

David Buerstedde

Managing Migration – The OSCE’s Response

Introduction

Migration has emerged as an increasingly prominent issue on the OSCE agenda as a consequence of the recent massive influx of refugees and migrants into Europe. Yet this was not initially the case. Unlike specialized agencies such as the United Nations (UN) High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the International Organization for Migration (IOM), which undertook humanitarian efforts on the strength of their specific operational capabilities and expertise, the OSCE had no direct role in addressing the immediate challenges presented by the 2015-16 surge in refugee and migrant flows in the OSCE region. The closest the OSCE came to frontline involvement was along what became known as the “Balkan route”. Here, OSCE field operations, foremost among them the Mission to Skopje and the Mission to Serbia, monitored the impact of the flows of migrants and refugees on the security, human rights, and rule of law situation in their host countries and acted as a conduit of information between people on the move, citizens, civil society organizations, and national authorities, including law enforcement agencies.

With the crisis in and around Ukraine occupying centre stage on the OSCE agenda last year, the OSCE foreign ministers who gathered in Belgrade in December 2015 for the annual Ministerial Council were not quite ready to embrace the migration issue politically within the OSCE context, precluding the possibility of assigning any particular role to the Organization on that occasion. Given the OSCE’s diverse membership and the consensus rule for decision-making, a more visible, timely, and strategic OSCE response to these unprecedented developments was simply not on the cards.

This situation began to shift in 2016 with the realization that managing migration and refugee flows and their impact will be a defining global and European security challenge for many years to come. Following an internal stocktaking of existing OSCE migration-related activities and a comprehensive discussion within a dedicated format, OSCE participating States have developed greater awareness of how the OSCE *acquis* covers migration and where the OSCE possesses relevant expertise that could potentially help to address a variety of short-, medium-, and long-term migration-related chal-

Note: The opinions expressed are those of the author alone. This contribution has previously been published by Friedrich-Ebert Foundation as part of an international policy analysis series on the impact of large-scale movements of migrants and refugees. The author is grateful to Sandra Sacchetti, Emiliano Alessandri, and Mary Albon for their helpful comments and valuable advice.

lenges. In anticipation of further guidance by the OSCE participating States, the OSCE Secretariat, institutions, and field operations have adapted their work on migration-related issues, adding emphasis where this seems opportune and making proposals on possible future engagement in this area. Most of these changes take the form of ad hoc initiatives that remain within their existing mandates while seeking synergies with relevant external partners. There is now a much broader understanding that the OSCE can and should contribute to addressing the challenges of migration. As a result, the OSCE's role is likely to come into clearer focus in the coming months, as the Organization defines its place alongside other multilateral actors.

Migration in the OSCE Context

The impact of the current levels of migrant and refugee flows on individual OSCE participating States varies from case to case, but the political, social, and economic repercussions are being felt throughout the OSCE area, and bring with them significant risks for regional and global stability. Populist movements and nationalist political groups are spreading fear and xenophobia, polarizing societies, and making it even harder for European governments to develop effective, responsible, and co-ordinated responses. People-smuggling and trafficking in human beings continue to put individuals at great risk and provide organized crime with huge profits.

The 57 OSCE participating States and eleven Mediterranean and Asian Partners for Co-operation include key countries of origin, transit, and destination. Among those most affected, Turkey still hosts the world's largest refugee population of more than 2.5 million people. Germany, one of the preferred destination countries, has given refuge to over a million individuals, while Sweden and Austria have taken in slightly more in proportion to the size of their populations. In relative terms, Jordan, an OSCE Partner for Co-operation, is sheltering a million refugees, equivalent to over ten per cent of its population of 9.5 million. Meanwhile, Greece, in the midst of an existential economic and financial crisis, continues to struggle to provide accommodation to refugees and migrants who continue to arrive, but are now barred from moving on to other destinations. Italy has recently seen a resurgence in the number of people arriving on its coastlines. In 2015, OSCE participating States along the Balkan route processed hundreds of thousands of migrants moving across their borders. Since the closure of the frontier between Greece and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to most categories of refugees in February 2016 and the EU-Turkey deal in March, the influx has been reduced significantly, but refugees and migrants resorting to people smugglers continue to find ways to circumvent border controls.

