

Approaches to Economic and Environmental Policy in OSCE Field Missions

The economic and environmental activities of OSCE field missions are, on the one hand, imbedded in the general OSCE responsibility of promoting security and co-operation in Europe, and on the other, in the special task of field missions to implement conflict management, including early warning, conflict prevention, conflict mediation and post-conflict rehabilitation.

A preliminary reference to this relationship is made because the conflict and security element of OSCE activities is of fundamental importance for further discussion on approaches to economic and environmental policy in field missions. In the past few years, this point in particular has been debated repeatedly in the missions and with the Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities as well as with the delegations of the participating States. This topic was dealt with at the 1999 OSCE Summit in Istanbul and is regularly on the agenda of the OSCE Economic Forum in Prague, as it was on the occasion of its ninth annual meeting in May 2001. In the following, this discussion will be supplemented with a point of view from the field missions.

The Basic Focus

Concepts on general policy approaches of the OSCE and its field activities have been discussed in detail in past years and recorded in the various documents of the Organization.² Most recently they were again raised in the "Charter for European Security" (Istanbul, November 1999). Presumably, the easiest way to describe them would be: "promotion of security *through* co-operation". In general, the field mission mandates drawn up by both the host countries and the OSCE are drafted with this in mind, although in a very broad manner.

Furthermore, the issue of practical policy implementation through OSCE field missions has basically been on the agenda for a long time. This has not only been true for economic and environmental issues. However, in these areas it has been given a high focus. Views range from concentrating exclusively

1 Between 1996 and 1999, the author was Economic Adviser and later Deputy Head of the OSCE Mission to Ukraine. He was the Head of the Mission's field office in Simferopol, the capital of the Crimean Autonomous Republic. He has worked in the OSCE Office in Yerevan since the beginning of 2000 as an Economic and Environmental Adviser. The opinions set out in the following article are those of the author.

2 The documents mentioned in the following article can be found at the websites of the corresponding international organizations.

on diplomatic conflict management, on the one hand, to emphasizing developmental co-operation as well as related project implementation, on the other.

One of the most fundamental questions being asked currently on OSCE field activities is the following: Should they be restricted conceptually to diplomatic mediation or should they include successively non-diplomatic areas of promoting security, that is the traditional field of developmental co-operation?

A Comprehensive Security Concept and the Issue of Implementing It in the Economic and Environmental Dimension

With the establishment of the Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities as well as the setting-up and/or increase in personnel of the economic and ecological sections of field missions, OSCE policy has been further institutionalized and emphasized politically also with respect to the second basket of the Helsinki Final Act ("Co-operation in the Field of Economics, of Science and Technology and of the Environment"). This also became apparent through the increase in the number of conferences and numerous OSCE project activities in the economic and environmental field. In this, the view is again demonstrated that one can and must pursue a course of long-term stabilization - and thus self-sustainable security - through the joint promotion of sustainable economic, social and environmental development over and above so-to-speak the original "immediate" conflict management. The security-related interpretation of the corresponding basic principles of the United Nations for sustainable development (*inter alia* stated in the "Agenda 21" at the UNEP Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro, 1992) have been reflected in this as well.

Therefore, the security relevance of economic and environmental questions is undisputed. However, now as in the past, there are still discussions within the OSCE on the opportunities and means to implement this security concept in OSCE field missions.

Outside Perceptions of the OSCE Economic and Environmental Dimension

External observers - especially the governments of its participating States and in particular those of host countries - have the impression that the activities of the OSCE and its field missions fit into the joint efforts of national and international organizations. There is an urgent need to co-operate regularly also in the economic and environmental area. On this level, it is indispensable the OSCE develops its own political instruments. This is particularly important in view of the fact that the international community must make efforts to avoid duplication and competition. Defining OSCE economic and environmental policy measures is a necessary prerequisite for the conceptional divi-

sion of labour between our Organization as a diplomatic institution, on the one hand, and international financial institutions and organizations for developmental co-operation, national development agencies and international and national NGOs, on the other. Defining how diplomatic conflict management, financial commitment and international developmental co-operation complement and supplement each other, has to be done in general terms as well as with a concrete reference to each specific host country.

