

Kurt P. Tudyka

The Greek OSCE Chairmanship 2009

Greece, a member of NATO and the EU, succeeded Finland to the OSCE Chairmanship in 2009. Thanks to the 2007 decision to postpone Kazakhstan's Chairmanship, this role fell to the Hellenic Republic a year earlier than had been intended. Just less than five months after the Five-Day War between Russia and Georgia in August 2008, and against the background of the other ongoing regional conflicts and the continual postponement of attempts to solve the OSCE's organizational problems, the omens for an effective working year were not good. The Greek Chairmanship entertained no illusions about the seriousness of the situation.

The Chairmanship Programme

On 15 January 2009, right at the start of her traditional inaugural speech to the Permanent Council to announce the new Chairmanship's programme, the Greek Foreign Minister, Dora Bakoyannis, stressed the need "to consider new ways to build indivisible security".¹ This encapsulated in essence all that Greek OSCE diplomacy would have to do in 2009 to keep the OSCE charabanc – still rickety following the emergency repairs carried out by her Finnish predecessor – on the road.

Immediately upon assuming the Chairmanship in Helsinki, she had explained that Greek diplomacy was ready and willing to explore the possibility of holding a meeting of participating States, "when the time is deemed as appropriate", to give all the participating States an opportunity to focus on "our common security", with no strings attached as regards timeframe and procedures. She refrained from defining any concrete goals of the "common" and "indivisible" security that was her desideratum.

Further points in her programme included a commitment to finalizing deliberations on enhancing the legal status of the OSCE, working on securing "practical results" in dialogue on Nagorno-Karabakh, the future of the OSCE presence in Georgia, creating clarity over the future of the CFE Treaty, developing the OSCE's border security regime – with a priority on engagement with Afghanistan – and promoting the rule of law.

Announcements of this kind have long been part of the standard repertoire of every Chairmanship, and they express no more than a dutiful willingness to fulfil the everyday commitments involved in leading the Organization

1 OSCE, *Opening Speech by the Chairperson-in Office H.E. the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece Mrs. Dora Bakoyannis at the Permanent Council of 15th January 2009*, CIO.GAL/3/09, 15 January 2009.

for a year. Yet, the Chairperson stressed one special feature of her country's working programme: She wished to develop the concept of "greening the OSCE", i.e. making it more environmentally friendly. As well as improving the Organization's daily work, this would include the promotion of "a promising new generation of environmental programmes".

The "Analytical Concept Paper" distributed the day after the Chairperson's programmatic speech was given the rather overblown title "The Future of the OSCE Viewed as Thesis and Antithesis in Harmony", the first section of which had the alliterative heading "Synergy, Symmetry, Strategy".² Bakoyannis's predecessors had already made use of such superficially impressive formulae, such as the Spanish Chairmanship's "Priority, Perseverance, and Patience" in 2007. That this "trptych of S's" is little more than an empty formula, however, becomes obvious when one considers the wording of the Concept Paper itself: "*Symmetry* of efforts in dealing with new 'asymmetric threats' as well as older challenges. *Synergy* of all participating States in promoting our co-operative, indivisible and cross-dimensional security. *Strategy* on ways we can better achieve our common goal of guaranteeing indivisible stability, security and co-operation throughout the OSCE area." The Analytical Concept Paper merely reiterates that which the Chairperson-in-Office had presented at the Permanent Council the day before; it lacks both analysis and anything that deserves the name of "concept".

Activities of the Chairperson

The activities undertaken by the Greek Chairperson-in-Office, like those of her predecessors, were revealed by her appearances before the Permanent Council, whose weekly sessions were chaired by her Permanent Representative, Mara Marinaki, as well as at the OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum, the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, and within the OSCE Troika. She visited the capital cities of participating States, other international organizations, including the UN and EU, and various OSCE field presences. It was her task to formally appoint heads of OSCE missions and other OSCE agencies. The work of the Special Representatives may also be considered as indirect expression of her effectiveness.³

At her inaugural speech to the Permanent Council, the Chairperson-in-office announced that she would work closely with all the OSCE field oper-

2 OSCE, *Analytical Concept Paper on the Programme of the Greek OSCE Chairmanship 2009. The Future of the OSCE Viewed as Thesis and Antithesis in Harmony*, CIO.GAL/2/09/ Rev.1, 16 January 2009.

