

**CO-CHAIRS' SUMMARY REPORT**

**THE ARF HIGH LEVEL WORKSHOP ON  
CONFIDENCE BUILDING MEASURES AND PREVENTIVE DIPLOMACY  
IN ASIA AND EUROPE**

**BERLIN, 27-29 NOVEMBER 2011**

**Introduction**

1. The ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) High-Level Workshop on Confidence Building Measures and Preventive Diplomacy was held in Berlin, Germany, from 27 to 29 November 2011. The workshop was co-hosted by the Federal Republic of Germany on behalf of the European Union (EU), and by the Republic of Indonesia as the current ARF Chair.

2. The Workshop was attended by all ARF participants except Brunei Darussalam. The Deputy ASEAN Secretary General for Political and Security Community, representatives from the Organisation for Security Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the Lithuanian OSCE chairmanship, as well as expert speakers from the Pacific Forum Centre for Strategic and International Studies, Honolulu, from the Peace Research Institute Frankfurt (PRIF) and the Centre for OSCE Research (CORE)/ Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg (IFSH) were also in attendance to the workshop. The programme of the meeting is attached as **Annex A**, the Annotated Agenda as **Annex B**, and the List of Participants as **Annex C**.

**Opening Ceremony**

3. The Workshop was officially opened by State Secretary of the Federal Foreign Office of Germany Emily Haber; Ambassador Nadjib Riphath Kesoema, Deputy Coordinating Minister for Political, Legal and Security Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia; and Mr. Alistair MacDonald, Senior Official for ARF, European External Action Service (EEAS). Opening remark texts are attached in **Annexes D, E, and F**.

4. In her speech, **State Secretary Emily Haber** underlined the importance that Germany and the EU place on greater cooperation with ASEAN and the ARF, especially with regard to the changing international strategic environment. While many of the biggest strategic global trends were occurring in Asia, Europe remained a key player and of closer geopolitical proximity to Asia than many observers might think. Trade and investment, for example, remains a key pillar of engagement. The future of the EU's Asian relationship importantly includes cooperation in addressing and solving together global threats and problems, both traditional and non-traditional. In this vein, Ms. Haber underlined the EU's interest in joining the East Asia Summit as soon as possible. State Secretary Haber underscored transparency, as well as sharing experiences, as key elements for confidence building and conflict resolution in both Asia and Europe.

5. Sharing the same vein of future challenges, **Ambassador Nadjib Riphat Kesoema** outlined the position of ASEAN after the latest ASEAN Summit in Bali and put forward the role of ASEAN as driving force of the region, including within the context of ARF. Given the new non-conventional threats that require new approaches, based on respect for diversity and differences, Ambassador Kesoema highlighted the importance of establishing a good climate for transparency, dialogue and cooperation.

6. **Mr. Alistair MacDonald**, welcoming participants on behalf of the EU, underlined the importance of strengthened inter-regional dialogue on security issues, particularly in relation to Confidence Building Measures (CBMs) and Preventive Diplomacy (PD). He stated that both ASEAN and Europe have undergone institutional transformation within the last four years, with the adoption of the ASEAN Charter and the Lisbon Treaty. It will be important for ASEAN and for the EU to have the will to use these new institutional capabilities, and share our experiences in these areas, to better address both old and new security challenges through strengthened CBMs and PD. The ARF, in strengthening its capacity and exploring dialogue with the OSCE, will be able to build on the strong foundations already laid.

7. In his keynote speech (**Annex G**), **H.E. Ambassador Rolf Nickel, Commissioner for Disarmament and Arms Control in the German Federal Foreign Office** emphasized that dialogue and cooperation remained key pillars for peace and stability and that both Europe and Asia faced similar threats and often employ similar instruments to address them. However, he also noted key differences, including the OSCE's more institutional approach. Ambassador Nickel outlined Germany's perspective on current challenges in conflict prevention, disarmament and arms control, including worrying developments in Iran, Syria and North Korea, as well as small arms and cyber security. He concluded expressing his hope to find some common answers on how to further strengthen dialogue and co-operation between Europe and the Asia-Pacific.

