



Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

Office of the Secretary General
Section for External Co-operation



Consolidated Summary

Table of contents

1	General information	3
1.1	Venue	3
1.2	Participation	3
1.3	Timetable and organizational modalities	3
1.4	Agenda	4
2	Summary of the opening session	11
3	Reports by session rapporteurs	15
3.1	Session 1: Evolving Threats and their Implications for Security in Europe and Asia	15
3.2	Session 2: Areas of Co-operation: Global efforts and regional complementarity to enhance disaster risk reduction	18
3.3	Side-event: The Northeast Asia Peace and Cooperation Initiative (NAPCI)	21
3.4	Session 3: Visions for Security Co-operation in Asia: Experience-sharing and new co-operation areas	23
4	Summary of the closing session	26
5	List of participants	29

1 General information

1.1 Venue

The Conference was held on 2 and 3 June 2015 at the Crystal Ballroom, Lotte Hotel Seoul.

1.2 Participation^{*)}

1.2.1 Twenty nine OSCE participating States, including Latvia/EU, took part in the Conference.

1.2.2 All the Asian Partners for Co-operation (Afghanistan, Australia, Japan, the Republic of Korea and Thailand) were represented.

1.2.3 One Mediterranean Partner for Co-operation (Israel) was represented.

1.2.4 The OSCE Secretariat was represented.

1.2.5 Six international organizations were represented and two academic institutions. Upon invitation by the host country, the Turkic Council and Malaysia registered their representatives.

1.3 Timetable and organizational modalities

1.3.1 The Conference began with the opening session at 9.15 a.m. on 1 June 2015 and ended at 1.30 p.m. on 2 June 2015.

1.3.2 The Conference was conducted in three thematic sessions.

1.3.3 The opening session was chaired by H.E. Ambassador Song Young-wan, Embassy of the Republic of Korea in Vienna, and the closing session by H.E. Mr. Vuk Žugić, Ambassador, Head of the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Serbia to the OSCE and Chairperson of the OSCE Permanent Council. During the opening session, keynote speeches were delivered by H.E. Mr. Yun Byung-se, Minister for Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea, H.E. Mr. Didier Burkhalter, Head of the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Switzerland, and H.E. General Tanasak Patimapragorn, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, Thailand.

1.3.4 On the margins of the Conference, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea organized a side-event on the Northeast Asia Peace and Cooperation Initiative (NAPCI).

1.3.5 Each session had a moderator and a rapporteur.

1.3.6 The working language was English.

1.3.7 Arrangements were made for press coverage.

1.3.8 The rules of procedure and working methods of the OSCE were applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the Conference.

^{*)} See part 5, list of participants.

1.4 Agenda

Background

The 2015 OSCE Asian Conference focused on the three dimensions of security, with an emphasis on the changing global security environment and multilateral security co-operation.

The Conference provided opportunities for the sharing of views and experiences between OSCE participating States and Asian Partners with a view to identifying avenues for concrete co-operation and exchanges of best practices. The Conference adopted a participatory approach, with limited time devoted to presentations of keynote speakers and with substantive inputs and exchanges from the floor. All participants were encouraged to actively contribute to the discussions.

Sunday, 31 May 2015

7.00–8.30 p.m. **Welcome reception (Athene Garden Room, 2nd floor, Lotte Hotel)**

For Conference participants travelling from overseas, hosted by H.E. Ambassador Song Young-wan, Embassy of the Republic of Korea in Vienna

Monday, 1 June 2015

8.30–9.15 a.m. Registration of participants

9.15–10 a.m. **Opening session (Crystal Ballroom, 2nd floor)**

The goal of the opening session was to set the scene for the subsequent discussions on the main topic of the Conference.

Chairperson: H.E. Mr. **Song** Young-wan, Ambassador, Embassy of the Republic of Korea in Vienna

- H.E. Mr. Vuk **Žugić**, Ambassador, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Serbia to the OSCE and Chairperson of the OSCE Permanent Council
- H.E. Mr. Lamberto **Zannier**, Ambassador, Secretary General of the OSCE

Keynote addresses:

- H.E. Mr. **Yun** Byung-se, Minister for Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea
- H.E. Mr. Didier **Burkhalter**, Head of the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Switzerland
- H.E. General Tanasak **Patimapragorn**, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, Thailand

10–10.30 a.m. Coffee break

10.30 a.m.–1 p.m. **Session 1: Evolving Threats and their Implications for Security in Europe and Asia**

The session focused on:

- Promotion of a comprehensive and coherent response to the phenomenon of foreign terrorist fighters;
- Dialogue among and between regional security-related mechanisms on the efforts to prevent and counter terrorism and violent extremism;
- Enhancing efforts among regional organizations to promote tolerance and non-discrimination.

Although not a new phenomenon, the topic of foreign terrorist fighters (FTFs) gained greater urgency during the months prior to the Conference. The transnational and multi-layered character of this phenomenon makes it vital for States to have at their disposal a comprehensive and coherent response, including strategies, action plans and pertinent legislation especially with regard to preventing the departure of FTFs, bringing them to justice, and returning individuals when they are to be reintegrated.

The Declaration on the OSCE Role in Countering the Phenomenon of Foreign Terrorist Fighters in the Context of the Implementation of UN Security Council Resolutions 2170 (2014) and 2178 (2014) (MC.DOC/5/14) consolidates OSCE commitments related to capacity-building, information-sharing and co-operation among participating States in order to effectively counter the phenomenon of FTFs and invites the OSCE Partners for Co-operation to actively engage with the OSCE participating States in these efforts.

To be effective, countering violent extremism and radicalization that lead to terrorism – or “VERLT” – requires context-specific measures reaching down to the grass-roots level. While there is no “one size fits all” approach, there are important over-arching policy principles and toolboxes valid in all situations that can be shared among countries around the world. These tools should include measures taken for the early detection of conditions conducive to radicalization, ideas about preventive and corrective measures, and rehabilitation and de-radicalization programmes.

The discussions in this session investigated how OSCE participating States and Partners for Co-operation could support and inform each other about specific efforts to counter the threat of FTFs by exchanging good practices, strategies and measures to counter violent extremism and radicalization that lead to terrorism. The session provided an opportunity to identify potential areas for enhanced practical co-operation.

Participants had a chance to find out how local, national and regional experience in preventing and countering terrorism and violent extremism could be more systematically shared among and between regional security-related mechanisms to guide and inspire collective efforts.

Finally, the session offered an important opportunity to look into how regional organizations can contribute to preventing violent extremism and radicalization by promoting tolerance, non-discrimination and respect for diversity. Participants were encouraged to present

successful initiatives and experiences at local, national and regional levels and to put forward suggestions for tools and levers that can be employed to counter intolerant ideologies and promote inclusive and diverse societies.

Moderator: H.E. Mr. **Shin** Dong-ik, Deputy Foreign Minister for Multilateral and Global Affairs, Republic of Korea

Rapporteur: Ms. **Park** Hyo-in, Second Secretary, International Security Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea

Speakers

- H.E. Ms. Takako **Ueta**, Ambassador, Professor, International Christian University, Tokyo, Japan
- Mr. Tom **Wuchte**, Head of the Action against Terrorism Unit, Transnational Threats Department, OSCE Secretariat
- Ms. Kate **Byrnes**, Deputy Permanent Representative, United States Mission to the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Vienna

Discussion

Conclusion and remarks by the moderator

1–3 p.m. **Lunch** hosted by H.E. Mr. Lamberto Zannier, Secretary General of the OSCE (Lotte Hotel, Emerald Room, 3rd floor)

3–5.15 p.m. **Session 2: Areas of Co-operation**

This session focused on:

- Global efforts and regional complementarity to enhance disaster risk reduction
- Best practices in developing confidence-building measures on cyber security

Disasters affect the security of nations and communities. They pose grave risks, also at the trans-boundary level, across the OSCE area. Climate change is expected to lead to more extreme weather events in future, which are likely to increase the frequency and scale of disasters. With its comprehensive security approach, the OSCE has an important role to play in addressing disaster risk reduction issues. Methods and tools of disaster risk reduction (DRR) also provide powerful means for joint action and confidence-building among the different stakeholders and the OSC's participating States and Partners.

The discussions in this session explored how OSCE participating States and Partners for Co-operation can co-operate and exchange knowledge, experience, best practices and lessons learnt in disaster risk reduction. In so doing, it also offered an opportunity to address the theme of “disaster risk reduction” within the overall framework of the 2015 global processes,

including the preparations for the post-2015 Development Agenda and the 21st Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.