3 The discussion below is based upon the following Reports of the Chairperson-in-Office to the Permanent Council, among others: CIO.GAL/16/09, 29 January 2009; CIO.GAL/26/09, 26 February 2009; CIO.GAL/39/09, 26 March 2009; CIO.GAL/55/09, 30 April 2009; CIO.GAL/89/09, 8 July 2009; CIO.GAL/90/09, 8 July 2009; CIO.GAL/104/09, 4 August 2009; CIO.GAL/116/09, 10 September 2009; and CIO.GAL/154/09, 22 October 2009.

ations.⁴ She demonstrated this intention immediately the next day by taking part in a meeting with the heads of field operations and institutions on 15 January in Vienna.⁵ Yet her visits remained selective. Her first trip to a mission took her to Pristina, on 3 February; the day before, she had held talks with the Serbian government in Belgrade. Alongside Spain, Slovakia, Cyprus, and Romania, Greece is one of the EU states that do not recognize the independence of Kosovo. A few days later, she visited Albania for talks with representatives of the government and the chairs of parties represented in parliament.

Her next visit to a country with an OSCE mission was to Georgia on 23 March. In early July, she spent a day each in Azerbaijan and Armenia, where she spoke with government representatives; she did not visit Nagorno-Karabakh. Contrary to her expressed intentions, she did not visit the other countries with OSCE presences, such as Moldova and the Central Asian republics. Her Special Representative, Charalampos Christopoulos, visited Moldova and Transdniestria on 24 and 27 February, respectively, and was involved in efforts to resolve the conflicts on other occasions, too. He worked particularly hard with regard to the conflicts in Georgia.⁶

The Chairperson-in-Office made her first visit following Greece's assumption of the Chairmanship to Moscow on 21 January, where she held talks with the Russian Foreign Minister on Georgia, European security, strengthening the legal status of the OSCE, the OSCE's engagement with Afghanistan, and election observation. A further month passed before she met the US Secretary of State and members of Congress in Washington, D.C.

On 7 February, she took part in the Munich Security Conference, where she made the case for the OSCE as the most suitable forum for the necessary dialogue on European security.⁷ On 19 February, she spoke at the Winter Meeting of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly in Vienna. During her trip to the USA, she spoke before the UN Security Council on 27 February.⁸ In mid-March, she chaired the meeting of the OSCE-EU Troika in Brussels, which dealt with the topics of Georgia, the Western Balkans, and European security. There, she expressed once again her willingness to organize an informal meeting of ministers in the summer in Greece.

In late March, she attended the Afghanistan conference in Den Haag. At the OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum in Athens on 18-20 May, she appealed to the participating States to strengthen their co-operation on mi-

4 Cf. *Opening Speech by the Chairperson-in Office*, cited above (Note 1), p. 3.

5 Cf. SEC.GAL/17/09, 11 February 2009.

6 Visits to Tbilisi and Tskhinvali on 12 and 13 January, 30 and 31 March, 16 and 18 June, from 1-3 October; from 20-21 October. He was denied access to Tskhinvali during his visits of 4-6 May and 10-12 August. He took part in the international discussions on the conflict that were held in Geneva.

7 Cf. CIO/GAL/21/09, 12 February 2009.

8 Cf. *Address by the Chairperson-in-Office to the United Nations Security Council*, given on 27 February 2009, CIO.GAL/29/09, 23 March 2009.

gration policy. On 26 June, a day before the informal OSCE meeting on Corfu, she took part in a G8 meeting in Trieste.

The most significant event during the Greek Chairmanship, aside from December's Ministerial Council meeting, which effectively brought the Chairmanship to an end, was the informal two-day meeting of representatives of the participating States on Corfu, which was attended by no less than 51 foreign ministers.

At the start of the 27-28 June meeting in Corfu, the Greek CiO and host spoke as follows:

It is symptomatic of the current situation that, while the need for a European security dialogue at the highest level is quite obvious, the participants have yet to reach agreement on the aims, content and framework of such a dialogue.

Our intention today is to rise above the blame-game and reach out for common solutions in order to provide a targeted impulse to the dialogue on European security.

[...]

Over the last ten years, European security policy has been increasingly dominated by unilateral and frequently confrontational approaches. [...] The loss of trust has been enormous. Even if European security relations should now improve, it may take years to overcome all the problems and conflicts that have been created.⁹

The eleven points listed by the Chairperson-in-Office in her concluding statement at the meeting of OSCE foreign ministers on Corfu read, on the whole, like a list of well known complaints and a remarkably candid admission of failure, or, at best, a promise to make good upon wearisomely repeated goals whose realization has still not been achieved.