Both characterizations are not only important for the manner in which our Organization views itself, but also have an effect on the perceptions our national and international partners have of the OSCE. At the same time, it is remarkable how the selection of their own specific political instruments has up to now had an effect on the internal definitions of political focus and thus political objectives. Moreover - externally - this process also affects the more or less security-related reputation the OSCE enjoys and the place of individual field missions within international field activities. The causes of OSCE political intervention and the means for policy implementation most often directly show that it is a provider of security services in the diplomatic arena. In conjunction with this, it is of primary importance for the OSCE that it develops decisive criteria for the implementation of concrete activities in its field missions.

The Conflict and/or Security Relevance as the Essential Criterion for OSCE Field Activities

The Conflict and/or Security Relevance of the Political Authorization of OSCE Field Missions

In general, security dangers or open conflict in potential host countries or the regions bordering them have been the starting point for negotiating the establishment of OSCE field missions. Thus, in the above-mentioned "Charter for European Security" (point 38), contributing to peaceful conflict settlement as well as explicitly verifying and/or assisting in fulfilling bilateral and multilateral agreements are the stated tasks of field missions. In addition, references to a series of the most general issues allow a very broad, not directly conflict-linked interpretation of the OSCE role in promoting peace.

The fact that in specific mission mandates, concrete conflict situations are only partially mentioned or there is no mention of the conflict at all, generally takes into consideration the mediatory and thus neutral nature of each individual field mission. This is also a reflection of the consensus principle of OSCE decision-making processes directed towards political balance. This principle, by the way, holds considerable potential for achieving lasting conflict resolution and self-sustainable stability.

Although the location of OSCE field missions has not been limited to a specific region (in the applicable documents), they have up to this point only been set up in countries in post-socialist space. Consequently the following generalizations can be made about the important circumstances surrounding conflict management in the missions especially with regard to the economic and environmental dimension:

- *Conflicts and threats to democracy.* The disintegration of multi-ethnic states is the main reason why visible as well as latent security threats have emerged in countries hosting OSCE missions. Conflicts have been based to a large extent on mistrust between ethnic or religious groups. They have local or regional character. After the democratic uproar of the 1980s and early 1990s, they have often served as a justification for a return to rigid administrative methods and limitations on civil freedoms. Both have direct implications for stabilization and security in the economy and the environment above and beyond the policy and policy-making level.
- *Fluctuating political orientations as a security risk.* Alongside incessant disputes on whether to take a new Western orientation or return to Eastern European traditions, our host countries are making efforts, at least in appearance, towards democratic transformation and the rule of law. Constitutionally anchoring and formally establishing democratic institutions is one of the basic characteristics of post-socialist states. At least public consciousness in these countries has been raised on the value of human rights, minority rights as well as civil rights and freedoms. In the meantime they have become a point of reference in public thought that cannot be ignored. Nonetheless because of chronic indecisiveness on the consistent development of formal democratic constitutions, a considerable political conflict potential with the associated economic security dangers has emerged.
- *Fluctuations in economic transformation as a security risk.* Like their political transformations, the economic transformations in our host countries are often characterized by indecision. Reform initiatives directed towards the creation of market economies have not been pursued consistently. The disintegration of entire economic areas, the loss of traditional markets and finally the global slump in economic activity has, due to inconsistent economic policy reforms in many post-socialist states, not been counteracted but rather worsened, particularly in post-Soviet space. In addition, because these countries have not taken consistent steps at the state level to stabilize their economies, existing risks have increased even more.

