

Loïc Simonet

## The OSCE and NATO: Side by Side in a Turbulent World

### Introduction

Of all the international organizations that play a role in the Euro-Atlantic region, the OSCE, a true “Transatlantic Security Organization”,<sup>1</sup> is undoubtedly the one which has the most similarities with NATO (the North Atlantic Treaty Organization). Both organizations were born in the 20th Century, during the Cold War. Both have gone through in-depth transformation and, to remain relevant, have adapted their mandate and modus operandi to the new realities of the 21st Century.<sup>2</sup> Both – each in its unique way – have adopted policies of conflict prevention and crisis management.<sup>3</sup> Both have reached out to the wider European neighbourhood. Both have common members – either directly or through NATO’s Partnership for Peace (PfP) – an overlap which certainly helps to keep the lines of communication open.

These two institutions are the cornerstones of the “New Security Architecture” that the November 1991 NATO Rome Summit defined. Both work to reach common objectives – establishing security and promoting democratic ideals in the Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian region. Both make decisions on the basis of consensus, although the OSCE does it on a larger scale. Both share the same co-operative approach to security.<sup>4</sup> Both had – a few years apart – the same intuition that “the challenges we will face in this new Europe cannot be comprehensively addressed by one institution alone, but only in a framework of interlocking institutions tying together the countries

---

Note: The views expressed in this article are those of the author alone and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the OSCE and its participating States.

- 1 Robert Barry, *The OSCE: A Forgotten Transatlantic Security Organization*, British American Security Information Council, BASIC Research Report 2002.3, July 2002. On the OSCE as a security organization and a “theory-guided view on the current OSCE as security actor”, cf. Andrea Gawrich, *Emerging from the Shadows – The Ukrainian-Russian Crisis and the OSCE’s Contribution to the European Security Architecture*, in: *Die Friedens-Warte*, 1-2/2014, pp. 59-80, here: pp. 61ff and 65ff.
- 2 Sten Rynning’s remarkable discussion of NATO’s 25 years of existence has considerably enhanced our understanding of the Alliance, cf. Sten Rynning, *The geography of the Atlantic peace: NATO 25 years after the fall of the Berlin Wall*, in: *International Affairs* 6/2014, pp. 1383-1401.
- 3 Cf. Emmet Tuohy, *NATO and its Conflict Management Toolbox*, in: Samuel Goda/Oleksandr Tytarchuk/Maksym Khylyk (eds), *International Crisis Management: NATO, EU, OSCE and Civil Society*, NATO Science for Peace and Security Series, E: Human and Societal Dynamics, vol. 127, Amsterdam 2016, pp. 54-65.
- 4 Cf. Antonio Ortiz, *Neither fox nor hedgehog: NATO’s Comprehensive Approach and the OSCE’s concept of security*, in: *Security and Human Rights* 4/2008, pp. 284-297.

of Europe and North America”.<sup>5</sup> Viewed in ideal terms, NATO and the OSCE could “each represent half of a comprehensive European security organization”.<sup>6</sup>

At the same time, however, the OSCE and NATO remain significantly different institutions. As Henry Kissinger noted, the concepts of collective security and of alliances are “diametrically opposed”: Collective security organizations, such as the UN (and the OSCE), presume a global common interest, whereas collective defence alliances, such as NATO, presume a specific potential adversary.<sup>7</sup> The Alliance’s member states share a high degree of integration, mutual trust, and collective security, and seek ways to speak with one voice and promote their common interests. The OSCE, by contrast, represents a large community with Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian dimensions and is composed of states with different perceptions of risks, threats, and challenges, which the Organization needs to take on board and manage. Significant differences between the OSCE and NATO also exist in terms of governance, funding, and staffing.

Practically, what can the OSCE bring to NATO?

The OSCE, like the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) before it, is designed to provide a unique, inclusive, values-based forum, with equal buy-in from all participating States, for pan-European security in its broadest sense. It can serve as a natural anchor for a broad-based strategic dialogue and can still provide a useful platform for NATO States to engage Russia and other partners (including Afghanistan, which is an OSCE Asian Partner for Co-operation) and to promote initiatives that usefully complement NATO’s own efforts and partnership structures.

In 2000, the then NATO Secretary General George Robertson stated that “the OSCE remains the sole organisation capable of setting standards of security behaviour through the commitments and obligations which all OSCE member states take on as they join the Organisation.”<sup>8</sup> With the Helsinki Final Act, the Charter for European Security, and the subsequent OSCE “*acquis*”, the Vienna-based Organization remains a standard-bearer of democracy and human rights and a repository of shared norms, principles, and commitments whose full implementation is a major element in the building of a truly effective security community. The OSCE can serve as a clearing house

---

5 *Rome Declaration on Peace and Cooperation*, Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Rome, 8 November 1991, Press Communiqué S-1(91)86, at: <https://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c911108a.htm>.

6 Jonathan Dean, OSCE and NATO: Complementary or Competitive Security Providers for Europe? A Long Range Perspective, in: Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg/ Ken Kesey IFSH (ed.), *OSCE Yearbook 1999*, Baden-Baden 2000, pp. 429-434, here p. 429.

7 Cf. Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, New York 1994, p. 247.

8 *Intervention by Secretary General at the OSCE Permanent Council*, Vienna, Austria, 2 November 2000, at: <https://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2000/s001102a.htm>, circulated within the OSCE as PC.DEL/668/00, 2 November 2000.

and a forum for sharing information and ensuring maximum transparency and synergy.

Since the OSCE and NATO share common values and objectives, certain OSCE norms can help participating States in their efforts to accede to the Atlantic Alliance, in a way complementary to NATO's Individual Partnership Action Plans (IPAPs). OSCE principles and documents are referred to several times in the 1995 *Study on NATO Enlargement*.<sup>9</sup> For instance, the OSCE Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security<sup>10</sup> corresponds to the requirements to be met by candidates for NATO membership, including, prominently, democratic control over the armed forces.<sup>11</sup> In Montenegro, the OSCE co-operated with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to implement the Montenegro Demilitarization (MONDEM) programme, which played a major role in Montenegro's NATO accession process. Montenegro became a NATO member on 5 June 2017.

In some regions, the Organization has a significantly denser network than NATO. OSCE field operations in Central Asia,<sup>12</sup> for instance, are particularly well-placed to assist the host countries in addressing emerging transnational threats and challenges and offer the potential for closer NATO-OSCE co-operation on the ground, where participating States wish to pursue it.

Like the European Union, NATO is able to work both *with* and *within* the OSCE. Used wisely, the OSCE can provide an effective complement to NATO's own capabilities, and reinforce the Alliance's efforts to promote long-term security and stability, and vice versa. But NATO member states, which represent more than half of the OSCE 57 participating States, can also help to shape the Organization's future from the inside. This is the *raison d'être* of the NATO caucus in the OSCE, where the ambassadors of the 29 NATO states that are also OSCE participating States gather each Wednesday afternoon in Vienna to co-ordinate their policies on first-dimension issues (Forum for Security Co-operation/FSC issues, Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe/Open Skies-related topics).

---

9 "States which have ethnic disputes or external territorial disputes, including irredentist claims, or internal jurisdictional disputes must settle those disputes by peaceful means in accordance with OSCE principles" (Section 6); "NATO enlargement would proceed in accordance with the provisions of the various OSCE documents which confirm the sovereign right of each state to freely seek its own security arrangements, to belong or not to belong to international organisations, including treaties of alliance" (Section 7); see also Sections 12 and 14-16, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *Study on NATO Enlargement*, 3 September 1995, at: [http://www.nato.int/cps/po/natohq/official\\_texts\\_24733.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/po/natohq/official_texts_24733.htm).

10 Cf. Loïc Simonet, The OSCE Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security after the First Annual Discussion on Its Implementation (11 July 2012): State of Play and Prospects, in: Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg/IFSH (ed.), *OSCE Yearbook 2012*, Baden-Baden 2013, pp. 343-360.

11 Cf. *Study on NATO Enlargement*, cited above (Note 9), section 72.

12 The Office of the NATO Liaison Officer for Central Asia in Tashkent was closed on 1 April 2017.

The adoption of the Platform for Co-operative Security at the 1999 OSCE Istanbul Summit is commonly seen as providing the “legal” basis for OSCE-NATO co-operation, since it was aimed at outlining general principles and modalities of co-operation with other international organizations sharing OSCE “values”.<sup>13</sup> Even if this initiative indeed created a new potential for NATO-OSCE co-operation, the common history of the two organizations had been forged long before, and the Platform offered merely a formalization of the fruitful co-operation they had already developed.

*The OSCE and NATO from 1990 to 2015: Two Key Elements of the European Security Architecture*

NATO and the OSCE have often been seen as engaged in rivalry and a struggle for dominance. P. Terrence Hopmann, former fellow at the Wilson Center, well recalls how the evolution of the CSCE in the early 1990s, its transformation into a fully-fledged organization in 1995, and the power and tools provided to the OSCE have, to a large extent, mirrored NATO’s own evolution as an instrument of European security.<sup>14</sup> From the Alliance’s full commitment to the OSCE in the 1990s to NATO’s readiness to contribute to peacekeeping operations under the OSCE’s leadership, the interaction between the two organizations has, since their joint involvement in Kosovo, evolved towards a more balanced – and more distant – relationship. Kosovo, together with NATO’s eastward enlargement, has obviously contributed to the OSCE’s “identity crisis”.

*“A Strong CSCE Is in the Alliance’s Interests”*<sup>15</sup>

The 1992 Helsinki Document provided the CSCE/OSCE with a “central role” in “fostering and managing change in [the Euro-Atlantic] region”.<sup>16</sup> How did NATO react to this statement?

