

**Co-Chairs' Summary Report of the ARF Workshop  
on "Confidence Building Measures and Preventive Diplomacy in Asia and Europe"  
Berlin, 12-14 March 2008**

1. Pursuant to the decision of the 14<sup>th</sup> Ministerial Meeting of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) held in Manila on 2 August 2007, the ARF Workshop on Confidence Building Measures (CBMs) and Preventive Diplomacy (PD) in Asia and Europe was held in Berlin, Germany, on 12-14 March 2008. The Meeting was co-chaired by Indonesia, and Germany on behalf of the European Union (EU).

All ARF participants with the exception of Papua New Guinea attended the Workshop. Representatives from the ARF Unit of the ASEAN Secretariat, the Organisation for Security Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) - Indonesia and CSCAP were also present. The Programme and Agenda of the Meeting is attached as **ANNEX A**, the Annotated Agenda as **ANNEX B**, and the List of Participants as **ANNEX C**.

**Introduction**

2. Ambassador Friedrich Gröning, Commissioner for Disarmament and Arms Control of the German Federal Government, opened the meeting on behalf of the European Union (**ANNEX D**). He emphasized the importance the EU and Germany accorded to enhanced cooperation with ASEAN and an active EU participation in the ARF, also evidenced by the hosting of a number of meetings in the EU in the past years. He underlined that dialogue and cooperation as well as a regional approach were crucial to maintain lasting stability. He recalled how the Organisation of Security and Cooperation in Europe had started as a Conference in Cold War Europe in the 1970s, and how CBMs was over time developed from a series of meetings into the highly advanced and structured security cooperation of today.

3. Key factors for success of the OSCE had been the commitment to transparency and an open dialogue on security issues, the adoption of a common, comprehensive, co-operative and indivisible security concept, the development of politically-binding standards and the gradual institutionalisation which led to the change of name into OSCE in 1994. All these steps were also the pre-conditions for the later conclusion of binding security treaties. In the process of regular review of these arrangements, the creation of credible verification mechanisms had been identified as a lesson of particular importance. The OSCE had also benefited from dialogue and cooperation with the United Nations and regional organizations. Ambassador Gröning expressed the hope that the present workshop could offer insights for the further development of CBMs and PD both in the ARF and the OSCE.

4. In his opening speech, the Co-Chair Ibnu Hadi, Director for Intra-Regional Cooperation for Asia-Pacific and African in the Indonesian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, noted that Berlin was a particularly suitable venue for a workshop on CBMs and PD. He recalled the wishes of ARF participants to contribute to peace and security through the building of confidence and trust amongst each other. According to the terminology and vision developed in consecutive meetings on PD (Seoul 1995, Paris 1997, Hanoi 2001, Tokyo 2004), the ARF was currently in the transition phase from confidence building to preventive diplomacy. As mutual trust amongst ASEAN countries – which work towards a Security Community by 2015 as part of the overall ASEAN Community building process - and ARF participants had increased, the ARF was in a good position to advance into preventive diplomacy. He looked forward to taking inspiration for the handling of the challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century from the exchanges at this Workshop and the cooperation of the Asia-Pacific and European regions in general.

5. Deputy Ambassador Bračković of the Republic of Slovenia greeted participants on behalf of the current Presidency of the European Union and underlined the important role of strengthening security cooperation.

**Session 1: Confidence Building Measures and Preventive Diplomacy in Europe**

6. **Mr. Pentti Olin, Senior Adviser of the Ministry of Defense of Finland, presented the OSCE Acquis in Arms control and main instruments in OSCE framework (ANNEX E).** They are intended to increase openness, predictability and transparency between the participating states. It is thus obligatory to give information on an annual basis regarding the defense policy and military doctrine, the strength of the forces and their equipment, and the forthcoming exercises if involving 9,000 troops or more, and to receive inspection and evaluation teams from other participants in order to verify the information. At the same time each participating state has the right to receive the corresponding information from the other states and to carry out the mentioned visits.