- *Depressed mood of the general public as a security risk.* Their mixed, but overwhelmingly negative experiences with political and economic reforms have led the populations of host countries to become exceedingly sceptical as well as economically passive. The lack of economic vision has led progressively to increasing social apathy. Social decline of large sections of the population leading to mass impoverishment has created a poverty mentality and emigration psychosis, which in turn cause more poverty. The lack of individual economic initiatives has in many ways turned into a serious security risk affecting the larger economy.
- *Inefficient public and economic administration as a security risk.* Authoritarian administrative forms, authorities with limited capacity and power (including the regional and local self-governing bodies), complicated administrative procedures, little adherence to the law in public and economic life, the linkage between state authority and economic power, corruption, nepotism and clannish relations, limited competition, little transparency, the drifting of large sections of the economy into black or grey markets - these are more or less the significant framework conditions in many of the countries hosting OSCE missions. State administrations often lack the capability, as well as sometimes the intention, to implement planned stabilization of the economy. The public does not apply enough pressure to ensure that there is more consistency, adherence to the law and transparency and/or participation in economic policy decisions.
- *Environmental problems as security risks.* On the whole, capital assets, which have hardly been renewed and are seriously ailing - like abandoned industrial plants, deficient technology and goods as well as antiquated infrastructures - are not just a legacy of socialist economies. They are potential sources of environmental threats and thus physical security risks. This also includes uncontrolled urban development as well as environmental burdens resulting from the impoverishment of the population. Special security dangers, particularly in an international context, arise from unequal regional allocation of, as well as overexploitation and wasting natural resources.

These and similar potentials for insecurity in economic and environmental issues should be taken into consideration in the conflict management and security policy calculations of OSCE field missions. Field activity task areas can be directly derived from them related to each host country. In the long run, they are important for the distribution of tasks between the OSCE and our international partners.

It is perfectly clear that because many post-socialist countries in economic and social terms have been re-categorized as belonging to the group of traditional developing countries or even lagging behind this group, many international organizations have inevitably directed their activities to the area of developmental co-operation.

International financial organizations like the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund or the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, technical aid programmes like the European TACIS programme as well as international development organizations like the various sections of the United Nations, especially UNDP and UNHCR, as well as national development agencies (e.g. USAID, DFID or the German GTZ) and various relief organizations, all deal with the areas of reform aid, development as well as humanitarian and social aid and post-conflict rehabilitation. Human rights, civil rights and environmental organizations provide support in their own political areas.

This is an especially important starting point - i.e. international organizations assuming responsibility for political fields - for the formulation of OSCE policy, for defining the role of OSCE field missions, and for the development of criteria for OSCE field activities as well as the form their implementation takes. If one takes OSCE security policy history into consideration alongside its personnel and structural capacities as well as the tasks in its mandates, it is easy to draw the conclusion that also and particularly the economic and environmental dimension of the OSCE and its field missions should be based more consistently on a clearly formulated and clearly perceptible focus on security.

One should consider exerting an influence on security-relevant topics at levels other than the central OSCE institutional level alone. It should be stated more clearly than before that the conflict- and/or security-related aspects in each individual host country are the most important, the OSCE's very own special criteria for developing its activities. Outside the framework of security-building political activities, development work (including introductory projects) should be left to the national and international organizations, which have dealt with them traditionally. There are several arguments that speak for this:

1. *Use of the security-related OSCE profile and image.* The OSCE is the key provider of non-military security services. It is seen as the number one address for European conflict and security activities, not least by our colleagues in the foreign ministries of the OSCE participating States as well as by international partner organizations. The OSCE is predestined

- to effect security policy resolutions, especially through diplomatic channels.
2. *Use of the security-policy reputation of the Organization and its field missions.* Because of the solid reputation of our Organization and the diplomatic status of its field missions, the latter have direct access to the highest political and administrative bodies of their host countries as well as a broad spectrum of people participating in public life. Field missions have been integrated in the political dialogue of international agencies in the field, thus the most important prerequisites exist for them to influence and mediate comprehensively on security policy.
 3. *Use of OSCE security-policy infrastructure and personnel resources.* The OSCE has the corporate know-how, solidified infrastructures and personnel resources at its disposal to deal with security-relevant topics. These are its comparative advantages. There are direct lines of communication to parties outside the Organization through the Permanent Council and the Conflict Prevention Centre. They enable the Organization to provide information quickly, which is an important part of conflict management, as well as facilitating direct discussions between the field missions and interested governments and organizations.
 4. *Avoiding duplication and international competition.* Dealing with the same or similar topics in more than one international organization has often led to duplication in their work. Therefore in the long-term, the OSCE will also have to compete with other organizations on who will handle which topic and also in particular vie for funding. In this regard, if the OSCE were to limit itself to security-relevant questions, possible problems in international co-operation could be avoided, especially because as a rule the important decision-makers within the international community have always simultaneously been donor countries. These could implement security policy more precisely in host countries - also in financial terms - by targeting issues as well as using the appropriate implementing organizations.
 5. *Promotion of international complementarity and co-operation.* Finally, clear conflict- and security-relevant contour lines in OSCE policy fields are the necessary basic framework that suggests mutual complementarity to our international partners and make co-operation with OSCE field missions plausible in the long term.