Additionally, information and communication technologies (ICTs) have added a complex dimension to inter-State relations, and efforts to address the potential negative impact of ICTs on international peace and security have become a principal international/regional security policy concern. Following the 2010 Report of the UN Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security (A/65/201), which identified confidence-building measures (CBMs) as an important tool to reduce the risks of conflict stemming from the use of ICTs, the OSCE has invested time and effort to develop such measures. The session, therefore, also looked at the respective processes and pertinent best practices with a view to identifying potential ways of enhancing co-operation and dialogue between the two regions as a contribution to promoting a coherent global approach towards disaster risk reduction and cyber stability.

Moderator: H.E. Mr. Bruno **Georges**, Ambassador, Permanent Mission of Belgium to the OSCE

Rapporteur: Ms. Esther Valerie **Osorio**, Attaché, Latvia/EU

Speakers

- H.E. Mr. **Choi** Sung-joo, Ambassador for International Security Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea
- H.E. Mr. Lamberto **Zannier**, Ambassador, Secretary General of the OSCE
- Mr. Kaoru **Saito**, Director of Disaster Preparedness and International Co-operation Division, Disaster Management Bureau, Cabinet Office, Government of Japan
- Mr. Ben **Hiller**, Cyber Security Officer, Transnational Threats Department, OSCE Secretariat

Discussion

Conclusion and remarks by the moderator

5.30 – 7 p.m. **Side-event: Northeast Asia Peace and Cooperation Initiative (NAPCI) (Lotte Hotel, Crystal Ballroom, 2nd floor)**

The side-event focused on:

- The situation in Northeast Asia and the need for a multilateral co-operation mechanism in the region;
- The significance of NAPCI and how it compares with the Helsinki Process;
- The role of middle-size powers (including the Republic of Korea) in encouraging regional powers to participate in multilateral co-operation; and
- The OSCE's experience in implementing CSBMs through multilateral co-operation and ways to strengthen the co-operation between the Republic of Korea and the OSCE with regard to NAPCI.

Background

The Northeast Asia Peace and Cooperation Initiative (NAPCI) is inspired by the OSCE's experience in multilateral security co-operation. Through the Helsinki Process, the OSCE helped to ease the tension between the West and the East during the Cold War period and contributed to the achieving of reconciliation and co-operation in Europe.

Since 2015 marks the 40th anniversary of the Helsinki Process, the Government of the Republic of Korea hopes that the OSCE participating States and Partners for Co-operation will take more interest in its efforts to build a similar mechanism in Northeast Asia. In this light, the Government of the Republic of Korea expects that this side-event will serve as an opportunity to increase knowledge and understanding of NAPCI.

Chair: H.E. Mr. **Kim** Hong-kyun, Deputy Foreign Minister for Political Affairs, Republic of Korea

Rapporteur: Mr. **Kim** Do-hwan, Second Secretary, Policy Planning and Coordination, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea

Speakers

- Mr. **Shin** Beomchul, Director General for Policy Planning, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea
- H.E. Mr. Fred **Tanner**, Ambassador, Senior Adviser to the OSCE Secretary General

Discussion

Conclusions and remarks by the Chair

7.30 p.m. **Welcome dinner** hosted by H.E. Mr. Cho Tae-yul, Vice Foreign Minister, Republic of Korea (Lotte Hotel, Emerald Room, 3rd floor)

Tuesday, 2 June 2015

9–11.30 a.m. **Session 3: Visions for Security Co-operation in Asia: Experience-Sharing and New Co-operation Areas**

This session focused on:

- Relevance of the 1975 Helsinki Final Act and 1990 Paris Charter principles of common co-operative security in Asia
- Strengthening institutional cooperation between existing security mechanisms in Asia and Europe
- Co-operating with new regional initiatives, including the Northeast Asia Peace and Co-operation Initiative

Regional security arrangements are the product of the unique political contexts in which they operate and have to reflect the interests and values of their respective stakeholders. Nevertheless, exchanging experiences of multilateral co-operation in the fields of security and the promotion of the rule of law can serve as an inspiration for security mechanisms in Asia and Europe. As a platform for addressing European security, the OSCE can for its part share its experience in building its practice of security co-operation and developing a comprehensive approach to security.

This session explored how multilateral forums or initiatives could learn from each other and adapt elements of co-operative security models to their political and security context in order to develop tailor-made approaches adapted to their individual requirements. Furthermore, it put forward practical ideas on how to enhance institutional and practical interaction between existing security mechanisms in Asia and Europe in order to ensure a more systematic approach to co-operation.

Moderator: H.E. Mr. Fred **Tanner**, Ambassador, Senior Adviser to the OSCE Secretary General

Rapporteur: Ms. **Yoo Yena**, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea

Speakers

- H.E. Mr. Peter **Prügel**, Ambassador, Regional Director for Asia and the Pacific, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Germany
- H.E. Mr. Akira **Muto**, Ambassador, Deputy Director-General for European Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan
- Mr. Suriya **Chindawongse**, Deputy Director-General for ASEAN Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Thailand
- Dr. **Chung** Kuyoun, Visiting Professor, Korea National Diplomatic Academy

Discussion

Conclusion and remarks by the moderator

11.30 a.m.–12 noon **Coffee break**

12 noon–1 p.m. **Closing session**

- Chairperson: H.E. Mr. Vuk **Žugić**, Ambassador, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Serbia to the OSCE and Chairperson of the OSCE Permanent Council
- Concluding statement by H.E. Mr. **Song** Young-wan, Ambassador, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Korea to the International Organizations in Vienna

- Concluding statement by H.E. Mr. Thomas **Greminger**, Ambassador, Permanent Mission of Switzerland to the OSCE and Chairperson of the OSCE Contact Group with the Asian Partners for Co-operation

1 p.m. **End of Conference**

1–7 p.m. **Excursion (field trip to the Demilitarized Zone between South and North Korea) (Passports were required for the trip.)**



Picture MFA of ROK

2 Summary of the opening session

Report by Ms. Marietta König, External Co-operation Officer, OSCE Secretariat

H.E. Song Young-wan, Ambassador of the Republic of Korea to Austria, chaired the opening session. Opening remarks and keynote speeches were delivered by **H.E. Mr. Yun Byung-Se**, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea; **H.E. Mr. Didier Burkhalter**, Head of the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland; **H.E. General Tanasak Patimapragorn**, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of Thailand; **H.E. Ambassador Vuk Žugić**, Head of the Permanent Mission of Serbia to the OSCE and Chairperson of the OSCE Permanent Council; and **H.E. Ambassador Lamberto Zannier**, Secretary General of the OSCE.

Before giving the floor to the keynote speakers of the opening session, **H.E. Ambassador Song Young-wan** welcomed the participants on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Korea and thanked the OSCE for its assistance in preparing the Conference.

In his opening remarks, **H.E. Minister Yun Byung-se** highlighted the year's seventieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War as one of the key events celebrated by both Asia and Europe. At the same time, however, he stressed that particularly for Koreans, this date stood not only for their liberation but also for the division of the Korean peninsula. He continued by pointing out the geopolitical challenges currently being experienced by both Europe and Asia. With regard to Europe, he particularly highlighted the crisis in and around Ukraine, to which the OSCE had immediately reacted through the deployment of the Special Monitoring Mission (SMM) and close observation of the implementation of the Minsk agreements. In Asia, North Korea's continued nuclear threats in particular were contributing to a destabilization in the region, as were current tensions in the skies and on the seas, land and cyberspace, all of which were playing their part in creating a "fragile, rather than a durable, peace" at both the "eastern and the western ends of the Eurasian continent". Given the increasing complexity of today's global security issues, among them the increase in transnational threats stemming from foreign terrorist fighters, violent extremism, cyber threats, outbreaks of epidemics, maritime refugees, and climate change, he heartily endorsed the sharing of experience and enhanced cross-regional dialogue between Europe and Asia.

On the subject of the two continents' interconnectedness and interdependence, he concluded by listing three focus areas in which the OSCE participating States and the Asian Partners could increase their co-operation: 1) Sharing experience concerning the OSCE's comprehensive security concept with a view to the development of a similar concept tailored to the realities in East and Northeast Asia, particularly on the Korean peninsula; 2) Exchanging knowledge concerning the building of trust through confidence- and security-building measures (CSBMs) as established within the OSCE and currently also being developed through Asian initiatives such as the Northeast Asia Peace and Cooperation Initiative (NAPCI); and 3) Jointly addressing transnational threats and issues of global concern.

H.E. Minister Didier Burkhalter highlighted the participation of three ministers in the opening session, which indicated the increasing necessity for co-operation between Europe and Asia and the importance of a joint security dialogue in the face of growing political and military polarization in both regions. Although he recognized the fragility of European security following the crisis in and around Ukraine, at the same time the crisis had enabled the OSCE to demonstrate the particular value of the tools at its disposal for dealing with

conflicts by deploying the SMM and also by taking an active role in the Trilateral Contact Group. In the context of a survey of principal elements in the OSCE's essential concept of co-operative security, which was aimed at mutual engagement and building bridges, he referred to the Panel of Eminent Persons initiated by the current OSCE Troika, which would look into ways of reconsolidating European security.