7. An important part of the OSCE's acquis on CBMs and PD is enshrined in the Vienna Document of 1999. Other instruments of the OSCE include the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE treaty) which focuses on the reduction of heavy armaments in Europe and which has successfully reduced the amount of weapons in Europe, and the Open-Skies Treaty, which allows aerial observation over the territory of another state, including the taking of photographs. The OSCE has also adopted the Principles Governing Non-Proliferation, a Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons, a Document on Stockpile of Conventional Ammunition, and a Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security - the latter was adopted in 1994 to regulate parliamentary control over armed forces and human rights issues within armed forces.

8. **The discussion following the presentation of Mr. Olin** addressed the achievements of the OSCE in general, the level of compliance with the obligations under the OSCE information exchange mechanisms (despite the absence of a binding compliance mechanism, the level of states response is generally good, e.g. 45 or 50 out of 56 states regularly replied) and the analysis of the information provided (all information was compiled and evaluated). The debate further touched the driving force for the changes in the organisation (both the changes of the security environment as well as the broad security concept and a positive vision of the future of the organization had changed the focus and the structure of the C/OSCE), the current problems with the CFE treaty, and the position of the EU in the OSCE (Member States were free to express their positions but there was a mechanism for EU coordination within the OSCE - *the issue of EU-OSCE cooperation was addressed in a later session*).

9. **Mr. Anton Martynyuk, CSBM Officer of the OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC) presented the general mechanisms of the implementation, evaluation and the enhancement of OSCE agreements (ANNEX F).** The presentation covered the three security dimensions of the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 (the politico-military dimension, the economic, science & technology and environmental dimension as well as the Human dimension), the OSCE's institutional evolution, its preventive diplomacy and conflict prevention functions, the work of the Forum for Security Cooperation (FSC), the role of field missions and the concrete projects that address amongst other issues cross-border trafficking, and the control and the destruction of Small Arms and Light Weapons as well as Conventional Ammunition.

10. Milestones of the development of the OSCE were the holding of regular political dialogue meetings on all issues of concern (including weekly meetings of permanent representatives in Vienna, and almost daily staff-level exchanges) and the establishment of permanent structures, ready to support or initiate responses to current challenges, starting from the Conflict Prevention Center (CPC) set up by the Paris Summit in 1990, the creation of Forum for Security Cooperation (FSC) at the Helsinki Summit in 1992, the establishment of the CSCE Secretariat within the CPC during the Rome Ministerial Council in 1992, and the creation of the FSC Support Unit within the CPC in 1995. In addressing the different phases of conflict, the OSCE's primary tools include early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management, and post conflict rehabilitation, with crisis management being the most difficult task. A situation centre reports to the Chairman-in-Office on potential crisis situations which allows identifying and addressing the crisis at an early stage.

11. **During the discussion following the presentation of Mr. Martynyuk**, participants sought more information on the OSCE's annual budget (€164 mio, 80% of which funds the field operations; additional contributions were provided based on projects or field operations), the size of the Secretariat which had expanded considerably over the years (from approximately twenty staff to over three hundred personnel in the Secretariat, and a few thousand temporary - often seconded - staff in field operations), staff recruitment, the coordination of activities between NATO, EU and the UN, and the evaluation of the achievements, especially taking into account the resources used in making these achievements.

12. **Colonel Hetzke of the Verification Centre of the Federal Armed Forces of Germany presented the experiences of an OSCE participating country with the implementation of the Vienna Document 1999 (ANNEX G).** He presented that the obligation of the participating countries to an annual exchange on military information led to the sharing of detailed data relating to the major weapon and equipment systems and noted that as much as 65,000 pieces of heavy weaponry were destroyed so far. Participants were also obliged to exchange information on defence planning, including defence expenditure, which would be evaluated and could be verified upon request, and to notify or to allow observation of military activities as of 9,000 or 13,000 troops respectively. Colonel Hetzke gave examples for concrete verification activities which would be notified to the receiving country 36 hours to 5 days prior to arrival and which normally could not be refused. Such visits would be carried out by a team of up to 4 inspectors and auxiliary personnel, last up to 48 hours in the specified area and were composed of a briefing, inspection on the ground and from the air. Germany was very active in carrying out such verifications and made additional inspections on top of the obligatory ones. Finally he explained that all information received and the results of verification activities were reviewed at a designated annual implementation assessment meeting.