- 
- 13 Cf. *Operational Document – The Platform for Co-operative Security*, adopted at the OSCE 1999 Istanbul Summit, para. 1, in: Charter for European Security, Istanbul, November 1999, in: Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Istanbul Summit 1999, *Istanbul Document 1999*, Istanbul 1999, January 2000/Corr., pp. 1-45, here: pp. 43-45, p. 43, at: <http://www.osce.org/mc/39569>. For commentary, see Sandra Sacchetti, The OSCE’s Platform for Co-operative Security: An opportunity for multilateral coherence, in: *Security and Human Rights* 1/2014, pp. 119-129.
- 14 Cf. P. Terrence Hopmann, The United States and the CSCE/OSCE, in: Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg/IFSH (ed.), *OSCE Yearbook 2000*, Baden-Baden 2001, pp. 63-81, here p. 76.
- 15 “The Alliance has long recognised that a strong CSCE is in its interests”, NATO Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs Gebhardt von Moltke at the meeting of the CSCE Parliamentary Assembly in Helsinki on 9 July 1993, quoted in: Pol De Witte, The Past, Present and Future of OSCE-NATO Relations, in: Victor-Yves Ghebali/Daniel Warner/Barbara Gimelli, *The Future of the OSCE in the Perspective of the Enlargements of NATO and the EU*, PSIO Occasional Paper 1/2004, Geneva 2004, pp. 43-89, here: p. 51.

The 1990s saw a trend towards building cross-references between NATO and the CSCE/OSCE in terms of norms, standards of behaviour, and instruments of security management. NATO, European integration, and the CSCE were seen as “the three key elements of the European architecture”,<sup>17</sup> each complementing the others in an architecture “firmly based on the principles and provisions of the Helsinki Final Act and the Charter of Paris”.<sup>18</sup> From the earliest proposals to institutionalize the CSCE process, NATO nations have been at the forefront of giving the CSCE/OSCE an operational dimension.

At their meeting in Brussels on 19 December 1991, shortly after the collapse of the Soviet Union, NATO foreign ministers expressed their readiness to make NATO’s “own collective experience available to CSCE”.<sup>19</sup> At this time, the Allies remained “fully committed to the CSCE as political process”.<sup>20</sup> In particular, NATO supported the CSCE’s potential for conflict prevention, crisis management, and the peaceful settlement of disputes by appropriate means, such as creating a suitably structured emergency consultation mechanism and strengthening the Conflict Prevention Centre.<sup>21</sup> At their Madrid Summit in July 1997, where the emergence of a “new Europe” was highlighted, NATO leaders reaffirmed their commitment “to further strengthening the OSCE as a regional organization according to Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations and as a primary instrument for preventing conflict, enhancing cooperative security and advancing democracy and human rights”.<sup>22</sup>

The Partnership for Peace was regarded as both complementary to and supportive of CSCE/OSCE activities. Even the 1997 Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation placed the OSCE at the core of the relationship between these two actors: “NATO and Russia will help to strengthen the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe, including developing further its role as a primary instrument in preventive diplomacy, conflict prevention, crisis man-

- 
- 16 Helsinki Summit Declaration, para. 19, in: Conference for Security and Co-operation in Europe, 1992 Summit, Helsinki, 9-10 July 1992, *CSCE Helsinki Document 1992, The Challenges of Change*, at: <http://www.osce.org/mc/39530>.
- 17 North Atlantic Council, *Final Communiqué*, Brussels, 17-18 December 1990, para. 7, at: <http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c901218a.htm>.
- 18 *Partnership with the Countries of Central and Eastern Europe*, Statement issued by the North Atlantic Council Meeting in Ministerial Session in Copenhagen, 6-7 June 1991, para. 5, at: <http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c910607d.htm>.
- 19 North Atlantic Council, *Final Communiqué*, Brussels, 19 December 1991, para. 10, at: <http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c911219a.htm>.
- 20 *Partnership with the Countries of Central and Eastern Europe*, cited above (Note 18), para. 4.
- 21 Cf. *ibid.*, para. 5.
- 22 *Madrid Declaration on Euro-Atlantic Security and Cooperation, Issued by the Heads of State and Government*, Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Madrid, 8 July 1997, para. 21, at: <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1997/p97-081e.htm>.

agement, post-conflict rehabilitation and regional security cooperation, as well as in enhancing its operational capabilities to carry out these tasks”.<sup>23</sup>

In theory, NATO enlargement was also meant to fully respect the OSCE’s key role in the European security architecture. The 1995 *Study on NATO Enlargement* acknowledged the OSCE’s unique role and pre-eminence: “As the most inclusive institution in the European security architecture, the OSCE has a key role to play in maintaining security and transcending divisions in Europe and should continue to be strengthened independently of enlargement of NATO”.<sup>24</sup> The study offered its vision of the European security architecture in which NATO and the OSCE would jointly operate: “The activities of the OSCE and of NATO are complementary and mutually reinforcing. [...] A strengthened OSCE, an enlarged NATO, an active NACC and PfP would, together with other fora, form complementary parts of a broad, inclusive European security architecture, supporting the objective of an undivided Europe”.<sup>25</sup>

Such a commitment from the Atlantic Alliance, in the 1990s, raised the hope of a “triumph of multilateralism”. Experts even imagined the fusion of NATO and the OSCE into a “Northern Hemisphere Alliance (NHA)”, a kind of perfect soft-power/hard-power combination,<sup>26</sup> able to make use of a comprehensive spectrum of instruments for crisis prevention and post-conflict rehabilitation.<sup>27</sup>

#### *From Bosnia and Herzegovina to the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: The “Golden Age” of NATO-OSCE Co-operation*

Relations between NATO and OSCE have been driven by events in the field, and expanded throughout the 1990s as a result, in part, of practical co-operation in peace support operations.

#### *The Failed Attempt to Contribute to Peacekeeping Operations under CSCE/OSCE Control*

The NATO Secretary General had already suggested in November 1991 that “there may well be scope for the Alliance to contribute its logistics, intelli-

---

23 *Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation*, 27 May 1997, at: [http://www.nato.int/cps/cn/natohq/official\\_texts\\_25468.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/cn/natohq/official_texts_25468.htm).

24 *Study on NATO Enlargement*, cited above (Note 9), section 15.

25 *Ibid.*, section 16. The North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) was established by the Allies in 1991 as a forum for dialogue and co-operation with NATO’s former Warsaw Pact adversaries, and replaced in 1997 by the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC; see below pp. 309-310).

26 Cf. Stanley R. Sloan/Heiko Borchert, *The Soft-Power Solution: US-European Relations in and beyond Europe*, in: Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg/IFSH (ed.), *OSCE Yearbook 2003*, Baden-Baden 2004, pp. 75-87, here: p. 78.

27 Cf. Heiko Borchert/Daniel Maurer, *Co-operation, Rivalry or Insignificance? Five Scenarios for the Future of Relations between the OSCE and the EU*, in: *OSCE Yearbook 2003*, cited above (Note 26), pp. 403-417, here pp. 405-406.

gence resources and even rapid reaction forces to CSCE or United Nations-mandated peace-keeping operations or observer missions”.<sup>28</sup> Indeed, the 1991 Gulf War had triggered a debate on whether the Alliance’s resources could be made available to allies involved in conflict prevention or resolution, whether or not NATO itself was formally involved. The transformation of the CSCE into a regional arrangement in the sense of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter, at the 1992 Helsinki Summit, facilitated such input. The CSCE Heads of State or Government acknowledged that NATO had “offered practical support for the work of the CSCE”, and welcomed “[EC, NATO and WEU] readiness to support CSCE peacekeeping activities, including by making available their resources”.<sup>29</sup> Such a contribution by NATO could take different forms: “an Alliance material or non-material contribution in the framework of a CSCE peacekeeping operation; provision of Alliance common assets to a peacekeeping operation; and/or Alliance support of participation by individual Allies in a peacekeeping operation”.<sup>30</sup> In 1993, the NACC *Ad Hoc* Group on Cooperation in Peacekeeping, in which the CSCE/OSCE participated actively, reached a common understanding.<sup>31</sup> Altogether, these developments “gave many observers the impression that the CSCE could mandate NATO non-Article 5 operations”.<sup>32</sup> At one point, the possibility was even considered that the OSCE could take control of NATO’s Partnership for Peace.<sup>33</sup> The NATO-Russia Founding Act itself reflected just this trend: The two partners agreed to plan, prepare, and carry out “joint operations, including peacekeeping operations, on a case-by-case basis, under the authority of the UN Security Council or the responsibility of the OSCE”.<sup>34</sup>

This was never translated into operational arrangements, and the Alliance later moved away from the model of mandate-based security governance towards building an independent capacity to act in crisis management. As a result, NATO has never directly supported OSCE operations, but merely provides security, logistics, information, and communications support for OSCE activities in territories where Alliance forces have been deployed.

---

28 Manfred Wörner, NATO transformed: the significance of the Rome Summit, in: *NATO Review* 6/1991, at: <http://nato.int/docu/review/1991/9106-1.htm>.

29 *Helsinki Summit Declaration*, cited above (Note 16), paras 10 and 20.

30 *NATO Deputy Secretary General’s Address to the CSCE Ministerial Council in Stockholm on 15 December 1992*, p. 2.

31 Cf. De Witte, cited above (Note 15), p. 50. The Russian Federation had suggested a NACC-OSCE “contact group” be established “to include peace-keeping tasks”. John Borawski, *The OSCE: In Search of Cooperative Security*, in: *Security Dialogue* 4/1996, pp. 401-408, here: p. 403.

32 David S. Yost, *NATO and International Organizations*, NATO Defence College, Forum Paper 3, Rome, September 2007, pp. 124-125.

33 Cf. Vincent Ramelot/Eric Remacle, *L’OSCE et les conflits en Europe*, Les Dossiers du GRIP, Brussels, 1 July 1995, p. 101.

34 *Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation*, cited above (Note 23).

*Co-operation Instead of Competition, Synergy rather than Hierarchy: The Division of Labour in the Balkans*

In contrast to “the disgraceful competition that characterised the activities of security-related institutions in the early phases of the conflict in the former Yugoslavia”,<sup>35</sup> later co-operation between the OSCE and NATO in the Balkans offers a good example of “mutually reinforcing activities”.