Here it is remarkable that the Chairperson-in-Office described the OSCE in relatively positive terms as a "natural forum" for any future dialogue, in which other organizations could be involved in a complementary fashion within the framework set out by OSCE relevant documents such as the 1999 Platform for Co-operative Security, as the latter had been conceived of for an entirely different purpose. As an initial step, the Chairperson-in-Office proposed that all participating States should explore ways for a "more structured dialogue".¹⁰

In this way, the Greek Chairmanship was successful in its efforts to convene an informal meeting of participating States – one that, moreover, did not conclude entirely without commitments, but rather achieved an agree-

9 *Informal ministerial meeting held in Corfu, Greece, on 27 and 28 June 2009*, CIO.GAL/86/09, 30 June 2009.

10 Cf. *Corfu Informal Meeting of OSCE Foreign Ministers on the Future of European Security, Chair's Concluding Statement to the Press*, 28 June 2009, CIO.GAL/83/09, at: <http://www.osce.org/cio/37803>.

ment to continue the discussions that had been commenced. This was given the elegant name of “Corfu Process”.¹¹ The Greek Chairmanship intended this process to perform a threefold purpose: “first, to maintain and improve existing structures; second, to enhance co-operative security across the OSCE area; and third, to achieve the maximum implementation of existing commitments, including on conflict resolution and arms control”.¹²

The Chairperson-in-Office flew directly from the meeting with her fellow OSCE foreign ministers to Vilnius, where she attended the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly’s Annual Session on 30 June. Giving a sort of half-term report on her year in office before the assembled parliamentarians, she stressed three areas to which the Greek Chairmanship was devoting particular time and resources. These included the question of strengthening energy security on the basis of the “OSCE Strategy Document for the Economic and Environmental Dimension”, as adopted at the 2003 Maastricht Ministerial Council. To this purpose, the Chairmanship had issued invitations to a conference held in Bratislava in June on “Strengthening Energy Security in the OSCE Area”. There was no more talk of “greening the OSCE”. The second area in which the Chairmanship had “sought tirelessly” to create lasting stability and security in Georgia. This concerned, above all, the continuation of the OSCE presence in Georgia, which was ultimately not secured. The third task that the Chairmanship had set itself was a high-level dialogue on European security. In this regard, Mrs Bakoyannis could speak of success.

Unusually, in the year of Greece’s Chairmanship, neither of the main sessions of the OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum took place in Prague. The January meeting was held in Vienna, while the second convened in Athens in March. The topic of the forum was “Migration management and its linkages with economic, social and environmental policies to the benefit of stability and security in the OSCE region”.

The position of Chairperson-in-Office changed hands during the year, following the parliamentary elections that were held in Greece in October. The incumbent Foreign Minister, Dora Bakoyannis, departed from her national office and thus from the position of Chairperson-in-Office on 5 October. A change of government during the Chairmanship disturbs the flow of work towards a given goal, if it doesn’t disrupt it completely. The transfer of power mid-year certainly cannot have a positive effect on the leadership of the Organization, as previous cases demonstrate.¹³ Mrs Bakoyannis’ successor as Foreign Minister and hence also as Chairperson-in-Office was the new

11 It has become fashionable in international diplomacy to use this vague word to disguise the emptiness of a policy while making it appear important; see, for example, the Helsinki Process, the Budapest Process, the Bologna Process, the Barcelona Process.

12 *Statement by the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office Foreign Minister of Greece H.E. Mrs. Dora Bakoyannis*, 18th Annual Session of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, Vilnius, 30 June 2009.

13 It has happened six times so far: Czechoslovakia in July 1992; Italy in May 1994; Austria as early as February 2000; Portugal in April 2002; the Netherlands only in December 2003; and Finland in April 2008.

Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Greece, George Papandreou, who appointed Dimitris P. Droutsas to be his “Alternate Foreign Minister” and Special Envoy of the Chairman-in-Office. The other leading Greek OSCE personnel continued in their positions.¹⁴ In the final quarter, the Greek Chairmanship undertook no activities of note, with the exception of the important, yet compulsory preparation and implementation of the Ministerial Council Meeting in Athens on 4-5 December 2009.