Minister Burkhalter furthermore stressed that Switzerland was committed not only to co-operative security in the OSCE area but also to promoting co-operation and strengthening relations between the OSCE and its Asian Partners. In underlining the relevance of the OSCE Contact Group with the Asian Partners for Co-operation as a platform for the discussion of potential co-operation areas such as transnational threats, managing borders, combating trafficking in human beings, and building democratic institutions, he particularly highlighted the Asian Partners' extensive expertise on the issue of disaster risk reduction, from which the OSCE could benefit highly.

Besides promoting an exchange of views on regional approaches in the field of cyber CBMs between the OSCE and the ASEAN Regional Forum, he also advertised the Swiss co-sponsored ASEM Symposium on Countering Radicalisation to be organized by Malaysia in October and encouraged all countries to support the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund, a Geneva-based public-private partnership supporting community-level initiatives to counter violent extremism. In that context, he also stressed that the Asian Contact Group possessed sufficient potential to expand the co-operation framework within this mechanism through such means as Chairmanship dialogues; in addition, the Contact Group might also be used to further explore possibilities for making progress with regional co-operative security initiatives such as NAPCI. He was furthermore much in favour of welcoming other countries interested in joining the group of OSCE Asian Partners.

He concluded by thanking the Asian Partners for their substantial financial support for the SMM and the Border Management Staff College in Tajikistan, and also for their secondments to such bodies as OSCE/ODIHR election observation missions.

H.E. Minister Tanasak Patimapragorn thanked the Government of the Republic of Korea for its hospitality, and Foreign Ministers Yun and Burkhalter for inviting him to deliver a statement at the 2015 OSCE Asian Conference, which provided an ideal platform for sharing experiences and exchange views on common security issues.

Stressing the growing threat posed by non-traditional security challenges, Minister Patimapragorn highlighted four areas where he saw potential for the sharing of experiences and best practices between the OSCE, the Asian Partners and also Asian security formats: addressing extremism, dealing with disaster management, fighting human trafficking, and preserving peace and stability. He emphasized that addressing extremism and its root causes needed to be in line with the UN Post-2015 Development Agenda and that the OSCE would strongly benefit from increased co-operation with ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations). On the subject of disaster management, he welcomed the Serbian OSCE Chairmanship's initiative to prioritize regional co-operation on water management and the emphasis on disaster response, which would correspond to such Asian regional initiatives as the Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre in Bangkok or the Asian Disaster Reduction Centre in Kobe, Japan. As regards the fight against human trafficking, he reported that Thailand was taking a comprehensive approach to addressing irregular migration in the Indian Ocean and had hosted a Special Meeting on Irregular Migration in the Indian Ocean on 29 May 2015 while also launching a humanitarian mission to provide assistance to migrants stranded at sea.

On the issue of preserving peace and stability, he commended the Republic of Korea's NAPCI initiative while also reaffirming Thailand's readiness to act as a bridge between the OSCE and ASEAN, based upon the fact Thailand was the only country to be both an OSCE Partner and a member of ASEAN. He stressed that Thailand continued to wish to actively contribute to the promotion of peace and security both regionally and internationally.

Minister Patimapragorn concluded by underlining Thailand's role in promoting peace and security in the world and reiterating his country's readiness to host the 2016 OSCE Asian Conference.

On behalf of the OSCE Chairmanship and the Chairperson-in-Office Minister Ivica Dačić, **H.E. Ambassador Vuk Žugić** thanked the Government of the Republic of Korea for generously hosting this event for the fourth time. He also thanked Ambassador Song Young-wan, his team in Vienna and the OSCE Secretariat for the excellent organization of the Conference.

Expressing gratitude for the Republic of Korea's generous support of OSCE initiatives and activities, he highlighted the country's continued commitment to the OSCE and the Asian Partnership for Co-operation.

Putting the conference into the broader context of an increasingly fragile international security environment, Ambassador Žugić noted that besides traditional security challenges such as the current crisis in and around Ukraine, new transnational threats had emerged, among them not only a tendency towards radicalization and violent extremism and growing with it the phenomenon of foreign terrorist fighters, but also the potential damaging effect of information and communication technologies in inter-State relations and an increase in natural disasters due to climate change. To properly address these new security threats, the OSCE participating States had adopted a number of new tools and commitments, among them the Basel Ministerial Council Declaration on countering the phenomenon of foreign terrorist fighters, which the Serbian Chairmanship was to follow with an OSCE-wide Counter-Terrorism Conference.

Ambassador Žugić continued by referring to the 40th anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act, which he called a historic triumph of co-operation over conflict that had set the OSCE's concept of comprehensive security and still remained valid today. Despite the OSCE's inability to prevent the crisis in and around Ukraine, the OSCE's inclusive nature and flexibility had proven that it was the organization best-suited to facilitating dialogue and joint action among countries with significantly divergent security perspectives and threat perceptions. The Helsinki Final Act had paved the way for the adoption of a broad set of confidence and security-building measures in the politico-military sphere that were intended to increase transparency and predictability. This was an aspect that had retained its attractiveness and might now be incorporated into an ad hoc security structure intended to facilitate co-operative solutions on transnational issues such as organized crime, terrorism, trafficking in drugs or weapons, trafficking in human beings, environmental challenges, and cyber threats. All of this might also be of interest for the Asian Partners, and the OSCE would stand ready to enhance co-operation and to share experiences, whether in Vienna or through the development of further contacts with regional institutions.

H.E. OSCE Secretary General Lamberto Zannier thanked the Government of the Republic of Korea for organizing the 2015 OSCE Asian Conference, as well as Ambassador

Song Young-wan and his dedicated team in Vienna for the excellent co-operation with the Secretariat and the Swiss Chairmanship of the Asian Contact Group in preparing the event.

Mr. Zannier stressed that the Republic of Korea had traditionally shown a strong commitment to an advanced dialogue and co-operation between the OSCE and the Asian Partners by providing the Organization with considerable financial and human resources. He further underlined that the Republic of Korea was also one among a number of Asian Partners who had been supporting and generously contributing to the SMM in Ukraine and other OSCE activities, which was highly appreciated by the OSCE and its participating States.

Noting the critical time for global and regional security during which the Conference was taking place, he commented on the re-emergence of armed conflicts in Europe, the appearance of new and particularly transnational threats to security, and the growing instability beyond the OSCE area, notably in the southern Mediterranean and Afghanistan. Particularly the last of these three factors would contribute to furthering radicalization, extremism and terrorism, and also the emergence of foreign terrorist fighters affecting both OSCE participating States and Partner countries. He continued by naming other rising threats to international security such as natural disasters, tension over natural resources, large-scale migration and the growth of cybercrime, and stressed that the magnitude and global impact of these threats required joint action and international co-operation. In this context, the long-standing OSCE Asian Partnership would offer a valuable platform on which to share experience and strengthen relations between the OSCE and its Partners for Co-operation.

In its efforts to adapt itself to the new challenges, the OSCE had adopted two declarations on countering kidnapping and hostage-taking by terrorist groups and foreign terrorist fighters at its 2014 Ministerial Council in Basel, while also being the only international organization to have adopted confidence-building measures on reducing the risks of conflict in the field of cybersecurity. He continued by referring to the OSCE's endeavours in the environmental dimension of security and its efforts to assist participating States in implementing activities on enhancing disaster risk reduction.

Mr. Zannier also reaffirmed the relevance and continued applicability of the ten Helsinki Final Act principles, as demonstrated in the OSCE's operational response to the crisis in and around Ukraine. Here, the OSCE was using its entire toolbox at a strategic and political level and across its three security dimensions, proving its added value as an inclusive platform for dialogue.

He further pointed out that, even if the historical and geopolitical context of the OSCE's foundation was unique, its core principles and mechanisms could be relevant for similar initiatives aimed at strengthening security in Asia. The agreement on a set of principles for inter-State co-operation in Asia could provide a foundation for a regional platform for dialogue upon which Asian States could raise security concerns and work together to address them. He encouraged the Asian Partners to explore the potential for additional co-operation opportunities between the OSCE and regional security frameworks in Asia such as ASEAN and its Regional Forum, the Trilateral Cooperation Secretariat, the East Asia Summit, and also NAPCI. Mr. Zannier concluded by suggesting increased interaction at working level and desk exchanges to further promote the sharing of best practices and lessons learned, e.g., on the OSCE's advanced regime of arms control and confidence- and security-building measures.