- Co-operation in the field first developed in Bosnia and Herzegovina, where NATO’s Implementation Force (IFOR) and, subsequently, Stabilisation Force (SFOR) provided vital support for the OSCE field operation. While NATO was assigned a military mandate in Annex IA of the General Framework Agreement for Peace (commonly known as the Dayton Agreement) of 14 December 1995, the OSCE was given the challenging new mission of implementing virtually all its non-military parts, encompassing a full spectrum of democracy-building activities (including supervision of the preparation and holding of free and fair elections) and the enforcement of the disarmament provisions.<sup>36</sup> In carrying out these tasks, IFOR/SFOR and the OSCE Mission (particularly the Mission’s Joint Operations Centre, JOC) developed a great deal of practical co-operation, with each appointing a liaison officer assigned for co-ordination and information exchange purposes. NATO-OSCE consultations led the North Atlantic Council (NAC) to authorize IFOR to provide priority support to the OSCE in the planning and conducting of the elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina on 14 September 1996, through the establishment of a secure environment for these elections, particularly with regard to planning, logistics, and communications. This kind of co-operation was again undertaken for the April 2000 municipal elections and the November 2000 general election. SFOR personnel also participated in situation awareness briefings and mines-awareness training provided to OSCE supervisors. SFOR liaison teams were deployed to the JOC and to all OSCE Regional Centres and Field Offices to provide on-the-spot advice and a smooth link with SFOR formations in the field and at headquarters.

Even if “responsibility for the implementation of virtually all non-coercive aspects of the Dayton Accords fell to the OSCE largely by default”,<sup>37</sup> post-Dayton Bosnia provided a good example of burden sharing between NATO and the OSCE. The successes of the OSCE – together with other international actors – in establishing an improved se-

---

35 Ortiz, cited above (Note 4), p. 294.

36 Cf. Flavio Cotti, The OSCE’s increasing responsibilities in European security, in: *NATO Review* 6/1996, pp. 7-12, at: <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/1996/9606-2.htm>; Oya Dursun-Ozkanca, Does it take four to tango? A comparative analysis of international collaboration on peacebuilding in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo, in: *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies* 4/2010, pp. 437-456.

37 Hopmann, cited above (Note 14), p. 71.

curity environment, has permitted successive reductions in scale and scope of IFOR/SFOR, which was brought to a successful end in 2005, clearing the stage for the EU multinational stabilization force (EUFOR). Kosovo has raised OSCE-NATO co-operation to a higher level. In 1998-1999, the two organizations were assigned complementary verification tasks in Kosovo relating to compliance by all parties with the requirements of UN Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1199 (1998), and had to work together creatively in very demanding circumstances. The OSCE Kosovo Verification Mission (KVM), established in October 1998 and comprising 2,000 unarmed verifiers, operated under NATO protection (air reconnaissance mission *Eagle Eye*, consisting of NATO non-combatant reconnaissance platforms, and low- and medium-altitude manned reconnaissance platforms, and a NATO-led extraction force, both terminated after the safe withdrawal of the OSCE monitors from Kosovo when operation *Allied Force* began in March 1999). The Kosovo Verification Coordination Centre established in Kumanovo, in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), played an important role in liaison, planning, co-ordination and information exchange with the OSCE KVM headquartered in Pristina.<sup>38</sup> In 1999, the end of the 78-day air campaign and the adoption of UNSCR 1244 opened a new phase of co-operation, with an OSCE better mandated and equipped to work on institution building: the OSCE Mission in Kosovo (OMIK) as Pillar III of the UN-led mission in Kosovo (UNMIK).

Procedurally and operationally, the close liaison between the two organizations must be judged a success, characterized by good working relationships, reciprocal visits, an unusual degree of openness, and an unprecedented degree of co-operation. During the build-up phase of the KVM, NATO input was both timely and important. In the disappointment and confusion following the withdrawal of the KVM on 20 March 1999, NATO's moral and material support was very welcome and much appreciated. Many NATO officers deployed later on with the Kosovo Force (KFOR) gained invaluable insight and experience by working in the KVM as civilian verifiers, taking away a new appreciation of the importance of the OSCE and its democracy-building role in post-conflict rehabilitation.

Today, NATO and the OSCE remain a stabilizing factor in Kosovo. The OSCE has the central role in building democratic institutions and seeking to establish a stable order in which Kosovo's ethnic communities can re-establish positive relations with one another, whereas NATO's presence in Kosovo, even after the downsizing and significant restructuring of KFOR in 2011-2012, guarantees the security necessary

---

38 Cf. *Remarks by Dr. Javier Solana, Secretary General of NATO, At the Inauguration of the Kosovo Verification Coordination Centre (KVCC), 26 November 1998*, at: <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/1998/s981126a.htm>.

for this work to move forward. Answering the request of the OSCE Secretary General, NATO once again assisted the OSCE staff in facilitating municipal elections in four northern Kosovo municipalities on 3 November 2013, as a third responder. Successful co-operation was also undertaken in the context of the gradual handover of KFOR's security responsibilities at religious/cultural heritage sites to the Kosovo Police, and in the area of police training.<sup>39</sup>

- Co-operation between NATO and the OSCE in FYROM has further illustrated their joint capacity to manage crises, and has brought a new comprehensive approach to preventing conflict. Indeed, in 2000-2001, collective and co-ordinated NATO-OSCE efforts contributed significantly to the avoidance of a violent crisis in that country, not only by brokering temporary ceasefires but also by discouraging the authorities in Skopje from declaring a state of war and pressing for a political solution. On 26 July 2001, Javier Solana, the EU's High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy, and NATO Secretary General Robertson, accompanied by the OSCE Chairman-in-Office, Romanian Foreign Minister Mircea Geoana, rushed to Skopje with the pledge that NATO, the EU, and the OSCE would assist in the implementation of the political framework agreement that would eventually be signed on 13 August in Ohrid. Following this agreement, the NAC authorized the deployment of 3,500 troops taking part in operation *Essential Harvest*, to implement the demobilization of the UCK/NLA within 30 days, and collect and destroy weapons voluntarily surrendered.<sup>40</sup> After the completion of *Essential Harvest*, and following the decision adopted by the OSCE Permanent Council (PC) on 29 September 2001 to further enhance its Spillover Monitor Mission to Skopje, NATO agreed, at Skopje's request, to retain a much smaller force in the country (*Amber Fox*). The role of this operation was essentially to support OSCE and EU observers tasked with confidence building, police training, and reporting on humanitarian issues, by providing capabilities for medical emergency evacuation as well for explosive ordnance disposal upon request, and a contingency capability for extracting international community monitors from dangerous situations if the government of FYROM was unable to do so.<sup>41</sup> After 2001, the Security Principals (the EU and the US as the two guarantors of the Ohrid Framework Agreement, together with NATO and the OSCE) continued to meet regularly to hold

---

39 Cf. Dursun-Ozkanca, cited above (Note 36), p. 450.

40 Cf. Alice Ackermann, On the Razor's Edge: Macedonia Ten Years after Independence, in: Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg/IFSH (ed.), *OSCE Yearbook 2001, Baden-Baden 2002*, pp. 117-135, here: pp. 128 and 130; Mihai Carp, Back from the brink, in: *NATO Review*, Winter 2002, at: <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2002/Managing-Crisis/Back-from-brink/EN/index.htm>.

41 Cf. the exchange of letters between NATO Secretary General Robertson and OSCE Secretary General Ján Kubiš, dated 9 and 12 October 2001, SEC.GAL/206/01, 12 October 2001.

discussions, share information, and take joint action where appropriate (in the form of joint meetings with key interlocutors or joint statements) on issues affecting the political and/or security situation in the host country. On 14 February 2013, the Heads of Mission of the European Union, the NATO Liaison Office, the OSCE, and the United States in Skopje strongly urged all sides to enhance the political dialogue, to focus on the country's strategic priorities and to put the best interests of the country and its citizens first.<sup>42</sup> More recently, the joint statement on incidents they presented to the parliament in Skopje on 2 May 2017 also had some effect.<sup>43</sup>

In addition to this preventive diplomacy, NATO and the OSCE have co-operated in the Ohrid border management process initiated in May 2003, also involving the EU and the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.<sup>44</sup>

- In the autumn and winter of 2000, regional tensions threatened to spill over from Kosovo into the Preševo valley in South Serbia, which is mostly inhabited by ethnic Albanians. Together with NATO, the OSCE managed to defuse the tensions, facilitated dialogue, promoted local self-government, and assisted with reforms including community policing.<sup>45</sup>

Did NATO “eclipse” the OSCE in the Balkans?<sup>46</sup> Even worse, was the OSCE “instrumentalized” by NATO in 1999, as Russia argued,<sup>47</sup> and kept in a “secondary position in the institutional division of labour”?<sup>48</sup> Did it play the role of NATO’s “deputy sheriff”<sup>49</sup> in Kosovo or even “maidservant” in FYROM in 2001?<sup>50</sup> On the contrary, the soft-power/hard-power combination of the

---

42 Cf. SEC.PR/38/13, 14 February 2013.

43 Cf. *Joint statement of the Heads of EU Delegation, US Embassy, OSCE Mission and NATO Liaison Office in Skopje on yesterday's incidents at the Parliament*, Skopje 2 May 2017, at: [https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage\\_en/25320/Joint-statement-of-the-Heads-of-EU-Delegation-US-Embassy-OSCE-Mission-and-NATO-Liaison-Office-in-Skopje-on-yesterday's-incidents-at-the-Parliament](https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage_en/25320/Joint-statement-of-the-Heads-of-EU-Delegation-US-Embassy-OSCE-Mission-and-NATO-Liaison-Office-in-Skopje-on-yesterday's-incidents-at-the-Parliament).

44 Cf. Yost, cited above (Note 32), p. 117.

45 Cf. North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *Address by the OSCE Chairman-in-Office Dr. Dimitrij Rupel for the Panel “Acting in Concert in the Balkans and Elsewhere – How Can Institutional Co-operation Make the World More Secure” at EAPC Security Forum, Åre, Sweden*, 25 May 2005, at: [http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions\\_21768.htm?selectedLocale=en](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_21768.htm?selectedLocale=en).