8. **H.E. Djauhari Oratmangun, Director General for ASEAN Cooperation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia**, echoed in his keynote speech (**Annex H**) the need for sharing information and best practices and noted that the ARF has become an important element promoting the development of PD in Asia. Furthermore, he noted that as a process and an inclusive forum that aims to enhance regional peace and security, the ARF through this Workshop, will continue to build confidence and trust as well as to encourage cooperative norms of behaviour in the region. He highlighted the ARF's evolutionary approach in which it has in the past year transitioned from its initial focus on CBMs to develop a PD Work Plan taking advantage of the synergy that comes from track I and track II activities. Lastly, H.E. Oratmangun underlined the ASEAN principles of consensus and the belief that only with full member participation can the ARF succeed in its efforts in the CBM and PD areas.

#### **Session 1: Confidence Building Measures (CBMs) and Preventive Diplomacy (PD) in Asia and Europe: Development and Specific Experiences**

9. **The Political Director in the Ministry of the Foreign Affairs of Lithuania, Mr. Vytautas Leškevičius**, representing Lithuania as current chair of the OSCE,

delivered a presentation (**Annex I**) on the development of the OSCE-Acquis especially on Arms Control Agreements, CBMs and PD. He explained that since the beginning, the OSCE has taken a broad and comprehensive approach to security that has encompassed three complementary and equally important dimensions ó political-military, economic and human. Mr. Le-kevi ius noted that the OSCE has a particular responsibility for confidence and security building measures, arms control, conflict prevention and peaceful resolution of disputes among the OSCE participating states. He highlighted three central arms control regimes that constitute the basis of collective security efforts to ensure stability and build confidence: the Vienna Document 1999, the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, and the Open Skies Treaty. Conventional arms control and CSBMs remain major instruments in the OSCE toolbox for ensuring military stability, predictability and transparency.

As the challenge today is to identify and address security risks in order that they do not become security threats, preventive diplomacy is one tool to deal with it, according to Mr. Le-kevi ius, i.e. to prevent rather than manage an unstable situation, and avoid that simmering tensions turn into military confrontation.

10. The representative from **Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Indonesia, Mr. M.I. Derry Aman**, explained the development and future cooperation of CBMs and PD in the ARF. He underlined that since its development in 1994, ARF has laid a strong foundation for its participants' cooperation and relationship in the political and security area. The CBMs that have been established in a first stage will be continued as the basis for the next stage of preventive diplomacy. Challenges ahead for the ARF cooperation in PD are: to keep pursuing synergy with other ASEAN-led mechanisms/arrangements, enhance cooperation with similar forums from other regions and promote consistency with similar efforts at the global level. These approaches will help ARF to fulfill its role in preserving peace and security in the region. The presentation is attached as **Annex J**.

11. **Ambassador Adam Kobieracki, Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre within the OSCE-Secretariat**, presented the OSCE perspective on the history and future of CBMs and PD, with a special focus on non-military CBMs and on Central Asia and South Caucasus. He noted that non-military CBMs can be useful in different stages of conflict (e.g., conflict prevention, conflict resolution and post-conflict rehabilitation) and come in various guises. In light of this, Ambassador Kobieracki argued that the OSCE has gained considerable experience and learned quite a few lessons over the years, including that CBMs by their nature will not resolve a conflict, confidence is best built by combining several CBMs reaching out to different layers in society in an incremental, cumulative process, that CBMs rarely succeed when they are imposed on the parties from outside, and that confidence building is a long term process. Furthermore, he concluded by stating that while many of the CBMs developed in the earlier years were more focused on hard security and geared towards inter-state relations, and reducing the potential outbreak of military confrontation in particular, non-military CBMs are increasingly seen as providing an essential additional bridge to sustainable peace - especially, but not exclusively, in intra-state crises. The presentation appears as **Annex K**.