3 Reports by session rapporteurs

3.1 Session 1: Evolving Threats and their Implications for Security in Europe and Asia

Report by Ms. Park Hyo-in, Second Secretary, International Security Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea

The moderator, **H.E. Shin Dong-ik**, Deputy Minister for Multilateral and Global Affairs in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea, stressed the significance for countering the threat of foreign terrorist fighters (FTFs) of UNSC resolution 2178 on threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts. He expressed concern that despite the enhanced international responses to terrorism, the threat of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) still persisted, as outlined in the UNSC Presidential Statement on threats to international peace and security released on 29 May. He also added that in addition to strengthening counter-terrorism measures and law enforcement co-operation, the root causes of terrorism should be addressed through a comprehensive approach including development, education and empowerment of women.

H.E. Ms. Takako Ueta, Ambassador, Professor at the International Christian University, described Japan's efforts to fight the threat of terrorism and FTFs. In response to the murder of two Japanese nationals by ISIL in January 2015, the Japanese Government came out with the "Three-Pillar Foreign Policy", which consisted of: 1) strengthening counter-terrorism measures, 2) enhancing diplomatic moves towards stability and prosperity in the Middle East, and 3) assistance in creating societies resilient to radicalization. Since the 9/11 terrorist attacks, Japan has been intensifying counter-terrorism measures such as immigration control, intelligence activities, prevention of hijacking, countering chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) terrorism, combating terrorist financing and other measures. Japan has also been strengthening counter-terrorism co-operation with various countries and regional organizations such as the OSCE, EU, ASEAN, ARF, APEC and ASEM. Meanwhile, in order to further facilitate systematic co-operation, there was a conspicuous need for institutionalized regular dialogue and meetings, not only on counter-terrorism activities but also on wider regional security co-operation in Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. Tom Wuchte, Head of the Anti-Terrorism Unit of the OSCE Secretariat, elaborated upon the OSCE's role and efforts in countering the FTF phenomenon. As a significant number of FTFs had joined terrorist groups in Syria and Iraq, States faced a greater need for law enforcement and judicial co-operation for the investigation and prosecution of terrorist offences, which was also significant in the context of the OSCE's efforts and its potential for collaboration with regional security mechanisms and the Asian Partners for Co-operation. Following the adoption of UNSC resolution 2178, the OSCE had adopted the Basel Declaration on the OSCE Role in Countering the Phenomenon of Foreign Terrorist Fighters in the Context of the Implementation of UN Security Council Resolutions 2170 (2014) and 2178 (2014), which consolidated the OSCE's commitments related to capacity-building, information-sharing, and co-operation among Participating States. The potential for co-operation between the OSCE and its Asian Partners was also addressed; in addition to continuously promoting the implementation of UNSC resolution 2178, the OSCE and the participating States would follow up with the commitments made at the White House Summit on Countering Violent Extremism in February 2015, and launch further capacity-building activities in this field.

Ms. Kate Byrnes, Deputy Permanent Representative of the United States Mission to the OSCE, said that the FTF phenomenon significantly affected Asia: approximately 1,300 FTFs were from the Indo-Asia-Pacific region, and Al Qaida's increased rhetoric was focusing on South Asia. In developing a broad approach to this problem, there were three interrelated aspects to be addressed: 1) countering violent extremism (CVE); 2) implementation and compliance with domestic, regional and international policy and legal framework regarding FTFs; and 3) the de-radicalization of returnees. She further emphasized that a successful CVE strategy would require a close partnership with local actors, promotion of tolerance and non-discrimination, protection of civil rights and strategic communication. As was stressed by UNSC resolution 2178, States should take measures to stop FTFs by, for example, preventing cross-border movement of suspected individuals and carrying out prosecutions. Governments and communities would have to work together to develop the ability to assess and address the risk posed by returning FTFs. Because collective efforts and partnerships were important, there had been various regional and international efforts to meet the challenge, including the White House Summit on CVE, the Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF), and the Global Coalition to Counter ISIL. The work of the OSCE was also acknowledged, with special mention being made of the Security Day entitled "Building Bridges: Promoting Dialogue to Prevent Radicalization and Violent Extremism".

In the discussion, a representative of the **European Union (EU)** outlined the EU's counter-terrorism efforts, drawing particular attention to strengthening partnership with key countries, capacity-building, international co-operation, and implementation of relevant UNSC resolutions, stressing that counter-terrorism measures should be in compliance with international law and human rights standards. The EU would also be further enhancing co-operation and active involvement with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), particularly when holding an inter-sessional meeting on terrorism in July. The EU representative emphasized the need to tackle root causes through the development of counter-narrative, early intervention in radicalization, and the prevention of Islam from being hijacked for terrorist purposes. A representative of the **United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime** argued that transnational crimes were interlinked and that the same criminal gangs were involved both in different types of crime and in terrorism. It introduced its active capacity-building programmes in South and Central Asia, in connection with which it welcomed any initiative or support from Asian Partners. A representative of **Australia** viewed CVE as a key priority for the country. The four pillars of Australia's CVE strategy were: 1) building further strength into the country's diversity; 2) working in communities and institutions close to vulnerable people; 3) establishing a framework for early intervention; and 4) addressing online radicalization.

A representative of **Afghanistan** stated that as a long-term victim of terrorism the country still faced the threat of FTFs. It would keep working on border security and the legal framework with efforts designed to inject new momentum to the peace process. A representative of **Thailand** stated that the country would strengthen regional co-operation in the areas of border management, CVE strategy development, and promotion of moderation. A representative of **Serbia** announced that the country was hosting the OSCE Counter-Terrorism Conference in July and would welcome the active participation of Asian Partners. A representative of the **Cooperation Council of Turkic Speaking States (CCTS)** stated that the CCTS wished to develop closer ties with the OSCE, which would create great synergy. A representative of the **Republic of Korea** stated that implementation of UNSC resolutions was the cornerstone of the country's counter-terrorism policy, and also outlined the country's priority areas in CVE, such as development, education, vocational training, and awareness-

raising. A representative of the **Trilateral Cooperation Secretariat** suggested that counter-terrorism, along with disaster risk reduction and cybersecurity, was a potential area in which Northeast Asian countries might cultivate further co-operation.

In response to questions and comments, **Professor Ueta** underlined that all countries should recognize the significance of the basic principles of the Helsinki Final Act. **Ms. Byrnes** noted the importance of law enforcement co-operation and strategic communication and messaging. **Mr. Wuchte** highlighted the comparative advantage of the OSCE in gaining a better understanding of and tackling violent extremism, particularly by virtue of its institutions and field missions.

3.2 Session 2: Areas of Co-operation: Global efforts and regional complementarity to enhance disaster risk reduction

Report by Ms. Esther Valerie Osorio, Attaché, Latvia/EU

H.E. Ambassador Bruno Georges, Permanent Representative of Belgium to the OSCE, introduced the speakers in his capacity as moderator and thanked the Republic of Korea for hosting the conference.

H.E. OSCE Secretary General Lamberto Zannier spoke in his presentation of the increasing relevance of disaster risk reduction (DRR) as an area for co-operation for the OSCE and its Asian Partners. He argued that a security perspective needed to be incorporated into disaster risk reduction strategies and described four main linkages between security and disasters. First, disasters had the potential to lead to increased tension and aggravate existing conflicts. Second, conflicts could be disaster risk escalators in that they decreased the capacity of authorities to manage disaster risks, while also raising people's vulnerability. Third, disasters could affect security and stability in a transboundary context. Fourth, disaster risk reduction could provide an opportunity to foster co-operation and confidence-building. Mr. Zannier recalled the 2014 Basel Ministerial Council Decision on enhancing disaster risk reduction, which called for synergies between DRR measures and the climate change adaptation plan and reinforced the mandate of OSCE executive structures in helping participating States to strengthen disaster risk reduction and management at all levels. Its implementation would contribute to the implementation of the recently adopted Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. The OSCE had a number of projects addressing disasters and climate change, many being implemented in the framework of the Environmental and Security Initiative in co-operation with other organizations. With its Asian Partners for Co-operation, the OSCE could establish and strengthen work through several platforms, among them the Asian Disaster Reduction Center, the Sixth Regional Economic Cooperation Conference on Afghanistan, the Northeast Asia Peace and Cooperation Initiative, and ASEAN. In conclusion, Mr. Zannier gave a survey of various events in 2015 closely linked to disaster risk reduction, including the upcoming OSCE Security Days event on climate change and security.

Mr. Kaoru Saito, Director of Disaster Preparedness and International Cooperation, Cabinet Office of the Government of Japan, presented the outcomes of the Third UN World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction held from 14 to 18 March 2015 in Sendai, Japan, which had attracted over 6,500 participants. He highlighted the emerging challenges that were putting populations at risk: accelerating urbanization, climate change, and expansion of the global economy and business activities. Disaster and poverty appeared to be linked in a vicious circle: the lower a country's GDP, the higher the percentage of deaths and the damage caused by disaster. Japan proposed to invest in preventive measures, which would reduce damage when disaster occurred, and to apply the "build back better" approach of building up a more resilient community in the reconstruction phase, drawing upon lessons learned. This approach had also been taken up in the Sendai Framework, which defined four priority areas for action: the enhancement of the understanding of disaster risk; strengthening disaster risk governance; investing in risk reduction for resilience; and enhancing preparedness for effective response. On the basis of the Sendai Framework, it would be possible to strengthen areas prone to disasters, through the Asian Disaster Reduction Centre and other bodies. Japan

stood ready to contribute to regional co-operation and confidence-building in this area through the OSCE Asian Contact Group.