Within the geographic boundaries of an area stretching from Vancouver to Vladivostok, other migration flows remain significant. They are part of the

overall picture, though much less discussed. Migration from Latin America to the United States and Canada has played hardly any role in OSCE debates. However, the influx of migrant workers from Central Asia into Russia has on occasion been raised as a concern, particularly since this movement has reversed due to Russia's economic downturn. Hundreds of thousands of migrant workers have returned to their countries of origin in recent years, depriving these economies of much-needed remittances and investment and adding fears to existing concerns about growing instability in parts of Central Asia. Most attention currently remains fixed on the Mediterranean and Balkan routes into Western Europe, as well as on the wars, political upheaval, and crisis-prone areas in the Middle East and Africa. Even though OSCE participating States may have very diverse perspectives on the immediate impact of the phenomenon on their own societies, there is a growing sense that concerted efforts offer the best hope for managing the security issues related to migration and thereby maintaining security and stability across the region.

The first reference to migration in OSCE documents is already found in the 1975 Helsinki Final Act, which included a section on "economic and social aspects of migrant labour". The 2005 Ljubljana Ministerial Council Decision on Migration¹ and the 2009 Athens Ministerial Council Decision on Migration Management² focused squarely on the effective governance of labour migration, which has since developed into an important part of the OSCE's work.³ However, labour migration is only one area of OSCE engagement, albeit one that is highly relevant. The OSCE participating States have adopted commitments and the OSCE has developed specific expertise not only on migration-related issues such as human trafficking, cross-border criminal activities, border management, and police co-operation, but also on protecting human rights and promoting tolerance and non-discrimination. The latter are particularly significant to ensure that responses are centred on the needs and rights of the individuals concerned. More broadly, the OSCE has a track record of working to address sources of insecurity that are the root causes of displacement and migration, including not only conflict, poverty, and human rights abuses, but also climate change and environmental degradation. In various places, whether in the Western Balkans, the Southern Caucasus, or parts of Central Asia, the OSCE has a long track record of working with internally displaced people (IDPs) and refugees, supporting political frameworks and projects aiming at reintegration and return.

1 Cf. Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Ministerial Council, Ljubljana 2005, *Decision No. 2/05, Migration*, MC.DEC/2/05, 6 December 2005, at: <http://www.osce.org/mc/17339>.

2 Cf. Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Ministerial Council, Athens 2009, *Decision No. 5/09, Migration Management*, MC.DEC/5/09, 2 December 2009, at: <http://www.osce.org/cio/40711>.

3 For more information on the OSCE's work in support of labour migration governance, see: <http://www.osce.org/publications/migration>.

Developing a Shared View of the OSCE's Role

Engaging in Structured Debate

The 2016 German OSCE Chairmanship is pushing for an OSCE ministerial decision or declaration on migration at the Ministerial Council in Hamburg (8-9 December 2016) that would acknowledge the link between migration and security and could spell out the OSCE's role in addressing migration-related challenges with greater clarity. At last year's Ministerial Council in Belgrade, the OSCE participating States came close to agreeing on a ministerial declaration. Interest was high, and the 2015 Serbian Chairmanship spared no effort in attempting to build consensus in negotiations that continued to the very end, even though they eventually proved unsuccessful. Apart from issues of substance, the overall political climate in the context of continued fighting in Eastern Ukraine played its part, but so too did completely unrelated matters that were thrown into the negotiation mix and could not be resolved in the final hours of the meeting. A stronger recognition of the multifaceted challenges and a better understanding of existing OSCE engagement in migration-related areas might have helped participating States to tackle their remaining differences earlier in the negotiation process.

The lesson from Belgrade was precisely that a more structured process for discussion would be needed to prepare the way for a more positive outcome the next time round. This process was kick-started by an OSCE Security Days event on "Refocusing Migration and Security – Bridging National and Regional Responses" hosted by the Italian foreign ministry in Rome on 4 March 2016.⁴ The OSCE Security Days, a Track II conference series introduced by OSCE Secretary General Lamberto Zannier in 2012, inject fresh perspectives into the OSCE security debate on emerging trends and priorities for OSCE action. The explicit purpose of the event in Rome was to launch a broad debate about the OSCE's role in addressing migration-related challenges. Keynote speakers included President Gjorge Ivanov of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Professor Jeffrey Sachs, the UN Secretary-General's Special Advisor on the UN's Sustainable Development Goals.