46 S. Neil MacFarlane, NATO in Russia's Relations with the West, in: *Security Dialogue* 3/2001, pp. 281-296, here: p. 281.

47 Wolfgang Zellner, Russia and the OSCE: From High Hopes to Disillusionment, in: *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 3/2005, pp. 389-402, here: p. 393.

48 Boyka Stefanova, OSCE and Balkan security, in: *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies* 1/2009, pp. 43-60, here: p. 56.

49 Victor-Yves Ghebali, L'OSCE au Kosovo: vers un rôle de “shérif adjoint” de l'OTAN dans les Balkans?, in: *La Revue internationale et stratégique*, no. 33, Spring 1999, pp. 74-84.

50 Victor-Yves Ghebali, Growing Pains at the OSCE: The Rise and Fall of Russia's Pan-European Expectations, in: *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 3/2005, pp. 375-388, here: p. 381.

OSCE and NATO has worked quite effectively in dealing with these kinds of post-Cold War security issues in Europe. NATO was able to bring first Bosnia-Herzegovina and then Kosovo to the point of stability and peace where the OSCE could move in to help create a framework for the development of modern democratic states. As for the OSCE, the backing of NATO's forces and infrastructure was essential to allow it to play a critical soft-power role.

Having said that, two remarks should be made. First, the end of the war in ex-Yugoslavia signalled the end of the fiction of an Atlantic Alliance subordinated, at least in theory, to the OSCE: NATO emerged as the preeminent security and defence organization in Europe, as "first among equals".<sup>51</sup> Second, the onset of the bombing campaign against the former Republic of Yugoslavia made OSCE co-operation with NATO a divisive issue in the OSCE PC, opening a period of relative disillusionment between the two parties and their member/participating States.

*The Disillusionment of 2000: The OSCE at the Core of the Tumultuous Relationship between NATO and the Russian Federation*

NATO's 1991 and 1999 Strategic Concepts clearly spelled out the Alliance's vision of the OSCE's role in the Euro-Atlantic security architecture. The 1999 Strategic Concept, adopted in the midst of the Kosovo intervention, mentions the OSCE three times and devotes a whole paragraph to it.<sup>52</sup> On the contrary, the Strategic Concept adopted by the Heads of State and Government at the NATO Summit in Lisbon in 2010 does not say a word about the Organization.<sup>53</sup> How should this apparent reduction in the interest of the Atlantic Alliance in the OSCE, a few weeks before the Astana Summit, where the 56 participating States would "recommit (themselves) to the vision of a

---

51 Ingo Peters, 'The OSCE, NATO and the EU within the "Network of Interlocking European Security Institutions": Hierarchization, Flexibilization, Marginalization', in: *OSCE Yearbook 2003*, cited above (Note 26), pp. 381-402, here: p. 398. Cf. also the introduction by Hans Haekkerup, Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General for Kosovo and Head of UNMIK, to the special edition of the *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* on "Russia, the OSCE and Post-Cold-War European Security", 3/2005, pp. 371-373, here: p. 371.

52 "The OSCE, as a regional arrangement, is the most inclusive security organisation in Europe, which also includes Canada and the United States, and plays an essential role in promoting peace and stability, enhancing cooperative security, and advancing democracy and human rights in Europe. The OSCE is particularly active in the fields of preventive diplomacy, conflict prevention, crisis management, and post-conflict rehabilitation. NATO and the OSCE have developed close practical cooperation, especially with regard to the international effort to bring peace to the former Yugoslavia." NATO, *The Alliance's Strategic Concept, Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C.*, 24 April 1999, at: [http://www.nato.int/cps/on/natohq/official\\_texts\\_27433.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/on/natohq/official_texts_27433.htm), para. 16; see also paras 14 and 31).

53 Cf. *Active Engagement, Modern Defence. Strategic Concept for the Defence and Security of the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Adopted by the Heads of State and Government at the NATO Summit in Lisbon, 19-20 November 2010*, at: [http://www.nato.int/strategic-concept/pdf/Strat\\_Concept\\_web\\_en.pdf](http://www.nato.int/strategic-concept/pdf/Strat_Concept_web_en.pdf).

free, democratic, common and indivisible Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian security community stretching from Vancouver to Vladivostok”, be interpreted? Had the OSCE, in the space of a decade, become irrelevant for NATO?

The – obviously negative – answer to that question might be found in the “Russian factor in OSCE crisis”.<sup>54</sup> The 1972-75 Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) had taken place against a backdrop of intense rivalry between the US- and Soviet-led blocs. Academics have shown that, from its very inception, the OSCE has been at the crossroads of divergent approaches between Russia and the United States and its allies. Russia’s growing concerns about NATO policies, at the dawn of the 21st century, placed the OSCE, a forum for discussion in which the Russian Federation is fully engaged, in a delicate situation.

#### *NATO Enlargement: The Elephant in the Room*

“NATO enlargement and its role in peace support operations have tended to dominate the European security debate for the better part of the decade”.<sup>55</sup> Twenty years ago, the NATO “Cold War club” had 16 members. Following the four enlargement waves of 1999 (the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland), 2004 (Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia), 2009 (Albania and Croatia) and 2017 (Montenegro), it now has 29. Seven of them are former Soviet allies, and three used to be constituent republics of the USSR. The Atlantic Alliance has also set up distinct partnerships with former Soviet Republics. On 9 July 1997, soon after the signing of the NATO-Russia Founding Act, the Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Ukraine was signed at the meeting of the NAC in Madrid,<sup>56</sup> and an action plan was adopted in 2002 at the NATO-Ukraine Ministerial meeting in Prague.<sup>57</sup> As for Georgia, it was granted a “substantive package” of co-operation, which includes the establishment of a NATO-Georgian Joint Training and Evaluation Centre (JTEC) – inaugurated on 27 August 2015 – a logistical facility, and a defence school.<sup>58</sup>

The opposition of the Russian Federation to NATO’s eastward enlargement – which, as a furious Boris Yeltsin put it in 1995, would “fan the flames of war throughout Europe”<sup>59</sup> – and especially the “problematic” extension of

54 Victor-Yves Ghebali, The Russian factor in OSCE crisis: A fair examination, in: *Helsinki Monitor* 3/2005, pp. 184-187.

55 Borawski, cited above (Note 31), p. 401.

56 *Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Ukraine*, 9 July 1997, at: [https://www.nato.int/cps/in/natohq/official\\_texts\\_25457.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/in/natohq/official_texts_25457.htm).

57 NATO-Ukraine Action Plan, 22 November 2002, at: [https://www.nato.int/cps/su/natohq/official\\_texts\\_19547.htm?selectedLocale=en](https://www.nato.int/cps/su/natohq/official_texts_19547.htm?selectedLocale=en).

58 With 885 staff currently deployed in Afghanistan, Georgia is the second largest contributor after the United States to NATO’s *Resolute Support* mission, which was established in January 2015.

59 Jelzin: Ost-Erweiterung der Nato wird in ganz Europa die Flamme des Krieges entfachen [Yeltsin: NATO’s Eastward Expansion Will Fan the Flames of War throughout Europe], in: *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 9 September 1995, p. 1, quoted by Egon Bahr/Rein-

offers of membership to Georgia and Ukraine at the 2008 Bucharest NATO Summit,<sup>60</sup> has been a constant aspect of its foreign policy. According to Wolfgang Zellner, it is “the most prominent negative Russian interest in the OSCE”.<sup>61</sup> By 1999, following the admission of three new members and the start of NATO operations in Kosovo, an opinion poll indicated that 66 per cent of the Russian population considered the expansion of NATO to be harmful to Russia.<sup>62</sup>

NATO enlargement has been a substantial irritant in Russia’s relations with the West, and this has clearly been reflected in the discussion within the OSCE.

#### *Some Obvious Consequences for the OSCE*

“It takes no great perspicacity to see that the enlargement of the European Union and NATO [...] are influencing relations between these structures and the OSCE and, consequently, the performance of the Organization itself and its ability to discharge its obligations as well”.<sup>63</sup> For Victor-Yves Ghebali, the enlargement of the European Union and NATO is one of the three main intersecting factors that explain the crisis in which the OSCE is presently enmeshed.<sup>64</sup> Indeed, NATO expansion is often seen as a determining factor in the eruption of events that have recently posed major challenges to the OSCE, such as the August 2008 conflict in Georgia<sup>65</sup> or the current crisis in and around Ukraine.<sup>66</sup> The process has also entailed direct consequences for

---

hard Mutz, Do We Need a New European Security Culture? Why the Best of Détente Is Yet to Come, in: Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg/IFSH (ed.), *OSCE Yearbook 2009*, Baden-Baden 2010, pp. 61-75, here: p. 65.

60 “We agreed today that these countries [Ukraine and Georgia] will become members of NATO”, *Bucharest Summit Declaration, Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Bucharest on 3 April 2008*, 3 April 2008, para. 23, at: [https://www.nato.int/cps/ua/natohq/official\\_texts\\_8443.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/ua/natohq/official_texts_8443.htm).

61 Wolfgang Zellner, Asymmetric Security in Europe and the Tasks of the OSCE, in: *OSCE Yearbook 2003*, cited above (Note 26), pp. 61-73, here: p. 65.

62 Cf. MacFarlane, cited above (Note 46), p. 285.

63 Bronislaw Geremek, The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe – Its Development and Prospects, in: Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg/IFSH (ed.), *OSCE Yearbook 1998*, Baden-Baden 1999, pp. 27-36, here: p. 29.

64 Ghebali, cited above (Note 54), p. 184.

65 “In sum, Russia’s response to Georgia’s military operation in South Ossetia was also a response to the expansion of NATO and US influence in the area, which Russia perceives as its ‘traditional’ zone of interests.” Elena Kropatcheva, Russia’s Response to Georgia’s Military Operation in South Ossetia, in: Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg/IFSH (ed.), *OSCE Yearbook 2008*, Baden-Baden 2009, pp. 45-61, here p. 59.