H.E. Ambassador Choi Sung-joo, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea, introduced the issue of cybersecurity, explaining the situation in Korea by pointing out that while it was one of the most wired, open countries it was also subject to many cyber-attacks. In the context of international security, cyber issues had the potential to cause conflicts through misconception and miscalculation. International norms needed to be further developed to ensure responsible behaviour on the part of States. Ambassador Choi stressed the importance of confidence-building measures in this field and the need to increase transparency. The OSCE had developed significant cyber CBMs and therefore provided a good reference for other regions and countries. On this issue the ASEAN Regional Forum would also adopt a work plan, which in his view was still at a preliminary stage in comparison with the OSCE. This could be attributed to the absence of regional security co-operation mechanisms and wide disparities in cyber capacity in the region. As long as countries in North-East Asia relied particularly on ICTs and the Internet, a prevalent lack of trust made CBMs all the more necessary. NAPCI, out of concern to explore less confrontational issues, considered cyberspace together with nuclear safety and energy security. The Republic of Korea was contributing to strengthening mutual understanding in the region by setting up bilateral and trilateral cyber policy consultations and actively participating in regional and multilateral conferences on cyberspace.

Mr. Ben Hiller, Cyber Security Officer, OSCE Secretariat, pointed out that cybersecurity had become a matter of national security for all States irrespective of their stage of development. ICT has added a complex new dimension to inter-State relations as offensive cyber capabilities had been used in larger conflicts and were continuing to be developed. Their easy accessibility for private actors meant that they were set apart from traditional military capabilities. Hostile cyber actions were therefore difficult to trace back to the perpetrator, which could increase inter-State tensions. Regional organizations that brought together States with difficult relations were thus ideal platforms for developing confidence-building measures in this field. The OSCE adopted 11 practical cyber CBMs in 2013, focusing on exchange of information in three principal areas: first, allowing States to “read” another State’s posturing in cyberspace, notably by sharing national views on cyber threats or military doctrines; second, offering opportunities for timely communication between States, notably by establishing specific channels; and third, promoting exchange on national preparedness and due diligence related to national cyber and ICT security. These CBMs were intended to enhance States’ capacities to collectively or individually deal with cyber-attacks. As regional approaches to cyber security still differed, joint thread-binding efforts were needed both on the strategic and on the practical level. He argued that on a strategic level the UN Group of Governmental Experts served as a universal reference, while continuous information exchange could achieve complementarity on the practical level. He proposed that an interregional workshop between the OSCE and its Asian Partners could enhance a knowledge transfer that would benefit both the OSCE area and Asia. A workshop of this kind could focus on the exchange of best practices on communication lines, the enhancement of States’ capacities for dealing with cyber-attacks, and the matter of how to institutionalize interregional information exchange in the long term.

In the discussion that followed, a representative of the **European Union (EU)** stated that the implementation of the Sendai Framework would be a key task and that the OSCE could play a role in this by creating political will and knowledge and by experience-sharing across the

OSCE area. This was also true in the field of cybersecurity, where OSCE experience could be valuable for the Asian region. The representative also announced that in 2016, along with the Netherlands and Malaysia, the EU would be co-hosting a workshop on operationalizing CBMs for co-operation during cyber incident response.

The **United States** highlighted the important role of women leaders at community level in disaster risk response. Synergies could be created between Aarhus Centres and civil society. The cyber field required a stable use of cyber space, the advancing of human rights online, and the promotion of a multi-stakeholder approach. The **Republic of Korea** reported on a meeting with China, Russia and Japan in March 2015 on enhancing co-operation on disaster risk reduction, which was still limited in the region. While the issue of disaster response was complementary to regional co-operation, existing mechanisms should not be duplicated. **Switzerland** stated that both the OSCE area and the Asian region could benefit from regional exchange and joint activities. It expressed its readiness to co-sponsor an interregional conference for sharing experience on cybersecurity, at which the potential of OSCE and ASEAN Regional Forum capacity-building could also be explored. **Slovakia** provided information about its disaster risk reduction activities during the 2013/2014 Slovakian chairmanship of the Economic and Environmental Committee, and highlighted the importance of engaging experts from the field and from the private sector. **Thailand** acknowledged the lack of institutional capacity in the Asian region, which could be countered by, for example, further developing the Aarhus Centre of Jakarta. Military assets such as hospitals and bases could be used in the event of natural disasters. Thailand also offered to serve as a link between the OSCE and ASEAN. **Australia** joined others in highlighting the need to share lessons learned from cyber incidents and to raise awareness of such threats.

3.3 Side-event: The Northeast Asia Peace and Cooperation Initiative (NAPCI)

Report by Mr. Kim Do-hwan, Second Secretary, Policy Planning and Coordination, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea

As a side-event of the Conference, the Republic of Korea (ROK) hosted a Special Session on the Northeast Asia Peace and Cooperation Initiative (NAPCI), which seeks to replace the structure of discord in Northeast Asia with an order of dialogue and co-operation. Under the theme of “The Northeast Asia Peace and Cooperation Initiative (NAPCI) and the OSCE’s Experience in Confidence- and Security-Building Measures (CSBMs)”, the event focused on enhancing the participants’ understanding of NAPCI and discussing ways to draw on best practices and lessons learnt from the OSCE for NAPCI’s benefit.

The Chair, **H.E. Mr. Kim Hong-kyun**, Deputy Foreign Minister for Political Affairs in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea, explained that NAPCI had been greatly inspired by the OSCE’s experience in multilateral security co-operation, notably by the Helsinki Process, and that NAPCI’s success would serve as a testimony to the usefulness of multilateral co-operation mechanisms such as the OSCE. He also asked the participants to pool their wisdom and experience for the benefit of NAPCI and of peace and co-operation in the region.

H.E. Ambassador Fred TANNER, Senior Advisor to the OSCE Secretary General, emphasized that it was crucial to secure “plug and play” or “interoperability” when pursuing a multilateral co-operation mechanism for building regional confidence, transparency and security. He added that such a mechanism should be complementary, reinforcing, ideally inclusive and in support of the UN objectives under Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter. Drawing from the experience of the OSCE, he suggested possible areas of inspiration for NAPCI, including strengthening its co-operation with existing multilateral mechanisms by promoting concrete projects for co-operation in soft-security issues as well as enriching dialogue by involving think tanks and civil society actors in its activities.

Dr. Shin Beomchul, Director General of Policy Planning Bureau in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea, highlighted the resemblances and differences between NAPCI and the Helsinki Process, in order to give participants a better understanding of the Initiative. He also asked the participants to share the experience and expertise of the OSCE, because the advance of NAPCI would contribute to the OSCE’s “V2V” (Vancouver to Vladivostok) vision by addressing the lack of multilateral co-operation in Northeast Asia.

In the discussion, representatives of NAPCI such as the **United States, Japan and Mongolia** expressed their appreciation of NAPCI’s approach in pursuing multilateral co-operation from the angle of soft-security issues, given the challenging security environment of the region. In addition, they noted that the comprehensive approach of the Helsinki Process would also be useful in Northeast Asia because such an approach enabled co-operation to be continued in an area even when co-operation in other areas was facing difficulties. A representative of **NATO** expressed his view that a track 1.5 dialogue could help the track 1 dialogue. A representative of **Switzerland** suggested that the OSCE be invited to the Second High-level Intergovernmental Meeting on NAPCI as one of the partners for co-operation.

H.E. Ambassador Lamberto Zannier, Secretary General of the OSCE, pointed out that it had taken almost two years to adopt the Helsinki Final Act after the first Conference on

Security Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) and that it had only been possible because dialogues on building a security mechanism in Europe had been taking place for many years. He also expressed his willingness to work together on advancing NAPCI by sharing the experience and expertise of the OSCE.

In conclusion, **H.E. Mr. Kim Hong-kyun** noted with pleasure that the event was serving as a meaningful venue for deepening the participants' understanding of NAPCI's role in helping to transform Northeast Asia into a region of dialogue and co-operation by establishing an infrastructure of trust. He also asked participants' to show continued interest in and support for the Republic of Korea's efforts in promoting peace and dialogue in the region.