12. **CSCAP representative Mr. Carl Baker (Pacific Forum Centre for Strategic and International Studies, Honolulu)** provided an overview of the results

of the CSCAP study group on Preventive Diplomacy and the future of ARF. The study examined the dynamics of the movement from confidence-building to PD and offered a set of recommendations for realizing this transition. The study group identified opportunities to create momentum for increased PD activity around three principal areas: the establishment of a normative framework and operational principles, the development of specific PD mechanisms, and capacity building and institutionalization of a PD role. Mr. Baker concluded by reviewing the study's set of time-phased recommendations for advancing the implementation of a successful PD program within the ARF, which included the importance of articulating a vision statement, the application of PD mechanisms within states when parties consent, and the creation of institutional capacity in monitoring and early warning. The presentation is attached as **Annex L**.

13. **Colonel Gerhard Faustmann from the Verification Centre of the Federal Armed Forces of Germany** presented the practical experiences of an OSCE participating country with the implementation of the Vienna Document 1999. He explained the philosophy of confidence building in Europe that developed from a climate of secrecy and a lack of transparency that created mistrust and led to serious miscalculations regarding strengths, capabilities and intentions of the potential adversaries, causing apparently hostile overreactions, e.g. an exaggerated arms build-up. This in turn engendered hostile reactions by the other side. Thus since the Cold War, the aim of the development of CBMs has been to interrupt this vicious circle by a "cooperative security approach". The remedy used here is confidence building by means of a maximum degree of openness and transparency. This keeps the security partners from miscalculations, misperceptions and wrong reactions, thus preventing arms races and the development of crises. The presentation appears as **Annex M**.

14. In the discussions, participants stressed that the sharing of information and best practices between the ARF, the EU, and the OSCE will provide a strong foundation permitting a more rapid and more confident progression to the stage of preventive diplomacy.

## **Session 2: Confidence Building Measures and Preventive Diplomacy in Asia and Europe: New Threats**

15. **Dr. Detlev Wolter from the German Federal Foreign Ministry** delivered his presentation on the development of CBMs and norms of state behaviour for global cyber security. He argued that the new, transformational cyber-space threats need to be tackled by regional organizations and fora such as the OSCE and ARF and represent a ripe area for further cooperation. He pointed out that in addition to the new threat of cyber-space crime and terrorism, the risk of state-sponsored cyber attacks has gained relevance as a matter of international security. These trends also call for measures of preventive diplomacy and international confidence-building. He cautioned that the various aspects of cyber attacks make defence a major challenge. For instance, due to its asymmetrical nature, deterrence against cyber attacks through retaliation is hardly feasible. Dr. Wolter argued that greater state responsibility and involvement was needed to address the challenge. A framework for admissible state conduct in cyberspace requires international rules, norms and principles as well as practicable CBMs to mitigate the risk of misperception and escalation. The presentation is attached as **Annex N**.

16. The presentation by **Colonel (General Staff) Christian Duhr, from the German Ministry of Defence** highlighted the need for renewing international efforts to prevent the illegal spread and misuse of Man Portable Air Defence Systems (MANPADS). He underlined that MANPADS have emerged as a threat to civilian as well as military aircraft. As hijacking becomes more difficult, other forms of attack become more attractive to terrorist groups. Best practices for the control of MANPADS have been agreed and there is ongoing action at the global, regional and bilateral level, which is primarily based on the United Nations' Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. Colonel Duhr closed by stating that the challenge now is implementation as it is a common international obligation to prevent terrorists and unlawful non-state actors from acquiring MANPADS to target civilian aircraft. This presentation is attached as **Annex O**.

17. **Dr. Hans-Joachim Schmidt, from Peace Research Institute Frankfurt (PRIF)** presented the nature of threats to maritime security and potential CBMs in the maritime arena. He underscored that in Asia, maritime CBMs can become an important element to regulate the strategic competition between major powers in a cooperative and more peaceful way, reduce tensions and contribute to the prevention of military hostilities in the region. In Europe, new maritime CBMs could usefully be a part of the future conventional arms control regime or a modernized Vienna Document. Furthermore, maritime CBMs can contribute to a peaceful solution of unregulated territorial claims. Dr. Schmidt's presentation is attached as **Annex P**.