66 The fear of a post-Yanukovich Ukraine joining NATO and closing Russia’s military base in Sevastopol has undoubtedly played a role in the upcoming annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation: “We are against having a military alliance making itself at home right in our backyard or our historic territory. I simply cannot imagine that we would travel to Sevastopol to visit NATO sailors.” Vladimir Putin, *Address by President of the Russian Federation*, Moscow, 18 March 2014, at: <http://eng.kremlin.ru/news/6889>, also quoted by Graeme P. Herd, Russia and Ukraine: Victory Is not Possible; Defeat Is not an Option, in:

OSCE business in the first dimension, such as the suspension of the implementation of the CFE Treaty by the Russian Federation in 2007<sup>67</sup> or President Dmitry Medvedev's proposal of a European Security Treaty Initiative two years later,<sup>68</sup> which both very much reflect Russia's criticism of "NATO-centrism" in the European security architecture.<sup>69</sup> Alexandra Gheciu observes that the tension between Russia and the United States and its allies over NATO's enlargement – "aggressive expansion", for this author – "has further complicated an already difficult situation within the OSCE, making it extremely difficult for the Organization to transcend its problems, achieve normative consensus among participating States, and on this basis (re-)emerge as a more influential actor in the field of security". And Gheciu concludes: "In other words, problems associated with dynamics of NATO enlargement demonstrate that in certain instances the alliance and the OSCE have partly undermined each other".<sup>70</sup>

NATO has not only been growing geographically, but has also greatly expanded its competencies "out of area", taking on functions in the field of security that originally belonged to the OSCE (for example, democratic control of the armed forces, police-related activities, the building of democratic institutions, energy security, etc.), undergoing functional de-specialization/generalization and, thereby, becoming more similar to the OSCE.<sup>71</sup> Through the Partnership for Peace, NATO has taken over earlier OSCE programmes for promoting civil control of the military and training for peacekeeping. NATO's evolution from a strictly collective defence organization into a multipurpose security agency is reflected in the Alliance's Comprehensive Approach, which was formally introduced at the Riga Summit in November 2006. This transformation of the Alliance into a "global NATO"<sup>72</sup> has changed the OSCE's environment, challenging its relevance and reducing the importance of its broad membership.

---

Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg/IFSH (ed.), *OSCE Yearbook 2014*, Baden-Baden 2015, pp. 199-214, here p. 204.

67 Cf. Loïc Simonet, *Trois ans après la suspension du Traité sur les forces conventionnelles en Europe par la Fédération de Russie: Retour sur les fondements juridiques d'un acte controversé*, in: *Revue générale de droit international public* 1/2011, pp. 157-173.

68 *The draft of the European Security Treaty*, 29 November 2009, at: <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/6152>.

69 Cf. Vladimir Voronkov, *The European Security Treaty after Corfu*, SEC.DEL/242/09, 14 September 2009.

70 Alexandra Gheciu, *Securing Civilization? The EU, NATO, and the OSCE in the Post-9/11 World*, Oxford 2008, p. 172. In 2017, the Russian Federation again commented that the decisions taken at the NATO Warsaw Summit, including regarding the Alliance's "open door policy", violate a number of NATO member states' commitments within the OSCE, Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the OSCE, *NATO vs OSCE. NATO summit decisions and their "compliance" with OSCE commitments*, at: <https://osce.mid.ru/web/osce-en/-/nato-vs-osce>.

71 Cf. Peters, cited above (Note 51), p. 399; Helga Haftendorn, "Das Ende der alten NATO [The End of the Old NATO]", in: *Internationale Politik* 4/2002, pp. 52-54.

72 Ivo H. Daalder/James M. Goldgeier, *Global NATO*, in: *Foreign Affairs* 5/2006, pp. 105-113; cf. also Zbigniew Brzezinski, *An agenda for NATO: toward a global security web*, in: *Foreign Affairs* 5/2009, pp. 2-20.

*The Atlantic Alliance Remains a “Threat” for the Russian Federation, and Vice Versa*

The 2015 National Security Strategy of the Russian Federation suffers no ambiguity: “The build-up of the military potential of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the endowment of it with global functions pursued in violation of the norms of international law, the galvanization of the bloc countries’ military activity, the further expansion of the alliance, and the location of its military infrastructure closer to Russian borders are creating a threat to national security.”<sup>73</sup> Although the Atlantic Alliance has tried, since the collapse of the Soviet Union, to regard its successor not as an adversary, but rather as a partner in co-operation, NATO’s traditional image as the enemy and rival has recently made a comeback in Russia. Further to NATO’s “systematic, creeping expansion eastwards, which has led to deeper dividing lines in Europe and fuelled the ingrained Cold War instincts”,<sup>74</sup> NATO’s armed intervention in Serbia to resolve the case of Kosovo has, in the Russian view, reinforced the feeling that Russian national interests have been ignored.

The close association between NATO and the United States has reinforced this “new Cold War” perception.<sup>75</sup> After some initial achievements, US President Barack Obama’s *Reset* policy, which was intended to improve US-Russia relations in 2009, was waylaid by growing frictions over the situation in Libya, the civil war in Syria, and the Snowden case, among other conflicting issues. In 2014, the gap between a resurgent Russia and the West became even wider over the Ukraine Crisis.

On 1 April 2014, the NATO foreign ministers decided to suspend all practical civilian and military co-operation between NATO and Russia, though maintaining their political dialogue in the NATO-Russia Council, as necessary. Russia was no longer seen “as a partner, but as more of an adversary”.<sup>76</sup> In early March 2014, Poland and the Baltic states requested an emergency meeting of the NATO Council under Article 4 to discuss the Russian threat. At the Wales Summit later that year, the NATO leaders also decided to strengthen the Alliance’s eastern flank. In order to enhance the credibility

---

73 *Russian National Security Strategy*, December 2015, para. 15, available at: <http://www.ieee.es/Galerias/fichero/OtrasPublicaciones/Internacional/2016/Russian-National-Security-Strategy-31Dec2015.pdf>.

74 Delegation of the Russian Federation, *Statement by Mr. Alexander Grushko, Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to NATO, at the 2017 Annual Security Review Conference*, Vienna, 27 June 2017, PC.DEL/853/17, 27 June 2017, p. 2, at: <http://www.osce.org/chairmanship/325791>.

75 Robert Legvold, *Managing the New Cold War. What Moscow and Washington Can Learn From the Last One*, in: *Foreign Affairs* July/August 2014, at: <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2014-06-16/managing-new-cold-war>.

76 *A new strategic reality in Europe, Speech by NATO Deputy Secretary General Ambassador Alexander Vershbow to the 21st International Conference on Euro-Atlantic Security, Krakow, Poland*, 4 April 2014, at: [http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions\\_108889.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_108889.htm).

of Article 5 guarantees, NATO approved a Readiness Action Plan aimed at shortening the reaction time of its forces in case of threat. To facilitate the deployment of both quick reaction forces and follow-on units, the Alliance decided to station the necessary facilities, equipment, and logistics specialists on the territories of Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Romania.<sup>77</sup> On 10 July 2017, Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg, opening a session of the Ukraine-NATO Commission, reiterated “the Alliance’s solidarity with Ukraine and our firm support of sovereignty and territorial integrity of this country”, also stigmatizing Russia’s “aggressive actions”.<sup>78</sup>

The new confrontation between the Russian Federation and the West not only distorts the relationship between the US/NATO and Russia; it might – and has obviously already done so – inflict serious harm on a broad array of international issues, including those discussed in the OSCE. “The tense relations between the USA and EU/NATO members, on the one side, and Russia, on the other, are expressed in regular disagreements on what the priorities of the Organization’s work should be. This leads to disputes over the establishment and mandates of missions and field operations and to disunity in budgetary questions. The split renders substantive institutional reform difficult if not impossible [...]”<sup>79</sup>

As a conclusion to this first chapter, it is interesting to note that the relationship between NATO and the OSCE is still seen in terms of competition and hierarchy. As an Asian commentator recently stated, “during the Cold War, NATO took center stage to address conventional warfare and OSCE was in a supporting role. However, in the post-Cold War 21st century environment of unconventional warfare and new security challenges, it is important to have a paradigm shift so that now OSCE should take center stage, with NATO having a supporting role. Dialogue, confidence building, and crisis management – rather than military power – should lead modern diplomacy. Only when diplomacy via OSCE fails should the West then resort to NATO.”<sup>80</sup> This reluctance to consider NATO and the OSCE as equal partners, together with a “disenchanted” post-Cold war agenda, have not prevented the two organizations from maintaining a solid, confident, and pragmatic relationship, based on human and technical cross-fertilization.

---

77 Cf. Rynning, cited above (Note 2), p. 1396.

78 Cited in: 112 Ukraine, *NATO supports Ukraine in struggle with Russia*, – Stoltenberg, 10 July 2017, at: <https://112.international/politics/nato-supports-ukraine-in-struggle-with-russia-stoltenberg-18698.html>.

79 Daniel Trachsler, Switzerland’s OSCE Chairmanship in 2014: A Challenge and an Opportunity, in: Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg/IFSH (ed.), *OSCE Yearbook 2013*, Baden-Baden 2014, pp. 69-79, here: p. 73.

80 Christina Lin, Move over NATO; OSCE is a better platform to engage China, in: *Asia Times*, 7 November 2016, at: <http://www.atimes.com/move-nato-osce-better-platform-engage-china>.