3.4 Session 3: Visions for Security Co-operation in Asia: Experience-sharing and new co-operation areas

Report by Ms. Yoo Yena, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea

The moderator, **H.E. Mr. Fred Tanner**, Ambassador and Senior Adviser to the OSCE Secretary General, opened the session by highlighting the potential for enhanced Euro-Asian regional co-operation through measures to address issues of mutual concern such as disaster risk reduction, drug trafficking and cyber issues as well as aspects of crisis prevention and conflict regulation. New rules, new frameworks and new initiatives should be jointly explored, providing opportunities to embark on a more predictable and harmonious journey in the Euro-Asian regional context over the years to come.

H.E. Mr. Peter Prügel, Ambassador and Regional Director for Asia and the Pacific of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Germany, said that the session was very timely, given that security in Asia was of the greatest interest to Europe considering the close economic relations and challenges common to the two regions. The most important achievement of the Helsinki Final Act and subsequent CSCE and OSCE documents was the acknowledgement that security must be considered in a comprehensive way. Although the OSCE was not a blueprint that could be directly “exported” and applied to Asia, OSCE experience might nonetheless offer insights for the region, and both regions should aim to work closely together with the aim of jointly promoting stability and security. Starting small with “soft issues” and linking existing institutions and structures were important steps towards building trust and tackling the growing risk of serious conflicts in Asia, a region constantly challenged by unresolved historical and territorial conflicts and widespread misperceptions. In that connection, Germany and the EU supported the strengthening of ASEAN and the ASEAN+ processes, as ASEAN was the most important and most active motor for stability in the Asia-Pacific region. The EU was deeply engaged with ASEAN, for example through its participation in the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia, through a strategic partnership between the EU and ASEAN and through the EU-ASEAN High-Level Dialogue. The EU also believed that NAPCI might serve as a very meaningful Northeast Asian complement to the Southeast Asian process of ASEAN and might contribute constructively to establishing a security dialogue on soft issues, which could promote more direct communication between the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea.

H.E. Mr. Akira Muto, Ambassador and Deputy Director General for European Affairs of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, said that 2015 marked the 40th anniversary of the adoption of the Helsinki Final Act, which set out important basic principles such as sovereign equality, the peaceful settlement of disputes, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and fulfilment in good faith of obligations under international law. Those principles were underpinned by the rule of law, and Japan had been assisting Ukraine in that connection by supporting the activities of the OSCE Special Monitoring Mission (SMM). As a “proactive contributor to peace”, Japan was trying to build a multi-layered rule-based security environment through dialogue and confidence-building. Specifically, to strengthen co-operation between Asia and Europe, it was important to draw on the experiences of the OSCE in confidence-building and to use and develop existing frameworks such as the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), the East Asia Summit (EAS), the ASEAN Defence Ministers Meeting-Plus (ADMM-Plus), and the Expanded ASEAN Maritime Forum (EAMF) in a multi-layered way. For example, the ARF was a valuable international forum that took a

three-stage approach: Stage 1 on promotional CBMs; Stage 2 on the development of preventive diplomacy; and Stage 3 on the elaboration of approaches to conflicts. In an increasingly challenging security environment in the Asia-Pacific region, Japan hoped that the ARF would gradually evolve and play an important role in securing regional peace and stability.

Mr. Suriya Chindawongse, Deputy Director General for ASEAN Affairs of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Thailand, said that the evolving geo-strategic landscape in the Asia-Pacific region reflected an era of transformation characterized by the “Asian paradox” and dichotomy, trust deficits and conflicting claims to both land and sea. ASEAN had tried to achieve an ASEAN-centred regional architecture, norms, rules and codes of conduct, and routine practical and pragmatic co-operation. The philosophy behind the architecture was that since ASEAN was a threat to none, it provided a neutral setting where major powers and other countries could convene more easily. However, a potential “curved space” situation was developing in which former structures and rules might not fully apply, with more intense competition amongst major powers, an emerging zero-sum mind-set, and ongoing tensions in areas of concern. A failure on the part of the ASEAN architecture to address those tensions could lead to the formation of “black holes”, in which the risks of miscalculations and accidents might lead to possible armed conflicts. In order to deal with the potential challenges of curved space and black holes, the countries in the region should adapt the regional architecture, strengthen existing rules and introduce new rules and enhance co-operation in win-win areas to promote people-centred approaches to enhancing security. New approaches were needed to prevent the development of black holes and to navigate safely through any curved space that arose. He encouraged further discussion of those issues within the framework of the 2016 OSCE Asian Conference in Thailand.

Dr. Chung Kuyoun, Visiting Professor at the Korea National Diplomatic Academy, focused on the theoretical and practical relevance of past experience in Europe and isolated implications relevant to the situation of Northeast Asia with a particular focus on NAPCI. NAPCI was a policy-guided process of conscious security co-operation on a regional basis, and different from the EU’s regionalization, which according to various political theories was a bottom-up process of regional integration led by the private sector and subnational communication. Within the European Union, three factors were dominant with elements of a spill-over effect: the linkage of issues, domestic constituencies’ preferences and government responsiveness. In contrast, North Asia was characterized by the lack of a perceived common security threat, inert bilateral security co-operation, different political regimes and different levels of democratization, which might impede Northeast Asia in moving forward. However, there were policy windows for NAPCI in Northeast Asia. Various patterns for multilateral security co-operation were available through forums such as the ARF, the ADMM-Plus, the second track Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific (CSCAP), and the track 1.5 Shangri-La Dialogue. The Republic of Korea could use its experience of middle power diplomacy in relation to Asia-specific non-traditional issues such as health security, nuclear safety and terrorism. In addition, it was imperative to identify substantive areas of collaboration, convergences of norms, strategies for strengthening domestic actors and institutions across the region, and compatibility with other security co-operation frameworks and initiatives.

In the discussion, a representative of the **European Union** (EU) noted that the OSCE’s unique approach to security co-operation had been developed continuously over 40 years since the adoption of the Helsinki Final Act. The EU believed that co-operation was the key

to overcoming recent regional and global security challenges such as the emergence of Daesh and violent extremism in Iraq and Syria, and the Ukraine crisis; it attached great importance to EU-ASEAN co-operation and reaffirmed its support for NAPCI, which was reflected in its readiness to share its own experiences.

A representative of the **United States** stated that the strength of the OSCE, particularly in times of crisis, lay in its positive note and organizational flexibility and adaptability, which had led to fruitful discussions on fighting the phenomenon of FTFs, addressing violent extremism, and dealing with cybersecurity and disaster risk reduction. The United States was continuing to invest in ASEAN, the East Asia Summit (EAS), and other regional institutions, and in working on regional issues in the South China Sea. The lesson learned from the OSCE experience was that any security mechanism must be based on common values. A representative of the **Trilateral Cooperation Secretariat** shared this view in the context of the situation in East Asia, mentioning the lack of a sense of urgency in the region and the preference for solving issues bilaterally. Mention was also made of elements that arguably acted as catalysts for the Helsinki Process: the threat of nuclear war, the arms race, détente between East and West, and the existence of persons dedicated to the Process's continuous advancement.

A representative of the **Republic of Korea** stated that the country was encouraged by the participants' appreciation of NAPCI, and stressed that the optimistic view on regional multilateral mechanism was not naïve but in fact realistic. The Republic of Korea was aware of the fact that it would take time to accumulate enough momentum to benchmark and introduce a regional multilateral mechanism like that of the OSCE in North-East Asia. To promote the kind of multilateral co-operation that would add value in the region, it was important not only to bring together like-minded countries that already shared common values, but also to explore ways to agree on common values through dialogue. A representative of **Afghanistan** introduced the Istanbul Ministerial Process in South Asia, a platform launched in November 2011 by Afghanistan and its neighbours to discuss regional issues such as combating terrorism, illicit narcotics and extremism, and raised questions about ways to overcome mistrust and learn from the experiences of the OSCE.

4 Summary of the closing session

Report by Ms. Marietta König, External Co-operation Officer, OSCE Secretariat

H.E. Ambassador Vuk Žugić, Head of the Permanent Mission of Serbia to the OSCE and Chairperson of the OSCE Permanent Council, chaired the closing session. Closing remarks were delivered by **H.E. Song Young-wan, Ambassador of the Republic of Korea to Austria**, and **H.E. Ambassador Thomas Greminger**, Permanent Representative of Switzerland to the OSCE and Chairperson of the Contact Group with the Asian Partners for Co-operation.