The Functions of Field Missions within the OSCE Economic and Environmental Dimension

Within the general framework of OSCE field missions' activities, there are also conflict management functions for their economic and environmental sections as part of the implementation of security policy for a specific coun-

try or region. Depending on the specific political situation in a country or region, they act as

1. *mediators* directly in conflict resolution, for example in the course of drawing the lines of economic responsibility between the conflict parties or in the regulation of resource utilization;
2. *a public podium* for the discussion of conflict- and security-relevant topics from the economic and environmental area;
3. *a connecting link* in the international dialogue on security and co-operation, primarily between conflict parties, institutions influencing conflict and security as well as generally interested national institutions and personalities on the one hand, and central OSCE institutions and other OSCE missions, international organizations and interested governments on the other;
4. *lobbyists* for conflict- and security-relevant national and international topics, primarily in the interest of the subsequent implementation of concepts and projects by international partner organizations;
5. *co-ordinators* of international reform advisory services, financial, developmental and other relief in conflict- and security-relevant situations, of course only to the extent that our partners on the ground consider this desirable and expedient;
6. *multipliers* of conflict- and/or security-relevant know-how, primarily in political and legal advisory services through in-house personnel as well as to an even greater extent by establishing contacts with international bodies;
7. *observers* of the general conflict- and/or security-relevant economic and environmental situation taking into account the special interests of our target group in the foreign ministries and certainly only to the extent that the corresponding economic and environmental analyses are not being conducted regularly in other institutions.

If an approximation of these approaches is pursued, one can derive general principles from the above-mentioned functions for including specific topics in the OSCE field missions' task catalogue.

Principles for the Selection of OSCE Field Activities in the Economic and Environmental Area

Alongside the security aspect, the realization that, ultimately, we can only be politically effective in the long term by co-operating with our partners, should be at the centre of our considerations. This is not only true for OSCE activities such as the promotion of democracy or the protection of human rights, but also in the economic and environmental area. The success of

OSCE security policy is based on its co-operation with its partners - on the national as well as the international level. In view of this, the following principles are suggestions for OSCE field activities in the economic and environmental area:

1. indirect or direct relevance to the conflict and/or security;
2. intention to promote the political significance of the conflict parties or sides effecting the conflict;
3. intention to obtain a response from the public on the national and regional levels, primarily with a view towards our dialogue partners, who form opinions as well as making and implementing decisions in both government as well as non-governmental areas;
4. intention to obtain a response at the international level, primarily with a view to the regional headquarters of international organizations that are interested in economics and the environment as well as the governments of OSCE participating States;
5. facility in transferring initial activities to other national and international partner organizations.

To complete the story, a reference must be made to the fact that there are discussions on the negative effects resulting from allegedly exaggerated approaches to conflict and/or security situations in OSCE field activities. The primary focus has been on the negative implications of this for the investment climate of the host country in question. Certainly, these arguments cannot simply be denied, however, they do not offer much help in dealing with the causes of the existing potential for instability.

The Range of Instruments Used in OSCE Field Activities in the Economic and Environmental Area

Also in the economic and environmental area, OSCE field activities should be limited primarily to mediatory and advisory functions. They should be directed towards influencing public opinion as well as political decision-making and implementation so that security is further promoted. Taking into account the premises of conflict and security affairs, and bearing in mind the actions of our partner organizations, the range of instruments should be adapted to the prospects of and the requirement for international division of labour.

Diplomatic Activity in the Economic and Environmental Area

The most important instruments of diplomatic activities in OSCE field missions are the political dialogue with personalities from governments and

NGOs, offering or facilitating legal and political advice, including large sections of the public in the discussion on security-related issues, establishing national and international contacts, placing our topics in the national and international media, as well as communicating with business and academic circles. The most important forms of communication are private talks, round tables, seminars and media appearances.

By communicating internally through their system of regional networks, OSCE field missions can also promote certain topics across borders.