## Session 2: Confidence Building Measures and Preventive Diplomacy in Asia

**13. Mr. Pratap Parameswaran, the Head of the ARF Unit of the ASEAN Secretariat gave an overview of the development of preventive diplomacy in ARF (ANNEX H).** He recalled that an ARF concept paper of 1995 had argued that “over time ARF must develop its own mechanism to carry out PD and conflict resolution” and had introduced the concept of a gradual approach for the ARF to move there, through three phases – (1) promotion of confidence building measures, (2) development of preventive diplomacy and (3) ultimately conflict resolution. At the time, it was suggested to develop guidelines for the peaceful settlement of disputes, to explore the use of ARF Special Representatives, fact-finding missions and good offices at the request of parties involved and to create a regional risk reduction centre. A seminar on November 1996 in Paris proposed an Annual Security Outlook which was agreed in 1999 and the 1<sup>st</sup> volume issued in 2000. An ARF concept on PD was endorsed in 2001 and contained a definition of PD for the purpose of the ARF, noted key principles and possible measures of PD. The stocktaking of the ARF process in 2002 had concluded with 9 recommendations, most of them being implemented. Yet, the scope remained for the ARF to improve its working methods, including communication in between meetings, to be more active in developing common procedures for collective response to threats facing the region and to improve compilation of best practices in various areas of cooperation. Moreover, the ARF could improve to translate commitment into action, for which it partly needed to be given more resources.

**14. Mr. Wong Chow Ming, Deputy-Director at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Singapore presented preliminary ideas for the future development of ARF which he characterized as “forum in transition” (ANNEX I).** He recalled that the formal decision to move into preventive diplomacy was quite recent, was taken only in 2005, and that it coincided with the more concrete cooperation such as the holding of table top exercises and the adoption of guidelines, such as on disaster relief cooperation in 2007. As these important steps were, however, not sufficient to reach veritable preventive diplomacy, the current general review of the ARF would take stock of past achievements and sketch out the ARF's future direction. These reflections needed to take into account changes in the external security environment (challenges and other regional processes) and internal developments, including the expansion of the ARF and the divergent interests. He informed that Singapore would table a revised paper to the upcoming ISG meeting in Ottawa (2-4 April) in which it would put forward at least the following proposals: 1) clarify role of ASEAN and non-ASEAN participants; 2) focus the ARF's activities on key areas; 3) enhance concrete, practical cooperation; 4) streamline decision-making; 5) strengthen ARF Chair, possibly through including the ASEAN Secretary-General as ex officio member of the Friends of the Chair mechanism, and strengthen the ARF Unit; 6) maintain “flexible moratorium” on membership; and 7) enhance cooperation with Track II and external organizations. The results of the PD study would be taken into account once available.

**15. During the discussion following presentations by Mr. Parameswaran and Mr. Wong Chow Ming** participants suggested that the ARF had been undergoing steady development and needed to continue to move forward. The debate touched the development of an ARF mission statement, practical steps to enhance the role of the ARF Chair, the proposed establishment of further yearly inter-sessional meetings (ISMs), for example on maritime security and non-proliferation and disarmament, and the improvement of working methods in line with the proposals tabled in 2007. The Meeting took note of the comment by the DPRK on the positive developments in the inter-Korean relations and the DPRK-United States relations. The ASEAN Secretariat updated the Meeting on the progress of the ARF Study on Preventive Diplomacy. Finally, Singapore appealed to ARF participants to submit further comments on the draft ARF Review paper as quickly as possible.

**16. Dr. Ralph Cossa of the Pacific Forum (CSIS) presented an overview of the work of the CSCAP study group on PD (ANNEX J).** He observed that preventive diplomacy was neither the first nor should it be the last resort and suggested that the ARF should not prolong the discussion on the concept of preventive diplomacy but get started with its implementation and make sure that someone drives the ARF's evolution. In view of the evolving security environment, he recommended that the ARF also look at inner-state situations, based on the agreement of all parties involved, hence not to generally exclude inner-state situations. Closer cooperation on non-traditional security issues provided for a good starting point, but it should not serve to avoid tackling the really important traditional security issues which remained in the Asia-Pacific region.