In Rome, the 2016 German OSCE Chairmanship announced its intention to set up an Informal Working Group (IWG) Focusing on the Issue of Migration and Refugee Flows. Chaired on behalf of the Chairmanship by the Swiss Permanent Representative to the OSCE, Ambassador Claude Wild, the IWG immediately took up its work, meeting seven times between 16 March and 27 June 2016. Reflecting the OSCE's comprehensive approach, five main themes were explored during these meetings: protection, combating crime, border management, successful integration, and solidarity and partner-

4 For an account of the proceedings, video footage, supporting documents, and the final report, see: <http://www.osce.org/secdays/2016/migration-and-security>.

ships. The testimony of experts and subsequent discussions involved participating States, Partners for Co-operation, relevant specialized departments and units of the OSCE Secretariat, the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM), the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media (RFOM), the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly (PA), international partner organizations, NGOs, civil society, and academia. In addition to oral presentations, written contributions to the process included non-papers by a number of delegations, a paper by ODIHR, and updates on developments and activities by OSCE field operations and Secretariat units, which covered areas including gender-sensitive migration governance and long-term trends. A full compilation of migration-related activities carried out by the OSCE Secretariat, institutions, and field operations was also produced. Briefings by the IOM and UNHCR, as well as a number of think-tanks were instrumental in informing the debate.

Complementing the discussion in the IWG, other OSCE forums such as the three subsidiary consultative bodies to the Permanent Council (the Security, Economic and Environmental, and Human Dimension Committees) continued to debate migration and refugee issues. Along with other major OSCE events in these three dimensions of security, the OSCE's 2016 Annual Security Review Conference, a three-day event for security dialogue, devoted a special session to migration. In June 2016, the Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities (OCEEA) organized an expert meeting that aimed at defining priority areas for enhancing the OSCE's long-term approach to migration governance from the perspective of the economic dimension of security.⁵

Migration has also been in the spotlight at OSCE PA meetings over the past two years. In February 2016, the OSCE PA's General Committee on Democracy, Human Rights and Humanitarian Questions released a report entitled "Migration crisis in the OSCE area: towards greater OSCE engagement", which was also presented at a meeting of the IWG.⁶ This publicly available report outlines key challenges facing the OSCE area and makes recommendations for OSCE participating States, institutions, and national parliaments. Given the Committee's remit, it focuses mainly on humanitarian and human rights-centred responses.

Civil society also provided input through various channels. With the support of the OSCE Chairmanship, experts from thirty civil society organizations as well as OSCE bodies and institutions met in Berlin in February 2016 for an expert workshop on migration organized by the Civic Solidarity

5 Cf. OSCE OCEEA, *Expert meeting, Enhancing the OSCE long-term approach to migration governance: the OCEEA contribution, Vienna, 17 June 2016, Key Findings*, at: <http://www.osce.org/secretariat/255316>.

6 Cf. OSCE PA, *Migration Crisis in the OSCE Area: Towards Greater OSCE Engagement*, February 2016, available at: <https://www.oscepa.org/documents/all-documents/winter-meetings/2016-vienna-1/reports-1>.

Platform, an advocacy network of civic groups from across the OSCE region. Though not officially connected to the OSCE, the platform has become well known for organizing civil society conferences during and close to the venue of OSCE Ministerial Council Meetings and for addressing recommendations centring on human rights to OSCE participating States and OSCE institutions. Most recently, the platform presented its recommendations on migration and refugees at a side-event of the September 2016 OSCE Human Dimension Implementation Meeting in Warsaw.

From Self-Reflection to Further Action

Throughout this period of reflection, different parts of the OSCE family reacted to the migration and refugee challenge by flexibly refocusing some of their programmes and activities or by intensifying activities already targeting critical issues, for instance in the OSCE's labour migration portfolio. Without spelling out a detailed list of responses or proposals for further action, the following examples give a good indication of the substantive contribution the OSCE could make if the participating States endorsed the Organization's stronger involvement. This year, the OSCE Special Representative and Coordinator for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings undertook a number of fact-finding visits, which took her to a temporary protection facility in Gaziantep, Turkey, in May 2016, and a transit facility in Busmantsi, Bulgaria, in June. Together with parliamentarians from the OSCE PA, she visited reception centres in Lampedusa and Catania, Italy, in June, and migrant and refugee hotspots in Greece in September. Her visits aimed at raising awareness and gathering first-hand impressions that will help her Office to support the early identification and protection of potential victims of trafficking in mixed migration flows. Meanwhile, the Transnational Threats Department has placed added emphasis on migration-related crime and trafficking in human beings in a number of its activities, strengthening co-operation with partner organizations, including the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), IOM, Interpol, Europol, and Frontex. On border management, where the Secretariat is working on creating an informal platform for the exchange of good practices on a wide array of cross-border threats and challenges, migration will feature prominently. Thought has also gone into establishing migration response teams to deliver on-site training to border law enforcement agencies.