18. **Mr. Jai S. Sohan, Director General ASEAN, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Singapore** provided a presentation on prevention and confidence-building with regard to emerging threats in the ARF. He commenced with a broad overview of the ARF's PD concept and Working Plan. Looking at the field of humanitarian assistance and disaster relief (HADR), he noted that large scale disasters are a real threat in the region. He then used the example of relief efforts after Cyclone Nargis in 2008 to highlight possible approaches to flesh out the PD Work Plan. This relief effort provided an example of an effective multi-tiered response that advanced ASEAN capabilities and cooperation not only in the HADR arena but beyond. The key take-away from this effort was the importance of retaining trust and confidence of all parties. Lastly, Mr. Sohan noted that as the ARF PD Work Plan is implemented, lessons learned from Cyclone Nargis would continue to be important and that ARF would seek to continue to form institutions and norms that generate trust and cooperation. Ambassador Sohan's presentation is attached as **Annex Q**.

19. On the issue of cyber-security the representative from Vietnam noted that together with the United States they will co-host a seminar on cyber-security in the first quarter of 2012. The representative from India mentioned that CSCAP has been tasked with presenting a study on cyber security in Asia.

20. China, Russia, the United States, Bangladesh and Vietnam commented on maritime CBMs. The representative of China noted for example that maritime security has become one of the priority areas in ARF with the adoption of the maritime security Work Plan, and referred to a number of CBMs already established with ASEAN member states including the Declaration on Conduct and its

Implementing Guidelines, as well as China's consistent willingness to work towards the eventual adoption on the basis of consensus of a Code of Conduct. All speakers underlined the importance of this issue to be regularly discussed in order to find best ways to reach a common understanding between states in the maritime issues to promote stability and peace in the region. All efforts have to be made in line with international law.

21. This discussion continued on the second day of the Workshop, with a brief presentation from the Philippines on its engagements within ARF as well as its views on territorial disputes in the South China Sea. The Philippines reiterated its proposal for a Zone of Peace, Freedom, Friendship, and Cooperation in the South China Sea as a possible way to promote a resolution to these disputes. The representative from China reiterated his government's commitment to resolving the issue peacefully through direct negotiation with the parties in accordance with international law.

### **Session 3: Strengthening Dialogue and Co-Operation Between Regional Organisations in Asia and Europe**

22. **Mr. Sayakane Sisouvong, Deputy Secretary General of ASEAN for ASEAN Political-Security Community**, provided a presentation on current and future cooperation between the ARF and other regional organisations. Stating that ARF had allowed the Asia Pacific region to foster a habit of constructive dialogue on security issues of common concern, Mr. Sisouvong reviewed the milestones in the ARF's preventive diplomacy efforts and its guiding principles – including reliance on timely, non-coercive, voluntary, and peaceful methods. Among the key challenges facing ARF's PD efforts, he listed the diverse interests of its members, limited resources, the continued lack of a mandate and guidelines for PD operational arms. ARF plans to address these challenges to ease regional tensions and fully implement its PD vision. Mr. Sisouvong welcomed greater cooperation and information sharing between ARF and other regional organisations, including the OSCE. His presentation is attached as **Annex R**.

23. **Ambassador Esko Hamilo, Under Secretary of State in the Finnish Foreign Ministry and EU Eminent and Expert Person within the ARF context**, provided a presentation on the EU's role within the ARF, including future fields of cooperation. It was the EU (and not its member states) which was a member of the ARF and the ARF can thus be a testing ground for joint European security policy. He argued that the European Union is a central international actor, shares the important vision of constructing regional structures as cornerstones of a system of global governance, and aims to strengthen its engagement with the ARF. He noted that the EU itself can be considered a CBM, is attempting to strengthen solidarity between member states through new articles and clauses, and is evolving to address new threats – both traditional and non traditional. The EU's Aceh Mission is an example of EU's capabilities and interest in working with ASEAN countries, but EU Reports on Conflict Prevention as well as analysis and policy can help inform ARF's efforts in CBMs and PD. Ownership and political will be key in the success of the ARF's PD efforts. This presentation is attached as **Annex S**. Singapore thanked Ambassador Hamilo for his presentation and said that ASEAN appreciated the hard work and effort that the EU had put in with regard to the ARF. Furthermore, the EU's

significant contributions would strengthen the ARF. However, it was also noted that EU's High Representative had not attended the past two ARF Meetings in 2010 and 2011 and therefore appeared to be a disconnect between what the EU was doing at the staff level and its signals at the political level.