Already a month before the end of the Greek Chairmanship, Dimitris P. Droutsas had to admit to the Permanent Council that the Greek Chairmanship’s efforts to deal with the Georgia question had been unsuccessful.¹⁵ Efforts to retain a cross-dimensional OSCE presence in the region had been tireless, but consensus proved impossible to reach, whereupon one of the OSCE’s largest field operations had to be closed. The Chairmanship nonetheless continued to support the status-neutral compromise proposal as the basis for a future resolution.

At the same time, the OSCE, together with the UN and the EU, co-chaired the “Geneva International Discussions”, which had produced concrete results by establishing the “Incident Prevention and Response Mechanisms”.

The Athens Ministerial Council

The 17th Meeting of the OSCE Ministerial Council, which was held in Athens on 1 and 2 December 2009, was adjudged by OSCE Secretary General Marc Perrin de Brichambaut to be different from all its predecessors as a result of the scale of the challenges that had emerged in recent years. He referred to the divergent interpretations of fundamental OSCE principles, the use of force on the continent, the open wounds of still unresolved conflicts, and the effects of the financial and economic crisis.¹⁶

Opening the Meeting as Chairman-in-Office, Greek Prime Minister Papandreou stated that the Greek Chairmanship had been driven by a single principle: “the determination to serve as an ‘honest broker’ to facilitate a renewed dialogue between the participating States”¹⁷ in order to show them the

14 Charalampos Christopoulos as Special Representative for Protracted Conflicts and Mara Marinaki as Chairperson of the Permanent Council.

15 Cf. OSCE, *Address by the Special Envoy of the Chairman-in-Office H.E. Alternate Minister for Foreign Affairs Mr. Dimitris P. Droutsas*, Special Session of the Permanent Council, Vienna, 6 November 2009, CIO.GAL/173/09, 6 November 2009, p. 3.

16 Cf. Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, *Report by the OSCE Secretary General, Ambassador Marc Perrin de Brichambaut, at the 17th OSCE Ministerial Council Meeting*, Athens, 2 December 2009, MC.DEL/46/09, 1 December 2009, p. 1, at: <http://www.osce.org/cio/40631>.

17 *Address by the OSCE Chairman-in-Office, Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Hellenic Republic, to the Opening Session of the Seventeenth Meeting of the OSCE Ministerial Council*, MC.DEL/8/09, 1 December 2009, in: Organization for Secur-

way to a new future. He described the meeting in Corfu as “a ray of hope in a stormy year”, continuing: “The discussions that followed in Vienna at the ambassadors’ level aimed to identify the main elements pertaining to the foundations for security in the Euro-Atlantic area, the challenges arising across the three OSCE dimensions, and obstacles to the implementation of commitments undertaken by the participating States.” The next step in the process was to decide “how to determine concrete objectives, themes, modalities and benchmarks”.

The Chairman-in-Office noted that there had been “some positive movement in settling longstanding obstacles to co-operative security in our region”. The great importance of the “bold political decisions taken by Turkey and Armenia” was identified. This rapprochement, however, was to prove short lived.

He also mentioned the meeting in Munich at the end of November between the presidents of Armenia and Azerbaijan under the auspices of the OSCE Minsk Group, an informal meeting in Vienna in November of the “5+2” negotiating format aimed at resolving the Transdniestria conflict, and the eight rounds of discussions held in Geneva on security and stability in Georgia, which were co-chaired by the OSCE, together with the UN and the EU. He admitted, however, that the Chairmanship’s efforts had suffered a setback with the closure of the OSCE Mission to Georgia. Rather unexpectedly, Papandreou declared that the economic and environmental dimension had been “at the heart of the Greek Chairmanship’s priorities”, referring solely to the “productive discussions” on the cross-dimensional aspects of migration that had been held at the 17th Economic and Environmental Forum.¹⁸

The Ministerial Council adopted 16 Decisions and five Ministerial Statements or Declarations. This was a fair number in comparison to previous Ministerial Councils.¹⁹ The Ministerial Declarations dealt with the so-called Corfu Process, the 65th anniversary of the end of the Second World War, the 25th anniversary of the adoption of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and nuclear non-proliferation. The single Ministerial Statement concerned the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict.

Looked at more closely, these results are revealed to be extremely insubstantial; part whistling in the dark, part stale self-praise expressed in hackneyed phrases. How many times have the bulk of Ministerial Council attendees heard it all before? Even more telling is to consider what could not be concluded owing to a lack of consensus.

ity and Co-operation in Europe, Seventeenth Meeting of the Ministerial Council, 1 and 2 December 2009, Athens, 2 December 2009, pp. 51-55, here: p. 51.