Speaking on behalf of the Serbian OSCE Chairmanship-in-Office, **Ambassador Žugić** expressed gratitude to all the participants in the conference for their active participation and valuable contributions, and to the Government of the Republic of Korea for hosting that important event. He stressed once again the relevance of the Conference to addressing challenges in both regions. He noted that terrorism remained one of the most significant transnational threats in the OSCE area and beyond and the increasingly global impact of violent extremism, radicalization and foreign terrorist fighters. Fostering co-operative solutions across and between regions to address the root causes of those trends was crucial - disaster risk reduction could provide an excellent opportunity for fostering co-operation and confidence-building within societies, helping to reduce tensions, build mutual confidence and promote good neighbourly relations. The final session had focused on the OSCE's comprehensive security concept, reconfirming the validity of the organization's unique security approach, promoting security and stability through the adoption of an integrated approach and the implementation of shared principles and commitments. He noted the importance of a permanent platform for discussing and addressing threats, and in particular, that confidence and security-building measures in the military sphere could play a crucial role in increasing transparency and predictability, mitigating the risk of incidents stemming from peaceful military activities. Even if the OSCE model was the result of a unique historical and geopolitical development, many of its key elements, like the ten principles of security, its use as an inclusive platform for dialogue or the CSBMs could be adapted to other situations. He concluded by emphasizing the importance of establishing a link between the discussion and the conclusions drawn at the Conference and the work carried out by the OSCE Asian Contact Group in Vienna to ensure more results-oriented co-operation and more effective responses to common security threats.

On behalf of the Government of the Republic of Korea, **Ambassador Song** expressed his appreciation to all the participants for their contributions and interactive dialogue throughout the Conference; participants had repeatedly referred to Europe and Asia's shared duties and responsibilities in addressing diverse global security issues. He noted that issues like foreign fighters, cybersecurity, disaster reduction and countering violent extremism and radicalization could not be put on hold. He highlighted the increasing co-operation between the OSCE and its Asian Partners, emphasizing that only co-operative security would prevail over the emerging and evolving threats in both regions. He emphasized the Republic of Korea's respect for human rights in connection with the peaceful resolution of the North Korea issue, which was influenced by their own experience while also inspired by the OSCE spirit. In that context, he further highlighted that his Government's NAPCI was strongly oriented towards the OSCE's tools and institutions, focused on trust building and aimed to promote a culture of dialogue in the Northeast Asian region. He stressed that NAPCI

regarded nuclear safety as one of the most relevant and urgent areas given the high number of nuclear power plants in the Northeast Asian region, 22% of the world's total, and in view of the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear accident, which had once again demonstrated the difficulties of properly handling nuclear accidents. He reiterated the Republic of Korea's proposal for a Northeast Asia Nuclear Safety Consultative Body as part of NAPCI's efforts and looked forward to the OSCE's advice on Europe's experiences in the area of nuclear safety, which comprised energy security, disaster management and cybersecurity. While Asia could not directly import European security mechanisms, it could examine the applicability of some tools that had proven useful in Europe in taking a "building block" approach. He concluded by reiterating the Republic of Korea's commitment to co-operative security and the strong bonds his country felt with the OSCE.

As Chairperson of the Asian Contact Group, **Ambassador Greminger** expressed his gratitude to all the speakers and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea for their hospitality and highly valuable assistance in organizing the 2015 OSCE Asian Conference. He noted that the ministerial opening session, attended by the Foreign Ministers of the Republic of Korea, Thailand and Switzerland had sent a strong signal as regards the importance of multilateral security efforts both in Asia and Europe. Switzerland had a durable commitment to the promotion of dialogue and co-operation between the OSCE and Asian multilateral frameworks. He noted that the Serbian OSCE Chairmanship and the Swiss Chairmanship of the Asian Contact Group had agreed to issue a perception paper setting out the main conclusions of the conference. While several speakers had mentioned regional mechanisms for discussing security issues in Asia, ASEAN was one of the few mechanisms that offered an institutional framework with a solid secretariat, regular meetings and joint information networks. Also, as Minister Burkhalter had said, co-operative security was complementary to bilateral security arrangements. Many speakers had referred to the need to build bridges between the OSCE and ASEAN, the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), the East Asia Summit (EAS), the Trilateral Cooperation Secretariat and NAPCI. He also welcomed Thailand's offer to serve as a bridge between ASEAN/ARF and the OSCE.

He underlined five concrete actions that could be considered. First, a more active partnership between the OSCE and its Asian Partners in the area of counter-terrorism could involve promoting exchanges between counter-terrorism centres, co-operation in capacity-building endeavours with regard to foreign terrorist fighters, permanent mechanisms for co-operation between secretariats, promoting voluntary reporting in the OSCE Security Committee by Asian Partners on the implementation of UNSCR 2178 and encouraging OSCE participating States and Asian Partners to contribute to the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF). Second, more regional and cross-regional co-operation in the area of disaster risk reduction could involve collaboration between the OSCE and Asian institutions and conferences like the Asian Disaster Risk Reduction Centre, the upcoming Regional Economic Cooperation Conference for Afghanistan, the ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance, the Aarhus Centre in Jakarta and NAPCI. Third, there was great interest in and potential for inter-regional exchange in the field of ICT/cybersecurity, an area in which the Asian region, in particular the ARF, was more advanced in practical co-operation among practitioners. A regular exchange between the OSCE and the ARF on cybersecurity could be established, coupled with joint activities like exchanges on CBMs, joint capacity-building efforts and table top exercises. He reiterated that Switzerland would be ready to contribute to a seminar addressing those issues and he also welcomed the proposal made during the Conference that the OSCE and ASEAN join the Global Forum on Cyber Expertise. Fourth, he noted that the side event on NAPCI had drawn attention to an impressive range of

potential fields for expanded co-operation with the OSCE and he highlighted the proposals to invite the OSCE as a dialogue partner to the next High-level Intergovernmental Meeting of NAPCI and to organize a track 1.5 meeting between NAPCI and the OSCE, similar to those conducted with NATO and the EU. Fifth, he advocated more structured co-operation between the ARF and the OSCE on conflict prevention and conflict management issues, ideally in the form of staff-to-staff talks and a political dialogue among the Chairmanships.

5 List of participants

State/Organization	Family Name	Fist Name	Title/Position
OSCE Participating States			
Germany	Prügel	Peter	Ambassador/Regional Director for Asia and the Pacific
Germany	Schubart	Marie	Research Assistant
USA	Byrnes	Kate Marie	Deputy Permanent Representative of U.S. to the OSCE
USA	Han	Shelly Heald	Policy Advisor, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
USA	Killion	David	Senior Senate Staff Representative
USA	Greco	Monica	Political Officer
USA	Yee	Samuel	Political Officer, U.S. Embassy Seoul
Austria	Bertagnoli	Elisabeth	Ambassador to the Republic of Korea
Belgium	Georges	Bruno	Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Belgium to the OSCE
Belgium	Bontemps	François	Ambassador, Embassy of Belgium in Korea
Belgium	Preud'home	Laurent	Deputy Head of Mission, Embassy of Belgium in Korea
Bulgaria	Andonov	Petar	Ambassador to the Republic of Korea
Canada	Trottier	James	Counsellor
Canada	Alnwick	Marie	Second Secretary
Canada	Song	Anna	Sr. Political Affairs Officer
Canada	Dubuc	Richard	Chargé d'affaires a.i.
Denmark	Stubbe Teglbjærg	Lea	First Secretary, Embassy of Denmark in Seoul
Denmark	Hammer Holm	Lasse	Political and Public Diplomacy Intern, Embassy in Seoul
Spain	Novarro	David	Deputy Head of Mission, Embassy in Seoul
Finland	Heimonen	Matti	Ambassador, Embassy of Finland in Seoul
Finland	Säilä	Melissa	Deputy Head of Mission and First Secretary

France	Goulange	Pierre	Counsellor, French Embassy to the Republic of Korea
United Kingdom	Dalgleish	Andrew	Deputy Head of Mission, British Embassy, Seoul
United Kingdom	Walker	Alisdair	Political Counsellor, British Embassy, Seoul
Greece	Sourvanos	Dionisios	Ambassador, Embassy in Seoul
Greece	Pentarvani	Valia	Deputy Head of Mission, Embassy in Seoul
Hungary	Csaba	Gábor	Ambassador of Hungary to Korea
Hungary	Sárdi	Károly	Deputy Head of Mission, Embassy of Hungary to Korea
Italy	Mercuri	Sergio	Ambassador, Embassy of Italy in Seoul
Italy	Cannito	Francesco	First Secretary, Embassy of Italy in Seoul
Latvia/EU	Kozlowski	Tomasz	Ambassador, Head of the Delegation of the EU to the Republic of Korea
Latvia/EU	Martins	Ana Beatriz	First Counsellor / Head of Political Section, Delegation of the EU to the Republic of Korea
Latvia/EU	Poupeau	Vincent-Guillaume	Counsellor, EU Delegation to the Republic of Korea
Latvia/EU	Osorio	Esther Valerie	Attaché
Latvia/EU	Jekelfalussy	Surena	Political Trainee, EU Delegation to the Republic of Korea
Mongolia	Baasanjav	Ganbold	Ambassador of Mongolia
Mongolia	Baasanjav	Munktuvshin	Attaché, Embassy of Mongolia
Montenegro	Perovic	Branko	Ambassador
Netherlands	Lammertink	Marten Laurent	Second Secretary
Poland	Wasilewska	Joanna	Head, Political and Economic Section, Embassy in Seoul
Romania	Ene	Daniel	Minister Counsellor - Deputy Chief of Mission
Russian Federation	Chekhlan	Daniil	Second Secretary, Embassy to the Republic of Korea
Serbia	Žugić	Vuk	Ambassador, Chairperson of the Permanent Council
Serbia	Kazazovic	Zoran	Ambassador
Serbia	Pančeski	Miodrag	Deputy Head of the Permanent Mission of Serbia
Serbia	Dordevic	Aleksandar	Counsellor, Embassy in Seoul