Among the OSCE's institutions, ODIHR has developed proposals for mobile teams to monitor the human rights situation at borders and reception centres. On account of its extensive experience with migration governance, ODIHR has considerable potential to contribute to a concerted OSCE response, including by promoting non-discrimination and the integration of migrants and refugees in their host countries. The HCNM has begun to look at the potential implications of large-scale movements of people on societies

with national minorities. On the basis of OSCE commitments such as the 2012 Ljubljana Guidelines on Integration of Diverse Societies,⁷ the HCNM tries to support participating States in implementing policies that promote stability and good inter-ethnic relations. The RFOM has, on various occasions, issued public statements expressing concern about infringements of the rights of journalists to report on matters of public interest, in this case in relation to stories and commentary on migration or refugees.

The expansion of OSCE initiatives and projects to specifically cover migrants and refugees can be envisaged across the board. For example, the Secretariat's Gender Section is considering establishing mentoring networks for migrant and minority women modelled on previous initiatives for women entrepreneurs in South Eastern Europe. In many cases, the OSCE Missions to Serbia and Skopje play a crucial role in the delivery of programmes and projects on the ground.

Raising awareness about current activities and possibilities for future action has been an integral part of the discussion within the framework of the IWG and in other OSCE bodies. This has contributed significantly to an awakening realization of the breadth of existing OSCE mandates in areas closely related to migration (labour migration, border management, countering transnational threats and human trafficking, human rights protection, tolerance and non-discrimination). It has also fostered awareness that the OSCE, thanks to its comprehensive concept of security, is particularly well placed to promote a holistic approach that treats the safety of people on the move and the security of states as mutually supportive goals.

The outcome of the IWG deliberations was summarized in a report by Ambassador Wild, which was presented to a special session of the OSCE Permanent Council on 20 July. The report, which is not a consensus document, is an important reference for internal discussion, but has also attracted interest outside the OSCE and been shared with key partner organizations. It provides an overview of what the OSCE is already doing under existing mandates and advocates a comprehensive role for the Organization. Its recommendations, fifty in total, propose concrete actions at the political, institutional, and technical levels, measures by which the OSCE could contribute to more effective governance of migration and refugee flows affecting the OSCE area – both now and in the future. The report's recommendations are directed at both the participating States and the OSCE Secretariat, institutions, and field operations, which are called upon to study them carefully in terms of feasibility and consistency with existing mandates. The list of recommendations is not exhaustive, and further ideas are certain to emerge. In some cases, the recommendations are already being implemented, but consideration could be given to strengthening relevant activities. Not all proposed actions require additional financial and staff resources, but many do.

7 Cf. OSCE HCNM, *The Ljubljana Guidelines on Integration of Diverse Societies*, November 2012, available at: <http://www.osce.org/hcnm/96883>.

Synergies will need to be considered, as will the risks of duplication with other organizations. In terms of timelines for implementation, short-, medium-, and long-term objectives need to be identified. Finally, many proposed initiatives require different organizational units to work closely within a joint framework of clearly defined roles.

The OSCE Secretariat, institutions, and field operations are currently carrying out an internal assessment of the recommendations, steered by an ad hoc working group set up within the Secretariat in early 2015. This has provided an internal platform for exchanging information on migration-related activities and assessing OSCE options for action. The working group also provided advice and support to successive Chairmanship efforts to encourage discussion among the participating States, particularly this year in relation to the IWG. It is chaired by the Director of the Office of the Secretary General and, at working level, co-ordinated through a focal point within this Office. One of the Wild Report's recommendations is to replace this ad hoc arrangement with a more formal and dedicated support structure led by a Special Representative/Co-ordinator. The Secretariat would ideally like this person to work from within the Secretariat and to be endowed with the authority and resources necessary to strengthen internal coherence and external visibility, thereby enhancing the impact of OSCE migration-related activities.