18 Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 52-54.

19 Cf. Kurt P. Tudyka, In the Absence of a Summit, Is the Ministerial Council Going Round in Circles? in, Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg/IFSH (ed.), *OSCE Yearbook 2007*, Baden-Baden 2008, pp. 53-63, here: pp. 55 and 58.

The Chairman-in-Office himself raised the question of the OSCE's legal status, which has been an ordeal for the Organization over the years and was once again left unresolved in 2009.²⁰ There was no declaration on Moldova. It proved impossible to overcome differences of opinion over questions of conventional arms control so as to restore the viability of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE Treaty). The Ministerial Council could not reach agreement on any of the six decisions the Chairmanship proposed in the human dimension, on issues that included freedom of the media, freedom of expression, the rule of law, and trafficking in human beings.

Just the subheading of the Ministerial Declaration on the OSCE Corfu Process is enough to reveal the modest ambition, maybe better characterized as mere "intention", to address the critical neglect of once noble principles, norms, and goals: "Reconfirm-Review-Reinvigorate Security and Co-operation from Vancouver to Vladivostok".²¹

This Declaration opens – cryptically or treacherously – by declaring that "the vision of a free, democratic and more integrated OSCE area [...] free of dividing lines and zones with different levels of security remains a common goal". Here one may ask, "Is the vision the goal?" And what does "more integrated" mean? Insightfully, the ministers go on to note that "to achieve this goal, much work remains to be accomplished". There then follows a list of the OSCE's failings: The principles of the Helsinki Final Act and the OSCE commitments "are not fully respected and implemented"; the use of force is still considered an option for settling disputes; the danger of conflicts between states has not been entirely eliminated, and there have been armed conflicts "even in the last decades"; tensions continue to exist and many conflicts have not been resolved. This admission of failures in the past is followed by the unsurprising acknowledgement that the stalemate in conventional arms control, the resolution of differences of opinion in this area, the return to full implementation of the CFE Treaty regime, and the "restoration of its viability" urgently require a concerted effort by the States Parties to the Treaty. The participating States' common achievements in the areas of rule of law, human rights, and fundamental freedoms need to be "fully safeguarded and further advanced".

This litany of confession and acknowledgement culminates in a declaration resembling the solemn vow of a scout troop: "Our highest priority remains to re-establish our trust and confidence, as well as to recapture the

20 For a detailed chronology of the OSCE's ordeal on this question, see: Sonya Brander, Making a credible case for a legal personality for the OSCE, in: *OSCE Magazine* 1/2009 pp. 18-22; Ida van Veldhuizen-Rothenbücher, Legal personality of the OSCE: Quo vadis? in: *OSCE Magazine* 1/2009, p. 23.

21 *Ministerial Declaration on the OSCE Corfu Process: Reconfirm-Review-Reinvigorate Security and Co-operation from Vancouver to Vladivostok.*, MD.DOC/1/09, 2 December 2009, in: Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Seventeenth Meeting of the Ministerial Council, cited above (Note 17), pp. 3-4.

sense of common purpose". The meeting of ministers that was held on Corfu is already lauded as a "milestone" along this road.

Finally, the Platform for Collective Security is invoked as the basis for dialogue with relevant organizations and institutions within the OSCE, which is the appropriate forum for this dialogue, and the proposal of the incoming Kazakh Chairmanship to hold an OSCE Summit in 2010 is noted "with interest". To this plan is immediately attached the reservation that such a high-level meeting would necessitate "adequate preparation in terms of substance and modalities".

The remaining 16 Ministerial Council Decisions contain reaffirmations and reconfirmations of intentions previously announced. Nearly half of them are self-referential or organizational in nature, namely the Decision on furthering the Corfu Process,²² the Decision on the future orientation of the economic and environmental dimension,²³ the Decision on the OSCE High-Level Conference on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination,²⁴ the Decision on the OSCE Chairmanship in the year 2012,²⁵ the Decision on the granting of the status of Partner for Co-operation to Australia,²⁶ the Decision on the time and place of the next meeting of the OSCE Ministerial Council,²⁷ and the Decision on issues relevant to the Forum for Security Co-operation.²⁸