Slovakia	Koncal	Martin	Counsellor
Sweden	Chu	Mattias	Counsellor / Political Affairs, Embassy of Sweden in Seoul
Switzerland	Burkhalter	Didier	Minister of Foreign Affairs
Switzerland	Reding	Jörg Alois	Ambassador of Switzerland to the Republic of Korea
Switzerland	Greminger	Thomas	Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Chair of the Asian Contact Group
Switzerland	Laggner	Benno	Ambassador, Head of the Division for Security Policy
Switzerland	Matyassy	Johannes	Assistant State Secretary for Asia / Pacific
Switzerland	Fanzun	Jon Albert	Chief of Staff to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Switzerland	Descoedres	Nicolas	Counsellor and Deputy Head of Mission
Switzerland	Renz Schwalbach	Marcus Tilman	Deputy Chief of Information to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Switzerland	Wälchli Giraud	Doris	First Secretary
Switzerland	Jeanty	Bernard	Defense Attaché
Switzerland	Meier-Nidecker	Thomas Michael	Deputy Regional Coordinator South East Asia and Pacific
Switzerland	Ahn	Hyeon-Ju	Economic and Political Affairs Officer
Switzerland	Salama	Nadia	Academic Intern, Swiss Embassy in Korea
Czech Republic	Husak	Tomas	Ambassador, Embassy in Seoul
Turkey	Okçal	Arslan Hakan	Ambassador to the Republic Of Korea
Turkey	Kaan	Başkurt	Counsellor / Turkish Embassy in Seoul
Ukraine	Marmazov	Vasyl	Ambassador of Ukraine to the Republic of Korea
Asian Partners for Co-operation			
Afghanistan	Sayeb	Mohammad Saleem	Ambassador, Afghanistan Embassy in Seoul
Afghanistan	Firozi	S. Jamaluddin	Second Secretary, Embassy in Seoul
Australia	Paterson	Bill	Ambassador, Australian Embassy to the Republic of Korea
Australia	Kewalram	Ravi	Minister and Deputy Head of Mission, Australian Embassy to the Republic of Korea

Australia	Hwang	Eugenie	Second Secretary, Australian Embassy & Permanent Mission to the United Nations, Vienna
Japan	Muto	Akira	Deputy Director-General, European Affairs Bureau, MFA
Japan	Maehira	Tomoyoshi	Official, European Policy Division, European Affairs Bureau, MFA
Japan	Iseki	Yaoshiyasu	Counsellor, Embassy of Japan in Seoul
Japan	Uetake	Fumi	Third Secretary, Embassy of Japan in Seoul
Japan	Saito	Kaoru	Director of International Cooperation Division, Disaster Management Bureau, Cabinet Office
Republic of Korea	Yun	Byung-se	Minister
Republic of Korea	Song	Young-wan	Ambassador, Permanent Representative of the Republic of Korea to the OSCE
Republic of Korea	Kim	Hong-kyun	Deputy Minister for Political Affairs
Republic of Korea	Shin	Dong-ik	Deputy Minister for Multilateral and Global Affairs
Republic of Korea	Choi	Sung-joo	Ambassador for International Security Affairs
Republic of Korea	Yoo	Dae-jong	Director General for International Organizations Bureau
Republic of Korea	Shin	Beomchul	Director General for Policy Planning Bureau
Republic of Korea	Lee	Chul	Director for International Security Division
Republic of Korea	Kim	Dong-jo	Director for Policy Planning and Coordination Division
Republic of Korea	Won	Doyeon	Director of Multilateral Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Assistance Division
Republic of Korea	Kwon	Jae-hwan	Counsellor of the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Korea to the OSCE
Republic of Korea	Park	Byung-ho	Second Secretary, International Security Division
Republic of Korea	Park	Hyo-in	Second Secretary, International Security Division
Republic of Korea	Kim	Do-hwan	Second Secretary, Policy Planning and Coordination
Republic of Korea	Lee	Jinmoon	Second Secretary, Multilateral Development Cooperation Division
Republic of Korea	Jang	Juyeon	Third Secretary, International Security Division
Republic of Korea	Jung	Eui Jung	LSDR, Korea Arms Control Verification Agency (KAVA) of Ministry of National Defense (MND)

Thailand	Patimapragorn	Tanasak	General, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs
Thailand	Vipattipumirates	Kallayana	Chief of Staff
Thailand	Vichit-Vadakan	Winn	Col., Office of the Minister
Thailand	Khantachai	Arkhet	Capt., Office of the Minister
Thailand	Svetanandana	Panupong	Capt., Office of the Minister
Thailand	Wannamethee	Sek	Director-general, Department of Information
Thailand	Chansuriya	Rattikul	Director-general, Department of European Affairs
Thailand	Chindawongse	Suriya	Deputy Director-General, Department of ASEAN Affairs
Thailand	Chandraramya	Pannabha	Director, Department of European Affairs
Thailand	Chindawongse	Chatvadee	Counsellor, Department of European Affairs
Thailand	Phuaknuem	Kanok	Second secretary, Department of Information
Thailand	Songkaeo	Ploysiri	Third secretary, Department of Information
Thailand	Kowattanawaranon	Kulkaew	Attaché, Department of European Affairs
Thailand	Srichaiwan	Nichakan	Attaché, Department of ASEAN Affairs
Thailand	Singhara Na Ayudhaya	Kulkumut	Ambassador, Royal Thai Embassy, Seoul
Thailand	Chulajata	Sumate	Minister Counsellor, Royal Thai Embassy, Soul
Thailand	Chaiyasan	Achara	First Secretary, Royal Thai Embassy, Seoul
Thailand	Thammanuruk	Sathitkul	First Secretary, Royal Thai Embassy, Seoul
Thailand	Chuchinnawat	Thitiporn	First Secretary, Royal Thai Embassy, Seoul
Thailand	Rujithanawat	Sudchai	First Secretary, Royal Thai Embassy, Seoul
Thailand	Eun-jin	Kim	Assistant, Political Section, Royal Thai Embassy, Seoul
Thailand	Jin-hee	Yoo	Assistant, Information and Cultural Affairs Section, Royal Thai Embassy, Seoul
Thailand	Hyeon-ju	Jung	Assistant, Protocol Section, Royal Thai Embassy, Seoul
Thailand	Upapong	Liliya	Reporter, National Broadcasting Services of Thailand

Thailand	Tangjai	Ratthapol	Cameraman, National Broadcasting Services of Thailand
Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation			
Israel	Levy	David	Deputy Head of Mission, Embassy of Israel
International Organizations			
CICA	Gong	Jianwei	Ambassador , Executive Director of CICA
CICA	Yang	Xiufang	Members of Professional Personnel
CICA	Mamdouhi	Farhad	Member of Professional Personnel
CICA	Pandey	Avinash	Consultant at the CICA Secretariat
ICRC	Volpin	Gianni	Representative, ICRC in Republic of Korea
ICRC	Yoon	Nara	Political Advisor,
NATO	Alberque	William	Head, Arms Control and Coordination Section, Political Affairs and Security Division
TCS	Iwatani	Shigeo	Secretary General, Trilateral Cooperation Secretariat
UNHCR	Hebecker	Dirk	UNHCR Representative in the Republic of Korea
UNODC	Solongo	Dolgor	Officer-in-Charge, Implementation Support Section I
Guests of the Host Country			
Turkic Council	Marzakhanov	Yedil	Project Director
Malaysia	Roziac	Fairuz	
NGOs/Academia			
ICU	Ueta	Takako	Ambassador, Professor, Dr. International Christian University, Japan
Friedrich Naumann Foundation, Germany	Richter	Lars-Andre	Dr., Resident Representative
OSCE Institutions			
OSCE Secretariat	Zannier	Lamberto	Secretary General
OSCE Secretariat	Tanner	Friedrich	Senior Adviser to the Secretary General

OSCE Secretariat	Wuchte	Thomas Anthony	Head on Anti-Terrorism Issues
OSCE Secretariat	Hiller	Ben	Cyber Security Officer
OSCE Secretariat	Sacchetti	Sandra	Acting Head of External Co-operation
OSCE Secretariat	König	Marietta	External Co-operation Officer
OSCE Secretariat	Szymanski	Aldona	Senior External Co-operation Assistant