*The OSCE and NATO in 2017: A Mature and Mutually-Complementing Relationship*

The OSCE's response to the crisis in and around Ukraine has put the Organization back in the spotlight, and has made it more visible in Brussels. In addition, as Pál Dunay points out, it has undoubtedly tightened the links between the Alliance and certain OSCE participating States which, rightly or not, might see it as the first in a series of Russian territorial claims.<sup>81</sup>

The Alliance immediately "welcome[d] the swift deployment of the OSCE Special Monitoring Mission, which must be able to operate unhindered and have access to all regions of Ukraine in order to fulfil its mandate",<sup>82</sup> and further condemned impediments to the Mission's work and attacks on OSCE observers.<sup>83</sup> NATO allies have been among the major contributors to the Special Monitoring Mission, both in term of funds and human resources. At the same time, the Alliance has tightened its links with Ukraine.<sup>84</sup>

In June 2016, arguing that an enhanced NATO presence in Vienna would contribute to actively promoting and strengthening the good relations between NATO and the OSCE, Secretary General Stoltenberg appointed his Representative to the OSCE in the person of Eirini Lemos Maniati, an experienced member of the NATO international staff.

As the NATO Heads of State and Government stated at their Summit in Istanbul in 2004: "The OSCE and NATO have largely complementary responsibilities and common interests, both functionally and geographically".<sup>85</sup> More than a decade on, this assertion remains more true than ever.

- 
- 81 Cf. Pál Dunay, *Lessons to Learn: The Effect of the Ukraine Crisis on European and Euro-Atlantic Security*, in: Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg/IFSH (ed.), *OSCE Yearbook 2014*, Baden-Baden 2015, pp. 237-259, here: pp. 245-246.
- 82 *Wales Summit Declaration, Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Wales, 5 September 2014*, para. 27, at: [http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official\\_texts\\_112964.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_112964.htm).
- 83 Cf. *Warsaw Summit Communiqué, Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Warsaw 8-9 July 2016*, para. 20, at: [http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official\\_texts\\_133169.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_133169.htm).
- 84 Cf. North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *Comprehensive Assistance Package for Ukraine*, Fact Sheet, July 2016, at: [http://www.nato.int/nato\\_static\\_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf\\_2016\\_09/20160920\\_160920-compreh-ass-package-ukraine-en.pdf](http://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_2016_09/20160920_160920-compreh-ass-package-ukraine-en.pdf). On the way NATO has handled the Russia-Ukraine conflict, cf. also Oleksandr Tytarchuk/Maksym Khylyko, *NATO, the EU and the OSCE in the Handling of the Russia-Ukraine Conflict: Competitive Synergy or "Freezing" Crisis Management?* In: Goda/Tytarchuk/Khylyko (eds), cited above (Note 3), pp. 87-100.
- 85 *Istanbul Summit Communiqué, Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council*, para. 43, at: <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2004/p04-096e.htm>.

*Regular and Confident Exchanges at Political and Staff Levels.*

Although the OSCE and NATO have not adopted a co-operation agreement to define their interactions and areas of co-operation, cross-representation allows each organization to be fully aware of the other's activities and comparative advantages.

NATO Secretaries General have addressed the OSCE Permanent Council three times. George Robertson did it twice (2 November 2000,<sup>86</sup> the first time that a NATO Secretary General addressed the PC, and 6 November 2003<sup>87</sup>), and Jaap de Hoop Scheffer spoke once (3 November 2005).<sup>88</sup> Anders Fogh Rasmussen also opened the 2011 Annual Security Review Conference.<sup>89</sup> The Istanbul Summit in 1999, which George Robertson addressed, was the first one ever addressed by a NATO Secretary General,<sup>90</sup> although his predecessor, Javier Solana, had taken the floor at the luncheon for Heads of State or Government at the OSCE Lisbon Summit on 2 December 1996.<sup>91</sup> Other high-level personalities frequently attend OSCE events. NATO's Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR), US Marine Corps General James L. Jones, addressed the PC on 14 September 2006. Rose Gottemoeller, freshly appointed as the first female Deputy Secretary General of the Alliance, attended the OSCE Hamburg Ministerial Council in December 2016.

Although the OSCE is usually not invited to attend and observe NATO ministerial meetings and summits, the Wales Summit in 2014 was an exception. On 5 September 2014, the OSCE Chairperson in Office, Swiss Foreign Minister Didier Burkhalter,<sup>92</sup> and Secretary General Lamberto Zannier were indeed able to take part in the event, organized on the margins of the summit by the government of the United Kingdom on implications of the crisis in and around Ukraine for European security at large, alongside EU High Representative on Foreign Affairs Catherine Ashton and Council of Europe Secretary General Thorbjørn Jagland.

Over many years, it has become a tradition for the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office to visit NATO's headquarters and address the NAC. Ambassador Gernot Erler, Special Representative of the Federal Government of Germany

---

86 *Intervention by Secretary General at the OSCE Permanent Council*, cited above (Note 8).

87 PC.DEL/1292/03, 6 November 2003, and SEC.PR/634/03, 6 November 2003.

88 *Speech by NATO Secretary General, Jaap de Hoop Scheffer at the OSCE Council*, Vienna, 3 November 2005, at: <http://nato.int/docu/speech/2005/s051103a.htm> and SEC.PR/490/05, 3 November 2005.

89 "NATO and the OSCE: building security together", Speech by NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen at the OSCE in Vienna, 30 June 2011, at: [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions\\_75886.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_75886.htm), circulated within the OSCE as PC.DEL/652/11, 30 June 2011, cf. also SEC.PR/243/11, 30 June 2011.

90 SUM.DEL/68/99, 19 November 1999.

91 REF.S/135/96, 2 December 1996.

92 For Minister Burkhalter's statement, cf. CIO.GAL/158/14, 5 September 2014.

for the OSCE Chairmanship, did so on 27 January 2016,<sup>93</sup> as did Ambassador Florian Raunig, Head of the Task Force for the Austrian OSCE Chairmanship, together with Ambassador Christian Strohal, Special Representative, on 22 February 2017. When events justify it, the Chairperson-in-Office can further brief the Alliance on an ad hoc basis. On 19 August 2008, Finnish Foreign Minister Alexander Stubb met foreign ministers from NATO in Brussels to discuss the situation in Georgia and co-ordinate further action. He also held a press conference at NATO headquarters.<sup>94</sup>

At headquarters level, the practice of regular staff talks has been established, hosted alternately by the two organizations, as an expression of the concept of “mutually reinforcing institutions”. The first OSCE-NATO staff-level meeting took place in Vienna on 7 July 1998. The number of staff talks per year reached four in 2004, before Secretary General Marc Perrin de Brichambaut suggested cutting them down to two in 2006, in order to establish a more consistent policy vis-à-vis other international organizations with which the OSCE co-operates. The two secretariats now meet once a year. For the first and only time, ad hoc joint staff talks were held in Vienna between the United Nations, the Council of Europe, the EU, NATO, and the OSCE on 29 June 2015 to discuss critical issues related to Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian security, with a particular focus on the crisis in and around Ukraine and fostering complementary roles on the ground. Targeted informal staff talks also occur at technical level, in the form of video-conferences, or when a delegation from NATO visits OSCE headquarters.<sup>95</sup>

The Secretaries General of the two organizations have multiple opportunities to meet each other, including on the margins of the “high-level segment” of the UN General Assembly each year or the high-level retreat with heads of regional and other organizations that the UN Secretary General holds at Greentree Estate, Long Island, New York.

The OSCE Security Days which, under Lamberto Zannier’s mandate, have become one of the privileged forums for intensive debate on security issues, are also a place for exchanges with NATO. The 2016 Security Days on “Revitalising military confidence-building, risk reduction and arms control in Europe” offered Deputy Secretary General Alexander Vershbow the opportunity of one of his last interventions before he relinquished his position.<sup>96</sup>

Last but not least, since 1998, OSCE observers have been invited to attend NATO-led planning exercises.

---

93 Cf. North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *NATO and OSCE discuss modernising tools of military transparency*, 27 January 2016, at: [http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news\\_127481.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_127481.htm).

94 Cf. SEC.PR/348/08, 19 August 2008.

95 For instance, a team from the NATO Allied Rapid Reaction Corps (ARRC) visited the OSCE headquarters on 9 March 2017.

96 Cf. NATO, *Remarks by NATO Deputy Secretary General Ambassador Alexander Vershbow at the OSCE Security Days*, 3 October 2016, at: [http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions\\_135530.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_135530.htm).

### *Cross-Fertilization through Technical Co-operation*

NATO and the OSCE have similar interests in and concerns about a growing number of technical issues, not only in relation to the Alliance's historical role and core business (collective defence and "hard security"), but also connected to a new and broader security "ecosystem".

#### *Arms Control, Confidence- and Security-Building Measures, and Military Transparency*

The OSCE offers a proven framework for the negotiation of conventional arms control and confidence- and security-building measures (CSBMs). In 2016, the Organization commemorated the 20th anniversary of its 1996 Framework for Arms Control, which was designed to create a web of interlocking and mutually reinforcing arms control obligations and commitments.<sup>97</sup>

NATO's strong interest in the OSCE's first dimension discussions does not need to be explained. On 10 February 2017, NATO convened an informal workshop on how to reinforce security dialogue in the Euro-Atlantic region. It focused more specifically on the importance of three major regional organizations – NATO, the European Union (EU), and the OSCE – in supporting each other to improve existing arms control mechanisms.<sup>98</sup> At NATO headquarters in Brussels, the High-Level Task Force on Conventional Arms Control (HLTF), composed of representatives of NATO capitals, focuses more particularly on the implementation of the CFE Treaty.<sup>99</sup> Already in the early 1990s, the Alliance had designed VERITY, an unclassified database aiming at supporting the implementation of the Treaty by all its States Parties, including NATO partners.<sup>100</sup> In 1994, the OSCE Permanent Council agreed to the request of the Verification Coordinating Committee of NATO to install an end-user station of the CSCE Communications Network at its secretariat for the reception of agreed CSBM and CFE notifications.<sup>101</sup>

On 12 December 2007, the Russian Federation decided to suspend the implementation of the CFE Treaty, and requested negotiations to restore its

---

97 Cf. Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Ministerial Council, Hamburg 2016, *From Lisbon to Hamburg: Declaration on the Twentieth Anniversary of the OSCE Framework for Arms Control*, MC.DOC/4/16, 9 December 2016, at: <http://www.osce.org/cio/289496>.