24. **Dr. Oleksandr Pavlyuk, Senior Policy and Planning Advisor in the Office of the OSCE Secretary General**, gave an overview of the OSCE and its regional cooperation. He noted that the previous ARF high-level workshop on this topic in 2008, also co-chaired by Germany and Indonesia, had led to closer relations between the OSCE and ARF, including the sharing of OSCE documents and best practices. He argued that this workshop additionally provides an opportunity to renew contacts and take stock and welcomed continued deepening of cooperation with the ARF. The OSCE has recognized that security within its area of responsibility is inextricably linked to adjacent areas and that cooperation with these other regions is crucial. Dr. Pavlyuk noted that the upcoming OSCE ministerial in Vilnius will bless further cooperation with other regional organisations. He also noted that the engagement with these other organisations has provided a mutually beneficial learning experience. Dr. Pavlyuk noted several meetings and briefings between OSCE and the ARF in the past few years. These engagements have revealed several common points of interest, including PD, CBMs, and countering transnational threats. Dr. Pavlyuk concluded with three points about future OSCE-ARF interactions: that better mutual knowledge is a pre requisite for closer cooperation, that there remains a need for continuity and follow up in these exchanges, and that it is essential to examine potential practical areas of cooperation. His presentation is at **Annex T**.

25. **Dr. Wolfgang Zellner of the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy (IFSH)** provided a presentation on exploring new fields of cooperation between the ARF and OSCE. He opened his presentation by citing similarities and overlapping memberships between the two organisations. He went on to explore new areas of cooperation between ARF and OSCE that go beyond the traditional area of CBMs, including inviting the ARF to attend meetings by the OSCE Forum for Security Cooperation and meetings reviewing implementation of CBMs as well as joint seminars and personnel exchanges. He reviewed established OSCE instruments for preventive diplomacy, such as its field operations and the High Commissioner on National Minorities, formalized policy approaches in the areas of transnational threats and challenges like counterterrorism and border management, as well as election observation missions. Dr. Zellner suggested that the lessons learned in these areas could be of benefit to ARF as it begins to implement its PD Work Plan and as it plans a potential elections monitoring mission to East Timor in 2012. Lastly, he highlighted that the OSCE's development of regular calendar events can provide useful lessons for the ARF, while the ARF's robust track II dimension can inform the OSCE, which is just beginning to expand a support network of academic institutions. This presentation is attached as **Annex U**.

### **Closing Debate**

26. The closing discussion centred on possible future areas of cooperation. Mr. Carl Baker suggested that both the OSCE and ARF need to be careful not to talk past each other given the disparate levels of organisational maturity between the OSCE and the ARF. He suggested that ARF's Inter Sessional Meetings (ISM) and defense

officials meetings could provide a useful forum for outside engagement. The representative from the Russian Federation suggested that the group seek to capitalize on the OSCE's and the ARF's comparative advantages. While both continue to face limitations on capacity and enforcement, they have advantages in its consensual approach and OSCE in addition has wide expertise. As a country that is both European and Asian, Russia will continue to act as a bridge between the two and work for a homogenous security space. A brief discussion on the situation in the Korean peninsula including on a call for CBMs followed. The representative from New Zealand proffered three recommendations for future cooperation between the EU, OSCE, and ARF: promoting greater transparency in naval operations in ARF - perhaps emulating the simple approach promoted by the OSCE verification process; information sharing from OSCE after its review of cyber CBMs as a possible new avenue for cooperation between them as well as with the UN; and a discussion of the MANPADS threat in Asia. The representative from the United States suggested that the OSCE could provide the ARF more insights about the steps it took earlier in its history to develop into its current mature state. He welcomed greater EU engagement with Asia and the ARF. Finally, representatives from the Russian Federation, Pakistan, New Zealand, and the USA expressed their appreciation for the useful exchange of views and forward-looking recommendations.

