across the Euro-Mediterranean space.

Over the decades, the OSCE-Mediterranean partnership has expanded in scope and content, most recently in response to the so-called Arab Spring. Co-operation now ranges from elections to capacity building, from women's empowerment to the fight against terrorism. Just yesterday, together with UNODC, the OSCE

² The speech is also available in the OSCE website: <http://www.osce.org/sg/124557>.

held a Mediterranean region expert workshop in Malta on counter-terrorism and hostage-taking and there is now a plan to create an OSCE Center of Excellence in Malta, focusing on rule of law, justice and the fight against terrorism.

As we move forward in intensifying our partnership, we expect that OSCE-Mediterranean dialogue will be even more strongly geared towards achieving concrete outcomes and results. Our Mediterranean Partners are now clearly more forthcoming in communicating their expectations. We are pleased and encouraged by this growing engagement. Efforts should now be put towards making full use of existing mechanisms for co-operation and ensuring better follow-up to recommendations made in our regular dialogue and at the annual OSCE Mediterranean Conference. The Mediterranean Contact Group, a forum celebrating its twentieth anniversary this year, will continue to be the main regular forum for close interaction between the OSCE participating States and our Mediterranean partners.

Dear Colleagues,

The OSCE recognizes that the Mediterranean is undergoing tremendous political, economic and societal challenges. That is why we have developed relationships not only with individual countries but also with a growing network of regional and multilateral organizations. As needs multiply in the region, seeking synergies and working out a suitable division of labor become ever more important goals. We are determined to strengthen ties and improve coordination with other multilateral organizations interested in Mediterranean issues such as the League of Arab States and the Union for the Mediterranean. As the largest regional organization under Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter, the OSCE stands ready to act as a bridge between organizations with common concerns about regional security and peace.

In sharing our considerable experience as a regional security organization, we remain convinced that a comprehensive definition of security needs to stretch well beyond the military domain to include the political, economic and environmental, and human dimensions of security. In this context, the OSCE reiterates its support for the ongoing reform processes in Mediterranean Partner countries since 2011, and reconfirms its readiness to share the OSCE experience in assisting during difficult processes of transition. In this regard, I wish to pay special tribute to the contribution of the OSCE's Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) to the successful institutional transition in Tunisia, which was the first Mediterranean Partner to approach the OSCE with a request for information on OSCE's experience in assisting democratic transition.

Indeed, the range of activities we are conducting with our Mediterranean Partners shows our determination to further operationalize our security dialogue. More than 20 projects are ongoing with our Mediterranean Partners, whose topics reflect the increasingly complex array of threats and risks faced by the Mediterranean countries from both outside and inside their borders. I have already mentioned the Conference on kidnapping for ransom which took place yesterday; the issue of

illicit trafficking of small arms and light weapons (SALW) will be the main topic of the 2014 Mediterranean Conference to be held in Neum, Bosnia and Herzegovina, in October.

Beside sharing of expertise and best practices, we are also implementing very concrete requests for assistance received from some of our Mediterranean Partners. Some of our key documents, such as the Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security, have been translated into Arabic to spread the knowledge and raise awareness among the local security sectors about these important instruments for confidence building and conflict prevention.

We intend to continue down this path, sharing our decades-long experience wherever this is considered useful. We are confident that sharing best practices will continue to provide a good basis for our engagement, as part of a Mediterranean dialogue driven by local demands and priorities.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

As the OSCE looks toward the fortieth anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act next year, enhancing the relationship with the OSCE's Partners for Co-operation will be a prominent item on its agenda. We look forward to strong engagement and concrete input from our Mediterranean Partners. Let me take this opportunity to thank the Permanent Representative of Mongolia to the OSCE, Ambassador Batjargal, for the role he is playing in carrying forward this specific cluster of the "Helsinki +40 Process" (Cluster VIII: "Increase Interaction with the Partners for Co-Operation and with International and Regional Organizations Working in Similar Fields").

In order to gather new ideas about the way forward, we have also decided to systematically involve think tanks and academic institutions in our discussions. I am happy to announce the launch of a new OSCE-linked network dedicated to Mediterranean issues. Named "New-Med", the new network will launch a broad discussion on the future of Mediterranean security and channel fresh, original perspectives into the ongoing diplomatic dialogue. New-Med will maintain a level of informality that is not possible in institutional contexts and will seek ties with other networks. It will act as an open forum for dialogue on the Mediterranean - also referred to as the "global Mediterranean" in title of this seminar - that should involve and benefit other organizations and actors sharing the same concerns for security and peace. Our Mediterranean Focal Point, Mr. Emiliano Alessandri, will further explain this initiative in due course.

Today's seminar should be seen as an important step in a longer-term process. The goal is not only to re-affirm the importance of Euro-Mediterranean ties, but to understand what Euro-Mediterranean interdependence concretely means in the specific security context in which we are currently operating. The added value that the OSCE can bring to the table should be a key item of discussion.

In this regard, I would like to draw your attention to the many interesting proposals which are contained in the papers that have been prepared for this conference, and I hope that many other useful recommendations will be made today by our distinguished panelists and guests. We will make sure that the outcome of this seminar will be fed into the Helsinki +40 Process, supporting our efforts to further deepen our ties with the Mediterranean Partners. I very much look forward to today's discussion.