**17. Dr. Cossa further shared some insights from the comparative PD study that had found that all parties needed to be committed to PD, that failure was never final, and that successful conflict prevention, management and resolution needed constant follow-up if success should be sustainable.** More developed institutions had some type of early-warning mechanism in order to allow them to be pro-active rather than reactive. The more institutionalized an organisation is, including structured and dedicated instruments, the more successful it is to implement PD. Translating the findings into recommendations for the ARF, he suggested adoption of the near term (2008-2009), mid

term (2010-2012), and long term (2015-beyond) measures. The first category could include working on a vision statement, also defining the role of the ARF, standardizing the Annual Security Outlook, using the EEPs and the ARF unit to collect early-warning information and conducting some capacity-building to enable the players to actually play the PD role. At a later stage the establishment of a regional risk reduction centre and the adoption of a statement of principles obliging participants to use these mechanisms in the event of potential conflict could be envisaged.

**18.** Further to Dr. Cossa's presentation, **Dr. Kwa Chong Guan** highlighted that ARF is well equipped with tools in implementing preventive diplomacy and yet needed to start utilizing these tools. It would be useful to develop a positive vision for the future of the ARF.

**19.** **Dr. C.P.F. Luhulima of the Centre for Strategic and International Studies of Indonesia presented experiences of ASEAN with CBMs and PD (ANNEX K1 and ANNEX K2).** He recalled the three principles of sovereign equality, territorial integrity and non-interference in the internal affairs that had guided ASEAN's work since its early years and were stipulated in the 1976 Treaty of Amity and Cooperation (TAC). As these principles were also translated to the ASEAN Regional Forum, the ARF's concept of preventive diplomacy was different from that of former UNSG Kofi Annan. Dr. Luhulima noted that given the concern with non-interference, the ARF would probably not develop in the same way as other regional entities. Nonetheless, the development of the ARF would benefit from the completion of the ASEAN Security Community which, though weaker than the creation of an ASEAN common market, was part of the ASEAN Vision 2015 and enhanced by the recently adopted ASEAN Charter. Dr. Luhulima also elaborated that there has been a paradigm shift in South East Asian thinking, largely due to the financial crisis end of the 1990s and the advancement of technology. Nowadays, ASEAN states needed to strike a balance between sovereignty and human rights.

**20.** **During the discussion of the presentations of Dr. Cossa and Dr. Luhulima** it was suggested by a participant that the ASEAN Charter should be regarded as a work in progress rather than as a final product. Some participants added to the debate that ASEAN also needed to be in the position to deal with external consequences of internal problems, such as refugee flows.

### **Session 3: Strengthening Dialogue and Cooperation between Regional Organizations in Asia and Europe**

**21.** **Manasvi Srisodapol, Deputy Director-General in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Thailand presented a summary of current proposals for future cooperation between the ARF and other regional organisations, as well as further ideas for an enhancement of PD in the ARF (ANNEX L).** Recalling the presently enhanced role of ASEAN as a regional organisation and the absence of inter-state conflict since ASEAN's foundation in 1967, he underlined the merits of consultation. Effectively, in the ASEAN region, the paradigm of competition had been replaced by the paradigm of cooperation and dialogue. The shared commitment and collective responsibility to enhance regional peace, security and prosperity in the region could be applied to develop the ASEAN security community which in turn could serve to inspire the future development of PD in the ARF. Proposals for further examination were the creation of an "ASEAN hotline full circuit", the enhancement of the role of the ASEAN Troika and more use of ASEAN members' individual good offices to other members.

**22.** The ARF could continue to offer good offices, for instance offer meetings of Six-Party-Talk Ministers in the margins of the ARF, and improve the sharing of experience on specific issues such as disaster relief, peace-keeping and maritime security through the ARF Unit at ASEAN Secretariat. Future cooperation with the OSCE could comprise an MoU between ASEAN and OSCE Secretariats, training courses at the OSCE for the ARF Unit, joint workshops and meetings, meetings between CSCAP and OSCE track II, meeting of the ARF chair with the OSCE chair and sharing of experience on early-warning and risk reduction centre and on standardized reporting (ASO).