Strengthening Partnerships

Migration has become a key topic for dialogue with the OSCE's Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation at regular Mediterranean Contact Group meetings in Vienna and the annual OSCE Mediterranean Conference. It is also a common theme in discussions with organizations with a strong Mediterranean focus, such as the Union for the Mediterranean and the League of Arab States. Opportunities for sharing expertise with the Mediterranean Partners are plentiful, but not always taken up. One complicating factor is that the mechanisms to promote such co-operation could be more effective if the OSCE participating States would agree to simplify them. For instance, the arrangement known as the Partnership Fund is mostly used to sponsor the participation of experts from OSCE Mediterranean Partner Countries in OSCE events. Without the unanimous consent by the participating States, it cannot be used to support meetings in the Partner Countries themselves, and the financing of such meetings through the OSCE's unified budget is also precluded.

One idea for visibly enhancing the Mediterranean Partnership foresees the establishment of some sort of OSCE Centre for Mediterranean Security, which would focus on a range of cross-dimensional issues, including migration. A centre of this kind could take on a co-ordination role for OSCE activities targeting the Mediterranean Partner Countries, reach out to stakeholders beyond OSCE circles, and develop joint projects with other regional

organizations, UN agencies and non-governmental actors, including by exploring private sector involvement and support. It could possibly be established in one of the Mediterranean participating States and provide a distinct platform for engaging the OSCE's Mediterranean Partners (Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Morocco, and Tunisia) through dialogue, research, training, and project development.

The establishment of an OSCE Mediterranean Centre, however broad the scope of its activity, could provide an important impetus to strengthen relations across the Mediterranean. The Italian Chairmanship of the Mediterranean Contact Group in 2017 and of the OSCE as a whole in 2018 is likely to further emphasize strengthening links across the Mediterranean region. One noteworthy OSCE project, "Combating Human Trafficking along Migration Routes", launched in Vicenza, Italy, in June 2016 in co-operation with the Italian *Carabinieri* and their state-of-the-art training centre, provides simulation-based training to enhance co-operation among border guards, police officers, prosecutors, labour inspectors, civil society representatives, and other relevant stakeholders from the Mediterranean region. Given the generally heightened interest in fostering closer relations, this project could portend further OSCE engagement with its Mediterranean Partners on a broad array of migration- and non-migration-related issues.

As always, the OSCE attaches great value to maximizing complementarity and co-operation with regional and international organizations and NGOs. For many years now, the OSCE has forged close partnerships with multiple UN organizations, as well as with UN-affiliated and other international and regional organizations. During IWG meetings, representatives of some of these organizations enriched the OSCE debate with their own perspectives, particularly on protection and legal topics. On these occasions, many clearly expressed support for an enhanced OSCE role on migration issues, pointing to the specific advantages of the OSCE as a regional security organization that can promote better migration management over the longer term, but can also play an important operational role.

In certain settings, such as Eastern Ukraine, the OSCE co-operates closely with the UNHCR. Due to its privileged access, the Special Monitoring Mission (SMM) can call attention to particular humanitarian needs and protection issues and facilitate the provision of relief through relevant agencies. A joint protection checklist⁸ developed by the UNHCR and the OSCE in 2014 has been successfully applied in this context and is also being used by different OSCE field operations to help OSCE staff identify the protection needs of vulnerable populations, including refugees, displaced persons, returnees, stateless individuals, and persons at risk of displacement.

8 Cf. OSCE/UNHCR, *Protection Checklist. Addressing Displacement and Protection of Displaced Populations and Affected Communities along the Conflict Cycle: a Collaborative Approach*, 2014, available at: <http://www.osce.org/cpc/111464>.

The OSCE's role needs to be seen in the broader context of global responses to the phenomenon of migration and refugee flows. As a regional arrangement under Chapter VIII of the UN Charter, and drawing on its cross-dimensional expertise, flexible toolbox, presence in the field, and strong links with the UN and other international and regional organizations, the OSCE is well placed to support the regional application of guidelines developed at the global level. At the September 2016 UN Summit for Refugees and Migrants, OSCE Secretary General Lamberto Zannier focused his intervention on the added value that regional organizations can bring to sound global migration governance.⁹ The New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants¹⁰ adopted by UN member states on this occasion will become an important reference document for the OSCE as it seeks to define its role in support of effective multilateralism. Conversely, the OSCE can make a regional contribution to the discussions that will hopefully lead to the adoption of a global compact on refugees and a global compact for safe, orderly, and regular migration in 2018.