### **Closing Remarks**

27. **Ambassador Ngurah Swajaya, Indonesian Permanent Representative to ASEAN**, in his closing statement stressed the key points from the workshop and welcomed the greater common understanding that the ARF participants gleaned in addressing such emerging security threats as cyber security, small arms, and maritime insecurity. The application of important elements of CBMs and PD - including consultation and consensus - and the broad range of issues discussed in this workshop from regional security to trans-national and non-traditional security challenges will in turn enable the ARF to continue to serve as the driving force in maintaining regional peace and stability. He also underlined the need for the EU to maintain its strong political commitment to ASEAN and to continue strengthening the engagement between the EU's and ASEAN's political leaders. Ambassador Swajaya's closing remarks are attached as **Annex V**.

28. **Ambassador Christoph Eichhorn, Deputy Commissioner for Disarmament and Arms Control in the Federal German Government**, began his closing remarks by thanking the speakers, the co-chair team and all participants for a fruitful cooperation and discussion. He noted the OSCE's success in promoting peace and stability in Europe and its ongoing work in the area of PD but also celebrated the ARF's establishment of efficient mechanisms and institutions that promote peace in Asia. For both organisations, CBMs and PD are key focus areas. Given their respective efforts, it is incumbent that both sides work together to find common understanding of new threats and challenges. However, neither side provides a prescription for how to deal with threats in the other's region but rather a source of inspiration. Ambassador Eichhorn concluded that, approaches aside, both sides needed to address the new and growing threats posed by cyber attacks, MANPADs, small arms, and maritime security.

He highlighted **the workshop's following main recommendations:**

- Contacts between the ARF Unit in the ASEAN Secretariat in Jakarta with the OSCE Secretariat in Vienna should intensify. Mutual visits of representatives of the ARF unit and the OSCE secretariat and the Conflict Prevention Centre in Vienna, if possible linked to a visit to EU institutions, should be envisaged in 2012. Further initiatives to strengthen the cooperation between the ARF and OSCE in the future should be considered.
- A deepening of political contacts between the respective ARF chairmanships and the OSCE chairmanship and the Secretary General would be beneficial to both organizations. The ARF Unit undertakes to raise this point with the incoming Cambodian ARF chairmanship. The OSCE Secretariat will take this up with the OSCE Secretary General.
- Cross-participation at relevant meetings could ensure a continuous dialogue between ARF and OSCE. OSCE could consider inviting ARF guest speakers to its regular fora.
- OSCE, EU and ARF have identified a wide range of possibilities for further development, including non-proliferation of WMD material, maritime security, nuclear security and safety, cyber security, MANPADS and others. The organizations should strive to identify concrete steps of cooperation in the field of new and non-traditional threats, also in view of capacity building. Both sides should also encourage track II cooperation between academic institutions.
- This could be in the form of projects, workshops and expert visits. For 2012, a co-chaired seminar on stockpile management, export and border controls with particular emphasis on MANPADS could be envisaged. Also, the possibility of an exchange between OSCE and ARF on the development of CSBMs for global cyber security should be explored further, given that the OSCE intends to intensify its work on cyber CSBMs in 2012 and ARF is already working on the issue.
- The EU and the ARF should exchange information on future cooperation in peacekeeping, conflict prevention and conflict resolution. It is crucial that the EU maintains sustained, high-level engagement with the ARF.

Ambassador Eichhorn's closing remarks are attached as **Annex W**.

29. The workshop thanked the Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of Indonesia for the generous hospitality and the excellent arrangements made for the delegates.

30. Following the workshop, participants were offered a thematic visit to the German Centre for International Peace Operations (ZIF). The ZIF presentation is attached as **Annex X**.