**23.** **Dr. Oleksandr Pavlyuk, Head of External Cooperation in the OSCE Secretariat (ANNEX M)** recalled how the OSCE had strengthened its outreach to other regional organisations of a very different kind. It was now cooperating in different forms with ASEAN, the AU, the Arab League, the OIC, and the SCO through a variety of activities, including briefing on its working methods and sharing of its best practice (it had recently translated into Arabic a best practice manual on SALW). The OSCE would be prepared to continue to participate in ARF meetings, to receive visitors and also be in the position to enhance cooperation further, for examples through establishing contacts and exchange of experience in substantive fields. He recommended starting with low-key practical cooperation and exchanges, as to avoid the need to formalize the relationship which could prove time-consuming in view of the fact that both the ARF and the OSCE were consensus-based organisations.

**24.** **Gilbert Dubois, Head of Unit for OSCE and Council of Europe of the European Commission's Directorate-General for External Relations presented experiences from the cooperation of the EU with the**

**OSCE (ANNEX N).** Underling the general EU support to multilateralism and regional cooperation, the EU considered the OSCE as a highly valuable organisation. Mr Dubois then presented the extensive cooperation of the EU with OSCE for instance in concrete projects (for example in Central Asia EU operations on border management act in harmony with related projects of the OSCE) and in field missions. The EU participates in the OSCE as a special observer, represented by the current EU Presidency and the European Commission (2 seats), and there have been much political- and working-level interaction.

**25.** During the discussion following presentations of session 3 it was underlined that enhancing dialogue between ARF and OSCE could be beneficial for both organisations. Possible fields of cooperation could encompass information sharing on CBMs and PD, regular contacts between the Chairs and Secretariats, joint workshops and meetings and invitations to participate in meetings.

### General and Closing Debate

**26.** In the closing debate, the meeting agreed that the OSCE experience, in particular the presentations on the implementation of transparency-related CBMs, norm setting, structured reporting and verification activities, provided considerable lessons for the future development of the ARF. The Meeting saw merit in exploring the suggestion that the usefulness of the ARF Annual Security Outlook could be enhanced by a more standardized and structured reporting format. ARF Defence Officials as well as track II Organisations like CSCAP could be invited to help identify which additional data ARF participants could usefully share. The OSCE's practice to gather reports through questionnaires in order to ensure the uniformed response could be analyzed further. The OSCE offered to provide samples of questionnaires and responses.

**27.** The meeting saw merits in establishing an open-ended informal working group on the strengthening of the ARF, including through enhanced cooperation with the OSCE which could develop some of the above idea further and explore ways and means to increase relationship between OSCE and ARF.

**28.** Further steps in the enhancement of CBMs and PD in the ARF might require the following steps put forward as proposals during the debate:

- the strengthening of the ARF Unit,
- the improvement of the communication between ARF participants (possibly through the creation of a communication network),
- the introduction of information exchange mechanisms on traditional security issues such as military information, structures and doctrine which might later be expanded to mutual invitation to military exercises and facilities,
- the enhanced cooperation on non-traditional security issues (for example selected health issues, haze or yellow dust) including the establishment of information exchange systems,
- the creation of a crisis room or some other form of early-warning mechanism,
- intensified cooperation with other regional organisations such as the OSCE,
- increased cooperation with track-II organisations.

### Closing Remarks

**29.** In the closing remarks, Ambassador Gröning (**ANNEX O**) stressed that the development of a common security understanding amongst ARF participants would be crucial and pointed to the need for political will to develop the ARF into a more structured cooperation i.e. institution. He closed the meeting with the assurance that the EU, including Germany, would be strongly committed to an active participation in the ARF.

**30.** Meanwhile, Mr. Ibnu Hadi in his closing remark (**ANNEX P**) underscored that CBMs & PD are important in promoting an advance mutual framework among countries. In this regard, OSCE and ARF have had a dynamic and fruitful exchange of best practices in CBMs & PD to promote peace and security. He underlined that everyone should be part of the implementation and also need to become leading actors in promoting CBMs & PD in Europe and Asia-Pacific.

**31.** The Meeting expressed gratitude to the EU and Indonesian Co-Chairs for effective co-chairmanship and to the Government of Germany for the generous hospitality and excellent arrangement in hosting the workshop.