Thank you.

Annex III

Conference Programme

Rome, 18 September 2014, Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Opening Session

Welcome Remarks

Mario Giro, Undersecretary of State, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Italy
Lamberto Zannier, Secretary General, OSCE

Introduction to the Seminar and New-Med Network

Emiliano Alessandri, Mediterranean Focal Point, OSCE Secretariat
Silvia Colombo, Research Fellow, IAI, Rome

First Session

The New "Global Mediterranean": Key Features and Actors

- Chair **Richard Youngs**, Senior Associate, Carnegie Endowment, Brussels
- Papergiver **Mohamed Anis Salem**, Board Member and Coordinator, Working Group on the UN and Regional Organisations, Egyptian Council for Foreign Affairs (ECFA), Cairo
- Panelists **Fathallah Sijilmassi**, Secretary General of the Union for the Mediterranean (UfM), Barcelona
 Kristina Kausch, Head of Middle East Programme, FRIDE, Madrid
 Ayman Khalil, Director, Arab Institute for Security Studies, Amman
 Claire Spencer, Head, Middle East and North Africa Programme, Chatham House, London

Debate

Second Session

The Evolution of OSCE's Mediterranean Engagement

- Chair **Loic Simonet**, Senior External Co-Operation Officer, OSCE Secretariat
- Papergiver **Monika Wohlfeld**, German Chair for Peace Studies and Conflict Prevention, Mediterranean Academy of Diplomatic Studies, Malta

- Panelists **Samir Koubaa**, Former Permanent Representative of the Republic of Tunisia at the OSCE
- Sharon Pardo**, Jean Monnet Chair ad personam, Director of the Centre for the Study of European Politics and Society at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer Sheva
- Thomas Vennen**, Head Democratization Department, ODIHR, Warsaw
- Saban Kardas**, President, ORSAM, Ankara

Debate

Third Session

The Future of Regional Cooperative Security

- Chair **Eduard Soler i Lecha**, Coordinator of the Mediterranean and Middle East Programme, CIDOB, Barcelona

- Panelists **Ian Lesser**, Senior Director for Foreign and Security Policy and Executive Director of the Transatlantic Center GMF, Brussels
- Nadia Arbatova**, Head of Department on European Political Studies, Institute for World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO), Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow
- Assia Ben Salah Alaoui**, Ambassador at Large, Kingdom of Morocco, Rabat
- Gabriel Busquets**, Ambassador at Large for Mediterranean Affairs, Spain, Madrid

Debate

Concluding Remarks

- Ettore Greco**, Director, IAI, Rome
- Nicolò Russo Perez**, Program Manager, Compagnia di San Paolo
- Gunaajav Batjargal**, Permanent Representative of Mongolia at the OSCE and Coordinator for Partners for Co-Operation, Helsinki +40 Process
- Fred Tanner**, Senior Adviser and Liaison to the Swiss OSCE Chairmanship, OSCE Secretariat

Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI)

Founded by Altiero Spinelli in 1965, does research in the fields of foreign policy, political economy and international security. A non-profit organisation, the IAI aims to further and disseminate knowledge through research studies, conferences and publications. To that end, it cooperates with other research institutes, universities and foundations in Italy and abroad and is a member of various international networks. More specifically, the main research sectors are: European institutions and policies; Italian foreign policy; trends in the global economy and internationalisation processes in Italy; the Mediterranean and the Middle East; defence economy and policy; and transatlantic relations. The IAI publishes an English-language quarterly (*The International Spectator*), an online webzine (*AffariInternazionali*), two series of research papers (*Quaderni IAI* and *IAI Research Papers*) and other papers' series related to IAI research projects.

Via Angelo Brunetti, 9 - I-00186 Rome, Italy

T +39 06 3224360

F + 39 06 3224363

iai@iai.it

www.iai.it

Latest DOCUMENTI IAI

- 14 | 08 Istituto Affari Internazionali, *Towards "Helsinki +40": The OSCE, the Global Mediterranean, and the Future of Cooperative Security. Summary Report*
- 14 | 07 Emiliano Alessandri, Nicole Koenig and Marco Siddi, *Priorities and Challenges of the 2014 Italian EU Presidency*
- 14 | 06 Istituto Affari Internazionali, *Scegliere per contare. Sintesi e raccomandazioni del Rapporto sulla politica estera italiana edizione 2014*
- 14 | 05 Domenico Lombardi and Samantha St. Amand, *Global Economic Trends and Recovery Prospects*
- 14 | 04 Eleonora Poli e Lorenzo Vai; Nicoletta Pirozzi (a cura di), *Quanto conta il Parlamento europeo per l'Italia? Un'analisi del dibattito parlamentare e pubblico tra il 2009 e il 2014*
- 14 | 03 Loukas Tsoukalis, *Exit strategy dallo stato confusionale europeo*
- 14 | 02 Daniel Gros and Alessandro Giovannini, *The "Relative" Importance of EMU Macroeconomic Imbalances in the Macroeconomic Imbalance Procedure*
- 14 | 01 Chiara Altafin (ed.), *The Threat of Contemporary Piracy and the Role of the International Community*
- 13 | 12 Chiara Rosselli (ed.), *Shaping the Future: Europe's New Voices. A Communiqué*