Moreover distributing background analyses within the OSCE, to the delegations of the participating States as well as to the circle of international organizations, is one of the most effective means of setting international accents and maintaining a political focus.

An important field has been opened in the implementation of political positions that have been co-ordinated with governments and international organizations. Co-ordinated action by international partners can and must increasingly achieve practical importance, also with respect to the authorities in our host countries, especially in the transfer of international law into national legislation as well as eventually introducing it as binding law. This must be accorded more significance with a view to generally promoting security either accompanying or following direct conflict management.

In addition to the above-mentioned diplomatic measures and public relations work, activities based on the implementation of programmes and projects should be included in the range of instruments of OSCE field activities only as a supplementary measure. In the following, this will have to be dealt with once again specifically because in contrast to the views expressed above, it is actually project work that has had an increasing influence on the daily work of field missions.

Project Work and OSCE Field Activities in the Economic and Environmental Area

For many different reasons, OSCE activities are increasingly evaluated based on the traditional criteria of our international partner organizations. In fact, it evaluates itself based on these criteria. Thus the number of projects and their budgets are frequently used to assess the political significance and influence of the missions. Therefore it is not surprising that the implementation of projects is increasingly understood as being *the* instrument to carry out OSCE policy. This may stem from the experiences made in traditional development relief work. Not least, this impression has also been strengthened by the fact that the contents of OSCE seminars and progress reports are frequently project-related. These attitudes have been explicitly expressed in the current discussions being conducted with the delegations of the participating States in Vienna on the future of the OSCE economic and environmental dimension.

As a consequence the emphasis on project work in particular results in the necessity that missions make a continuous effort to obtain the corresponding financing and moreover mission members become considerably absorbed by project work or even overburdened. Furthermore bureaucratic project management and necessary negotiations with potentially interested partners also place demands on the capacity of OSCE central institutions.

At the same time, in view of the growing number of project activities, there are increasing reservations about an all too clear shift in political accents to the disadvantage of the real diplomatic range of OSCE instruments. From a totally practical viewpoint, there is a danger that mission catalogue topics would be reduced to certain specific project titles.

Topics of OSCE Field Activities in the Economic and Environmental Area

The topics of OSCE field activities in the economic and environmental area have emerged from the general work of the missions towards long-term conflict resolution and self-sustainable stability. A wide range of topics were discussed at the OSCE Conference on Economic Co-operation in Europe (Bonn, 1990). However, with a view to our field activities there is an urgent need to adapt these to the conflict and security-policy conditions in the field. Above all one should concentrate on subjects like the following:

1. *the regulation of direct conflict-relevant economic and environmental issues* like the definition of administrative responsibilities, the utilization of infrastructures and natural resources;
2. *post-conflict and -catastrophe rehabilitation* in the areas affected, including the reintegration of formerly deported persons and their families, refugees and victims of catastrophes;
3. *the general democratization of economic and environmental issues and making them subject to law*, especially through promoting transparency in public affairs, restructuring economic and environmental administrations and the public services (anti-corruption measures play a special role in the public eye);
4. *building public confidence and surmounting social lethargy* especially by including the public in decision-making processes and implementing decisions;
5. *the improvement of the general investment climate* and finally economic stabilization and resuscitation - in particular, this also has implications for restructuring public administration;
6. *regional stability and rapprochement* through cross-border co-operation and agreement on utilization of infra-structures and natural resources;
7. *sustainable development with a special focus on environmental issues*, e.g. post-industrial rehabilitation, the protection, the efficient utilization

- and the possible recycling of limited natural resources - this includes giving priority support to individual environmental initiatives;
8. *international security involvement*, primarily by considering financial support, through development activities and advisory services.

Partners in OSCE Field Activities in the Economic and Environmental Area

The goals of OSCE field activities in the economic and environmental area should be: introducing OSCE basic values and know-how into the dialogue between the parties to a conflict and/or those having an effect on security, making national partners more aware of above all security-relevant problems, giving them advice on solving these and supporting conflict management and sustainable security policy by finding international partners. As has already been emphasized, the efficiency of OSCE policy is dependent primarily on its being effectively conveyed to disseminators.