Looking Ahead

The view that the OSCE has a role to play in contributing to a more effective management of migration and refugee flows has won increasing support among OSCE participating States. At an informal OSCE Ministerial Council Meeting convened in Potsdam in September 2016 by OSCE Chairperson-in-Office and German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier to discuss the current security environment in Europe, many participants described migration as a major security challenge now and for the foreseeable future. Several ministers advocated in favour of a holistic and multi-dimensional approach that would see the OSCE combine its many tools to better integrate migration into its overall work. More significantly perhaps, no objections to the OSCE's playing a role in addressing migration were voiced.

In autumn 2016, the IWG is moving into negotiation mode, discussing elements of a possible Ministerial Council decision or declaration on migration, in effect the first of the recommendations contained in the Wild Report. Ambassador Wild, who remains in charge of the dossier on behalf of the OSCE Chairmanship, will need to employ all his diplomatic skills to achieve a concrete result in a political context that remains complicated. The Ham-

9 For the OSCE Secretary General's speech at this event, see: *Intervention of the OSCE SG Lamberto Zannier*, High Level Meeting of the Plenary of the General Assembly to address large movements of refugees and migrants, New York, 19 September 2016, available at: <http://www.osce.org/secretariat/265496>.

10 For the full text of the Declaration, see: United Nations General Assembly, *Declaration for Refugees and Migrants, Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 19 September 2016*, A/RES/71/1, 3 October 2016, available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/events/conferences/57e39d987/new-york-declaration-refugees-migrants.html>.

burg Ministerial Council will offer an opportunity to give a political signal towards more firmly anchoring migration governance in the OSCE's work. Internally, a document of this kind would be a welcome political endorsement by the participating States of a more active role for the Organization in this area, while it would demonstrate to outside partners that the OSCE means business. Beyond reaffirming OSCE principles and commitments, it could serve to highlight the OSCE's role and possible contribution to global efforts on the governance of migration and refugee flows.

Whether OSCE participating States will agree to entrust the OSCE with specific new tasks related to migration by making use of the Organization's conflict prevention capacities, field presences, and human rights protection mechanisms remains to be seen. If the OSCE's executive structures are given additional tasks to perform, adequate financial means and enhanced staff resources will need to be found. Given the repeated cuts to the OSCE budget over the past few rounds, doing more with less is no longer a workable formula. As the OSCE Secretary General respectfully but clearly communicated during recent budget discussions, the scope for reprioritizing activities is close to zero and would leave other important areas uncovered.

Given the generally conflicted mood within the OSCE, expectations that the Hamburg Ministerial Council might broaden the scope of OSCE engagement or give specific operational guidance may well be premature. A number of political stumbling blocks, including seemingly unrelated issues, could derail ministerial agreement. Some participating States will want to emphasize basic tenets and values, including solidarity and burden-sharing, while others may be reluctant to commit themselves. The question of the OSCE's work in relation to IDPs regularly complicates OSCE debates, from discussions on the Organization's capacity to address all phases of the conflict cycle to budget negotiations involving field operations in certain conflict areas. While some want to see IDPs as an integral part of the wider challenge, and one that should warrant specific mention, others prefer to keep IDP issues strictly limited to relevant formats dealing with the protracted conflicts in the OSCE area. Incidentally, the Wild Report names IDPs as an important issue, noting, however, that it is not covered by the IWG's remit, which was exclusively concerned with the cross-border movement of people.

Even if there should be no tangible outcome in Hamburg, the OSCE Secretariat and institutions will continue to strive towards more coherence in their migration-related activities and consolidate the work already undertaken over the past two years. Under the scrutiny and with the encouragement of the appropriate subcommittees of the OSCE's Permanent Council, they are likely to focus their follow-up action on those recommendations of the Wild Report that enjoy broad support and can be accommodated within current resources. They will also likely make use of further opportunities to strengthen the impact of existing OSCE migration-related activities. Even in the absence

of consensus, the incoming Chairmanships – Austria in 2017 and Italy in 2018 – have some means to add emphasis and give direction.