98 Cf. North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *Strengthening NATO-EU-OSCE security dialogue on arms control*, 10 February 2017, at: [http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news\\_141728.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_141728.htm).

99 The HLTF was set-up by allies in 1986 following the "Halifax Statement on Conventional Arms Control".

100 See the presentation on VERITY by Metin Paksoy, Arms Control Databases Sub-Section, Arms Control & Coordination Section (ACCS), Political Affairs and Security Policy Division, NATO, on "Databases as a tool for co-operation", delivered at the Special FSC Meeting on Civil Military Emergency Preparedness (CMEP) on 26 September 2007, FSC.DEL/490/07, 25 September 2007.

101 Cf. PC.DEC/3, 15 December 1994.

viability and ensure its continuous upgrading. After expressing its disappointment and concern,<sup>102</sup> NATO presented a “parallel actions package”, which did not succeed in allowing the States Parties to overcome their divergences. Despite the conflict of August 2008 and the following unilateral recognition of South Ossetia and Abkhazia, which complicated the situation around the Treaty, consultations took place in Vienna in 2010 and early 2011 in the framework of the Group of 36, which consists of all the States Parties to the CFE Treaty, plus six additional NATO members. These consultations ended in failure and were suspended in 2011.<sup>103</sup> Since 2007, it has become a tradition for the NATO allies to issue a declaration on the CFE regime at the OSCE Ministerial Council, generally inspired by the communiqué issued by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs at their December meeting, underscoring the strategic importance of the Treaty as a cornerstone of Euro-Atlantic security and urging the Russian Federation to work co-operatively to preserve the benefits of this landmark regime.<sup>104</sup>

The OSCE’s own unique set of complementary, mutually reinforcing arms control arrangements and confidence- and security-building measures – particularly the Vienna Document (VD), a politically binding instrument adopted in 1990 – has played a central role in fostering security in Europe. NATO strongly supports efforts to strengthen this mechanism for transparency and predictability and has repeatedly advocated in favour of modernizing the VD, inviting everyone to participate constructively in this work.<sup>105</sup> A number of NATO member states have tabled concrete proposals on how to modernize the document. In a time of growing competition in the Euro-Atlantic area, NATO’s “empowerment” of the OSCE to reinvigorate the VD and the corresponding “division of labour” between the two organizations to ensure that relations are characterized by predictability, confidence, and stability should be underlined and valued.<sup>106</sup> The OSCE and its VD could prove to be an advantageous and inclusive arena in which to discuss hazardous

---

102 Cf. North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *NATO response to Russian announcement of intent to suspend obligations under the CFE Treaty*, 16 July 2007, at: [http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news\\_46613.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_46613.htm).

103 Cf. Pierre von Arx, *Recent Developments in the Field of Arms Control and Confidence- and Security-Building Measures*, in: Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg/IFSH (ed.) *OSCE Yearbook 2011*, Baden-Baden 2012, pp. 201-223, here: pp. 216-217.

104 Cf. MC.DEL/86/08, 8 December 2008; MC.DEL/78/09, 2 December 2009.

105 Cf. *Warsaw Summit Communiqué*, cited above (note 83), para. 13; *Press conference by NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg following the meeting of the NATO-Ukraine Commission at the level of Defence Ministers*, 15 June 2016, at: [http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions\\_132488.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_132488.htm); *NATO Secretary General stresses the importance of political dialogue after NATO-Russia Council*, 20 April 2016, at: [http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news\\_130125.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_130125.htm).

106 Cf. Kadri Liik/Merle Maigre, *NATO-Russia dialogue and the future of the NATO-Russia Council*, European Council on Foreign Relations, 5 July 2016, at: [http://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary\\_nato\\_russia\\_dialogue\\_and\\_the\\_future\\_of\\_the\\_nato\\_russia\\_council](http://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary_nato_russia_dialogue_and_the_future_of_the_nato_russia_council).

military incidents and resume dialogue on military transparency between Russia and NATO member states.<sup>107</sup>

In the area of small arms and light weapons (SALW) and stockpiles of conventional ammunition, which is another recognized OSCE “niche”, with a considerable level of activity in all the OSCE’s sub-regions, the close coordination between NATO, the EU, and the OSCE also deserves to be mentioned. Co-ordination activities have been taken up on an ad hoc basis between all players, typically through regular video-conferences.

The 2016 Hamburg Ministerial Council launched the Structured Dialogue on the current and future challenges and risks to security in the OSCE area which, in 2017 under the Austrian Chairmanship, focused on threat perceptions, developments in military doctrines and trends in force postures, and military activities that have the potential to cause concern. While avoiding the “bloc-to-bloc” approach, the Alliance’s concerted position and clear guidance, at least on some key common points, in support of the Dialogue, has been and will remain helpful.

#### *Counter-Terrorism and Counter-Narcotics*

After the 9/11 attacks, both the OSCE and NATO identified international terrorism as a key threat to the Euro-Atlantic area and to international security more generally, and adapted their strategy and capacity to be able to combat that threat. The 2012 Consolidated Framework for the Fight against Terrorism mandates the OSCE to co-operate externally with other relevant international and regional organizations to avoid duplication of efforts and maximize synergies,<sup>108</sup> which echoes NATO’s Policy Guidelines on Counter-Terrorism, adopted that same year.<sup>109</sup> The OSCE and its Consolidated Framework are mentioned explicitly in NATO’s 2012 Guidelines.<sup>110</sup>

Co-operation between NATO and the OSCE on counter-terrorism occurs mainly at headquarters level through regular cross-invitations to conferences and events and via information exchange. For instance, the NATO Centre of Excellence – Defence Against Terrorism (COE-DAT) has regularly involved the OSCE’s Action against Terrorism Unit (ATU) in its meetings. Reciprocally, Ambassador Sorin Ducaru, NATO Assistant Secretary General

---

107 Cf. Loïc Simonet/Veera Tuomala, How can the OSCE help to reduce the risk of hazardous military incidents? In: *NATO Review*, November 2016, at: <https://www.nato.int/docu/review/2016/Also-in-2016/OSCE-help-reduce-risk-military-incidents/EN/index.htm>.

108 Cf. Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Permanent Council, *Decision No. 1063, OSCE Consolidated Framework for the Fight against Terrorism*, PC.DEC/1063, 7 December 2012, Annex.

109 “NATO will promote complementarity with and avoid unnecessary duplication of existing efforts by individual nations or other International Organisations. NATO will seek to coordinate and leverage its expertise and resources and will focus on targeted programmes where it can contribute to and/or reinforce the actions of Allied nations and other international actors, as appropriate.” North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *NATO’s policy guidelines on counter-terrorism. Aware, Capable and Engaged for a Safer Future*, 21 May 2012, para. 8, at: [http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official\\_texts\\_87905.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_87905.htm).

110 Cf. *ibid.*, para. 12.

for Emerging Security Challenges, has been actively interacting with the OSCE relevant bodies these past few years. Both organizations have been involved in facilitating the implementation of the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy in Central Asia, and have shared expertise on how to prevent weapons of mass destruction (WMD) terrorism and how best to implement UN Security Council Resolution 1540.<sup>111</sup>

The potential for NATO-OSCE co-operation to combat terrorism should, however, be further explored. In particular, there is a need to move towards operationalizing NATO-OSCE co-operation on the ground, particularly on border- and police-related activities and training. Central Asian states, for instance, have repeatedly requested assistance from both NATO and the OSCE with regard to border security and management. There might be room for exploring the enhancement of co-operation between the two organizations in that region, perhaps with the involvement of other international partner organizations.<sup>112</sup> Co-ordination is needed to ensure that activities around Afghanistan<sup>113</sup> are complementary and avoid duplication, while seeking to minimize “forum shopping”. More concretely, NATO and the OSCE could join forces in setting up mechanisms to encourage and facilitate information exchange between ISAF and the border services of neighbouring Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan. NATO could use the Border Management Staff College (BMSC), one of the OSCE’s most effective tools for fighting transnational threats in Central Asia, as a useful conduit for the training of officers from Afghanistan, side by side with officers from OSCE participating States in the region, and as a regional capacity building hub on issues relating to transnational threats (TNT).

In the area of counter-narcotics, NATO and the OSCE could consider co-ordinating training activities for Afghan and Central Asian counter-

---

111 “Continued cooperation with regional organisations such as the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) can contribute to efforts to encourage member States to comply with relevant international agreements.” North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO’s *Comprehensive, Strategic-Level Policy for Preventing the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and Defending against Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) Threats*, 1 September 2009, para. 31, at: [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official\\_texts\\_57218.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_57218.htm), circulated within the OSCE as SEC/DEL/278.09, 19 October 2009.

112 It is deeply to be regretted that the special mapping exercise between the OSCE, NATO, and the EU to analyse existing projects in Central Asia, identify gaps, and decide on actions to be taken in a co-ordinated manner in form of a matrix, which was launched in 2014, has never been brought to a conclusion.

113 Following similar efforts in 2004 and 2005, the OSCE was invited to support the presidential and provincial council elections in Afghanistan scheduled for 20 August 2009 and, under Permanent Council Decision No. 891, dated 2 April 2009, the participating States agreed to send an Election Support Team (EST) organized by ODIHR, to assist the Afghan government and international efforts. In that framework, the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) provided in extremis medical support, including CASEVAC, MEDEVAC, rescue, and extraction. NATO/ISAF installations were also made available as safe heavens if required. Through ISAF, NATO once again provided the security necessary for us to deploy an OSCE Election Support Team in support of the presidential and provincial elections of April 2014.

narcotics and law enforcement officials. Both organizations currently run similar training programmes, which could be synchronized for greater impact. Another idea is to set up mechanisms to facilitate information and intelligence sharing between ISAF/NATO counter-narcotics experts, and border agencies and counter-narcotics agencies in Afghanistan and neighbouring Central Asian states – a priority raised by the Afghan authorities.<sup>114</sup>

The NATO Science for Peace and Security (SPS) Programme, which spans a range of new security challenges and strives to bring together scientists, experts, and policy makers from NATO and partner countries to address emerging security challenges,<sup>115</sup> could be the framework for OSCE-NATO joint activities on TNT-related issues.