In this sense, also in the economic and environmental area, OSCE field activities are not a substitute for national responsibility. Field activities serve to promote or co-ordinate international relief so that it is transformed into national self-help.

The most important OSCE partners in the economic and environmental area include the following:

The host governments: Host governments of OSCE field missions are the most important of the OSCE partners. They and their administrations are the most important initiators and actors of post-socialist political and economic reforms. Most often they include the political elites as well as the leading economic circles of a country. It is not seldom that they have direct power over the central branches of the economy. From a social viewpoint they are often the real beneficiaries of the post-Soviet status quo, so to speak, the first addressees of reform. In its security-oriented endeavours, the OSCE is thus often faced in central administrative circles with divided interests, as soon as these endeavours go beyond the direct context of the conflict. Nevertheless supporting administrative reforms and not least forceful persuasion towards implementing democratic principles and the rule of law in the offices of the public authorities is a primary concern in the economic and environmental activities of the OSCE missions.

Regional governments and organs of local self-government. The work with regional governments and local self-government includes dealing with economic and social conflict potential on the margins of state government and supporting them through "stabilization from below". The mostly spontaneous decentralization of state governments, the shifting of economic and social developments from the cities out to the provinces, the return of large industrial to small- and medium-sized production capacities, in particular agrarian activities and crafts, migratory movements, infra-structural and environmental

problems all comprise the backdrop for this. Setting up contacts between selected security-relevant provinces and communities - or those that are seen as such - with central state administrations and international organizations, the development of administrative activities and finally the integration of international consulting and development work can be made the tasks of OSCE field missions. The re-establishment of cross-border contacts between former conflict areas can with the co-operation of neighbouring field missions be readily promoted.

Non-governmental organizations. In the non-governmental area, primarily the employer organizations and other umbrella organizations, not least the trade unions, are partners who are to be won over for OSCE security matters with regard to economic subjects. They support conflict resolution and stabilization by specifically representing economically important social groups. Difficulties in communication occur when a field mission - because of the cultural traditions of the host country - is not familiar with the host country's economic life. This is also true of economic organizations that do not devote very much attention to OSCE subjects and have reservations about intervention from parties outside the business world.

Traditionally, in the area of environmental protection, non-governmental organizations have become involved. Co-operation with them is not a problem and in the interests of both parties involved. Good work has been accomplished primarily in the national implementation of international law regulations on environmental protection as well as in campaigns covering specific topics of special interest to the public.

International organizations. The international financial institutions and the organizations for developmental co-operation, foreign development agencies and international non-governmental organizations belong to a special group among our partners. From the perspective of the field missions, it seems meaningful and necessary, to on the one hand, politically support the efforts of our international partners, and on the other, to leave to them the practical implementation of concrete development programmes and other projects. The main priority of our dialogue should be complementarity. This is all the more true for the economic and environmental area, because here the security relevance of OSCE intentions is not evident to many of our partners.

It should be a matter of concern in the co-operation with our partner organizations that their capacities are channelled to make them implementing organizations promoting security.

For this it seems worthy of consideration that regular meetings be held between the Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities and representatives of international organizations, in the case this is not already taking place. Forms of co-ordination between the OSCE and international organizations and interested governments can be found in the so-called Platform for Co-operative Security or the Stability Pact for South

Eastern Europe. Here economic and environmental discussions could be introduced.

In addition, one should work towards the introduction of recommendations by OSCE field missions into the decision-making processes of other international organizations. This would give the OSCE and its field missions the opportunity to influence international decision-making more precisely with respect to our host countries.

Above all by establishing requirements for financial assistance and development relief, OSCE recommendations could be implemented more consistently. Naturally governments are devoting special attention to this point.

Central institutions of the OSCE and the delegations of the participating States. Without a doubt, the use of OSCE infrastructures offers OSCE field missions the capacity to promote security dynamically. High-ranking contacts can be created without any trouble through the Permanent Council in Vienna between the field missions and the delegations of participating States and their governmental and non-governmental decision-makers. Conveying political signals can occur directly through the Secretary General and the Conflict Prevention Centre. Thus it is not difficult to direct the attention of interested governments and organizations towards specific topics. By and large, the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly could also be used more intensively than before in this respect.