Nine Decisions concerned the external effectiveness of the Organization in the area "between Vancouver and Vladivostok", namely the Decision on further OSCE efforts to address transnational threats and challenges to security and stability,²⁹ the Decision on further measures to support and promote the international legal framework against terrorism,³⁰ the Decision on migration management,³¹ the Decision on strengthening dialogue and co-operation on energy security in the OSCE area,³² the Decision on women's participation in political and public life,³³ the Decision on enhancing OSCE efforts to ensure Roma and Sinti sustainable integration,³⁴ the Decision on combating hate crimes,³⁵ the Decision on travel document security – ICAO Public Key Directory,³⁶ and the Decision on small arms and light weapons and stockpiles of conventional ammunition.³⁷

-
- 22 MC.DEC/1/09, in: *ibid.*, pp. 15-16.
23 MC.DEC/4/09, in: *ibid.*, p. 23.
24 MC.DEC/10/09, in: *ibid.*, p. 38.
25 MC.DEC/12/09, in: *ibid.*, p. 41.
26 MC.DEC/13/09, in: *ibid.*, p. 42.
27 MC.DEC/14/09, in: *ibid.*, p. 43.
28 MC.DEC/16/09, in: *ibid.*, pp. 46-47.
29 MC.DEC/2/09, in: *ibid.*, pp. 17-20.
30 MC.DEC/3/09, in: *ibid.*, pp. 21-22.
31 MC.DEC/5/09, in: *ibid.*, pp. 24-26.
32 MC.DEC/6/09, in: *ibid.*, pp. 27-29.
33 MC.DEC/7/09, in: *ibid.*, pp. 30-31.
34 MC.DEC/8/09, in: *ibid.*, pp. 32-34.
35 MC.DEC/9/09, in: *ibid.*, pp. 35-37.
36 MC.DEC/11/09, in: *ibid.*, pp. 39-40.
37 MC.DEC/15/09, in: *ibid.*, pp. 44-45.

In all likelihood, it was the uncontroversial substance of these Decisions that allowed the participating States to entirely refrain from interpretative statements and dissenting opinions. Nonetheless, a number of participating States did make separate statements, namely Sweden on behalf of the European Union, the Russian Federation, which also spoke in the name of Armenia, Belarus, and three Central Asian countries, Denmark, also on behalf of NATO, and Ukraine, Moldova, and Georgia.

In his concluding remarks, the Greek Chairman-in-Office claimed, with feeling, that “the adoption, after seven years, of a political declaration”³⁸ represented the opening of a new chapter for the OSCE. That is clearly an exaggeration. While it is true that the Ministerial Council had not adopted a general declaration since its meeting in Porto in 2002,³⁹ nonetheless, in contrast to previous general political declarations, this latest document consists of – besides insubstantial avowals of the Organization’s own importance (as endlessly and ritually repeated elsewhere) – essentially nothing more than an expression of the intention to continue to talk about the open questions of European security in the immediate future – an intention ultimately given the designation – flattering to Greek ears – of “Corfu Process”.

Conclusion

As already mentioned, thanks to the postponement of Kazakhstan’s bid, Greece had to assume the Chairmanship of the OSCE a year earlier than expected. The Chairperson of the Permanent Council, Mara Marinaki, has eloquently described the logistical challenges of preparing for the Chairmanship year.⁴⁰ On the whole, the problems of European security that had existed at the start of the year were unresolved, even unchanged, at its conclusion. Disappointment and displeasure outweighed any satisfaction brought by the launch of the “Corfu Process”.

Marking time, jogging in circles, running up a dead-end road: All remain forms of motion. Perhaps in this way the Greek Chairmanship has at least enabled the OSCE to “warm up”. But now finding the way forward has become a goal in itself.

38 Concluding Remarks by the OSCE Chairman-in-Office, Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Hellenic Republic, to the Closing Session of the Seventeenth Meeting of the OSCE Ministerial Council, MC.DEL/73/09 of 2 December 2009, in: *ibid.*, pp. 62-64, here: p. 63.

39 Cf. Porto Ministerial Declaration, Responding to Change, in: Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Tenth Meeting of the Ministerial Council, Porto, 6 and 7 December 2002, MC.DOC/1/02, Porto, 7 December 2002, reprinted in: Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg/IFSH (ed.), *OSCE Yearbook 2003*, Baden-Baden 2004, pp. 421-455, here: pp. 422-425.

40 Cf. Mara Marinaki, “Difficult and frustrating, but in the end, a marvellous journey”: That was 2009, in: *OSCE Magazine* 1/2010, pp. 8-11.