Regular OSCE meetings - above all the yearly OSCE Economic Forum in Prague and the preparatory seminars leading up to it - have proved valuable as an arena for the dialogue on security-related economic and environmental issues. For field missions, this offers an opportunity to set accents on national and regional security matters in international discussions and to create necessary connections. It is to the special credit of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities that non-governmental organizations and academic circles have been invited expressly to attend these discussions. It is urgently recommended that the Office of the Co-ordinator be given considerably more responsibility than before to work towards long-term co-operation with government institutions of the participating States as well as the headquarters of international partner organizations and co-ordinating between them all. In the particular interest of the field missions, this must also occur simultaneously with rapidly making contacts with those working on these topics in the international arena. The political campaigning work of the missions must be backed by the Office of the Co-ordinator.

Furthermore, it is urgently necessary that the Co-ordinator's Office influence the mission activities conceptually, especially by developing a common understanding of economic and environmental security approaches and the range of tools for their implementation. One must work towards making the OSCE economic and environmental dimension clearly recognizable within the framework of international co-operation.

OSCE field missions in neighbouring countries. As has already been mentioned, the OSCE is in a position, through its network of field missions, to go beyond the national framework to influence regional security, cross-border co-operation and regional rapprochement. In this case, the regional offices of international and non-governmental organizations are our national and regional partners.

The academic community. The academic communities of our host countries are taking part in OSCE seminars and round tables with great interest - frequently within the framework of non-governmental organizations. They are valuable disseminators of our security policy endeavours. Therefore we are devoting our attention to economic and environmental professors, although the departments of political science are the more obvious partners for co-operation with the OSCE. Field mission members are taking part in academic life by offering lectures. In the missions, for the first time internships are being offered for students and university graduates.

In the area of economic and environmental consulting, one could consider long-term co-operation with academic personnel from the Co-ordinator's Office who would concentrate on special topics. In this or a similar manner, the results of academic research could be used directly for OSCE field operations and field missions could request individual consultations from the appropriate experts.

Scientific analysis of OSCE economic and environmental activities by academic institutions like the Hamburg Centre for OSCE Research (CORE) would also have a positive effect on the missions.

The mass media. In general, it has not proven easy to interest the media in economic and environmental topics, which lie outside direct conflict circumstances and spectacular incidents. Consulting work is very difficult to market. It is often the case that extensive efforts must be made to find competent journalists and then have them focus on the mission activities in the long-term.

Taking into consideration the TV habits of the public as well as an interest in making it easier to allow journalists to do their work, it seems advisable to work towards standardizing the presentation of OSCE field operations in the media of each individual host country. The same is true for specific topics and events. Putting together seminars and round tables under the heading "Dialogue towards Security and Co-operation" - in each case supplemented by a national feature - has been very successful.

In its internal structural policy and personnel policy the OSCE should further pursue the development of capacities in its media work. Along their sections covering "Press and Information" as well as "Training" could be enough to strengthen the field capacities in this area.

Economic Circles. Avoiding outside influence and undesired public awareness may not just be a distinctive feature of the economic circles in our host countries. Nonetheless, keeping a relatively persistent low profile with regard

to the general public has been inevitably intensified there by the fact that large sections of public and economic life have continued to distance themselves from the law. It is not seldom that profit is gained - in the truest sense of the word - through lack of reform, conflict potential and political insecurity - a circumstance often intensified by a passive public. Of course this significantly restricts the fields of co-operation from the start. Additionally, even in more open economic circles there is little understanding for the role and instruments of the OSCE in the political promotion of economic stabilization. The interests of small- and medium-sized companies do not often go beyond the horizons of their own branches. First contacts barely go beyond original economic interests.

In co-operating with the influential economic circles of their host countries, OSCE missions therefore are considerably dependent on co-ordinating their choice of topics with the financing and implementation activities of other international organizations. Without the corresponding material support, the economic and environmental campaign work of the OSCE will only hear a distant echo from the business world.

From the perspective of OSCE field missions, a clear focus on conflict and security policy topics are an urgent prerequisite for long-term effective co-operation with national and international partners. In view of the further transformation of the OSCE, this framework for the substance and the instruments of OSCE field activities should also be placed in the economic and environmental dimension.