### *Cybersecurity*

NATO already began to address the issue of protecting its communication and information systems against cyber threats a long time ago. After the 2008 conflict in the Caucasus demonstrated that cyber attacks have the potential to become a component of military operations, NATO's 2010 Strategic Concept, adopted at the Lisbon Summit in 2010, recognized that "cyber attacks [...] can reach a threshold that threatens national and Euro-Atlantic prosperity, security and stability". The use of cyber attacks in 2014, in the context of hybrid operations in Crimea and Eastern Ukraine, and a disruptive Distributed Denial of Service (DDoS) attack against NATO that blocked the Alliance's website for more than ten hours, justified a third policy on cyber defence endorsed at the Wales Summit.<sup>116</sup> Several bodies associated with NATO are also helping the Alliance to improve cyber defences, including the NATO Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence in Tallinn, Estonia, which is a NATO-accredited research and training facility dealing with cyber defence education, research, and development.

Like NATO, the OSCE has focused increased attention on cybersecurity. Its work towards a body of confidence-building measures (CBMs) to reduce the risks of conflict stemming from the use of information and communication technologies led to the adoption, at the 2016 Hamburg Ministerial Council, of a decision on that matter.<sup>117</sup> At the Warsaw Summit, without expressly mentioning the OSCE, NATO expressed its support for the work undertaken in other international forums, including efforts related to CBMs

---

114 Cf. Alexander Vinnikov, NATO and Central Asia: Security, interests and values in a strategic region, in: *Security and Human Rights* 1/2009, pp. 68-82, here: p. 80.

115 Cf. North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *Science for Peace and Security*, at: <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/78209.htm>.

116 Cf. *Wales Summit Declaration*, cited above (Note 82), para. 72.

117 Cf. Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Ministerial Council, Hamburg 2016, *Decision No. 5/16, OSCE Efforts Related to Reducing the Risks of Conflict Stemming from the Use of Information and Communication Technologies*, MC.DEC/5/16, 9 December 2016, at: <http://www.osce.org/cio/288086>.

and the development of voluntary international norms of responsible state behaviour in cyberspace.<sup>118</sup>

NATO and the OSCE could build on their obvious synergies in this field. On 27 January 2014, the OSCE Co-ordinator of Activities to Address Transnational Threats briefed NATO's Defence Policy and Planning Committee (DPPC) on OSCE efforts related to the development of cyber/ICT security-related CBMs. More recently, on 22 March 2017, the NATO Assistant Secretary General for Emerging Security Challenges briefed the 64th Joint Meeting of the OSCE Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC) and the Permanent Council on "military aspects of cyber security".<sup>119</sup> This active information exchange between NATO and OSCE in this area should continue and further deepen.

#### *Economic Environment*

NATO and the OSCE have partnered quite actively these past few years on the economic and environmental aspects of security, but on rather a piecemeal, project-by-project basis, and without an overall strategy or a comprehensive framework.

NATO, through its SPS Programme, has joined the Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC)<sup>120</sup> as an associate. ENVSEC provides the Alliance with the opportunity to join forces in addressing environmental challenges that have security implications. The first joint NATO-OSCE activity in that framework was a multi-year project on monitoring the Kura and Aras river system, which is shared by all three countries in the South Caucasus. From 2003 till 2008, NATO supported the installation of a central laboratory in each of the three countries, Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia. The equipment that was purchased and installed with NATO SPS Programme funds were identical for the three countries and the experts were jointly trained in Norway and Belgium. This ensured that each country had a single central reference laboratory and that all of them were monitoring the water quality with the same high standards, allowing them to consolidate data with confidence, and providing a unique platform for information sharing in the region. OSCE provided funds to top up the salaries of the experts involved and the OSCE Mission in Georgia regularly assessed the laboratories on site and helped to ensure that end-users were kept informed. OSCE field operations in the re-

---

118 Cf. *Warsaw Summit Communiqué*, cited above (Note 83), para. 70.

119 Cf. FSC-PC.DEL/3/17, 23 March 2017.

120 ENVSEC was launched in 2003 simultaneously at the OSCE Economic Forum in Prague and the Environment for Europe Ministerial Conference in Kiev. The OSCE, the UNDP, and the UNEP are the founding members, and were joined by the UNECE, the Regional Environment Centre for Central and Eastern Europe (REC), and NATO in the following years. The primary objective of the initiative is to promote environmental co-operation as a tool for conflict prevention and confidence-building. ENVSEC works in four main areas: management of transboundary natural resources; hazardous substances and industrial legacies; climate change adaptation; and public awareness and participation.

gion have been instrumental in monitoring the project activities and bringing the project to the attention of local authorities.

In 2004 the OSCE, NATO, UNDP, and UNEP collaborated on an in-depth technical assessment of environmental risk factors in the Ferghana Valley. They also launched a 2.5 million dollar programme to deal with radioactive waste management, preventing and remedying industrial hazards, improving disaster preparedness and risk reduction, and to introduce sustainable management of land and water. More recently, in 2012, within the “Environmental Security” section of NATO’s SPS Programme, the OSCE submitted a project on “strengthening preparedness for floods and landslides in South Caucasus”, aiming at strengthening early warning and preparedness for natural disasters in Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia, with specific focus on floods and landslides.

On 10 December 2007, in Valencia, Spain, a workshop on “Water Scarcity, Land Degradation and Desertification in the Mediterranean Region – Environment and Security Linkages” was jointly organized by the NATO Public Diplomacy Division, the OSCE Spanish Chairmanship, and the Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities (OCEEA).<sup>121</sup> Participants discussed the specific roles the OSCE, NATO, and other organizations could play in fostering environmental security in the Mediterranean region, following the adoption by the OSCE Ministerial Council of the Madrid Declaration on Environment and Security.

Finally, the neutralization of “melange”, an extremely reactive, volatile, and highly toxic missile fuel component that was used for rockets and guided missiles in the former Soviet Union, provided the OSCE with the opportunity to partner with the NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency (NAMSA), which had set up a “melange joint board” to which the OSCE was invited to send an expert. A workshop on the disposal of this component of rocket fuel was held in Kyiv, Ukraine, on 6-8 July 2005<sup>122</sup> and a joint trust fund specially dedicated to melange related projects was explored, but it does not seem that this initiative was pursued further. More tailored co-operation with NAMSA could be envisaged. The OSCE could, for example, request the agency’s help in clearing up unstable munitions.

#### *Countering Trafficking in Human Beings*

NATO’s 2004 policy on trafficking in human beings mentions the OSCE’s work in the area.<sup>123</sup> The OSCE’s ambitious project on “Combating Human Trafficking along Migration Routes” has also aroused the Alliance’s interest.

---

121 Cf. SEC.PR/568/07, 10 December 2007.

122 Cf. SEC.PR/352/05, 8 July 2005.

123 “NATO will support and sustain further development of practical cooperation between nations and between NATO and other international institutions such as the UN, OSCE and International Organisation for Migration.” NATO, *NATO Policy On Combating Trafficking In Human Beings*, Policy document, 29 June 2004, para. 2, at: <http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/2004/06-istanbul/docu-traffic.htm>.

The Director of the NATO Stability Policing Centre of Excellence attended the opening ceremony of the first OSCE simulation-based training on human trafficking, conducted at the Center of Excellence for Stability Police Units (CoESPU) in Vicenza, Italy, on 14 November 2016, and the Alliance has observed the following exercises.

*Women, Peace, and Security*

The first NATO Policy on Women, Peace and Security dates back to 2007, and NATO's first Action Plan in this area was drafted in 2010. A revised Policy and a new Action Plan were adopted in 2014.<sup>124</sup> In September 2014, a NATO Education and Training Plan for Gender in Military Operations was approved, which unifies and synchronizes gender education and training at all levels. The Nordic Centre for Gender in Military Operations (NCGM) was designated the NATO Department Head for Gender in Military Operations. Furthermore, a network of gender advisors and Gender Focal Points has been established throughout the entire organization – on both the civilian and military side – in all departments, units, and levels of command. The nomination of a NATO Special Representative for Women, Peace and Security as a permanent NATO position has also been an important contribution to further institutionalizing and securing gender expertise within NATO, particularly at the strategic level. Last but not least, the appointment, in 2016, of the first-ever female Deputy Secretary General of the Alliance, in the eminent person of Rose Gottemoeller, gave an important signal.

NATO recently pledged to strengthen its partnership for gender equality with other international organizations, including the OSCE. Indeed, the OSCE has developed its own policies on how to include women at all stages of the conflict cycle and work on a wide range of issues covered by the women, peace, and security agenda, solidly based on its 2004 Action Plan for the Promotion of Gender Equality. The OSCE Gender Section supports participating States in the development, implementation, and evaluation of National Action Plans on the implementation of UNSCR 1325 on women, peace, and security and half of existing plans worldwide are from the OSCE region.

The OSCE and NATO regularly discuss common issues of interest, and potential areas for further co-ordination, including regarding the implementation of UNSCR 1325 in Ukraine. Ambassador Marriët Schuurman, NATO Special Representative for Women, Peace and Security, participated in two key OSCE events in 2016, addressing the Forum for Security Co-operation in February in connection with International Women's Day<sup>125</sup> and speaking on "Gender Mainstreaming in Operational Responses to Violent Extremism" at

---

124 Cf. North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *NATO/EAPC Policy for the implementation of UNSCR 1325 on Women, Peace and Security and related resolution*, 1 April 2014, at: [http://www.nato.int/cps/de/natohq/official\\_texts\\_109830.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/de/natohq/official_texts_109830.htm).

125 Cf. FSC.DEL/18/16, 2 February 2016.

the conference organized by the OSCE Action against Terrorism Unit in November.

#### *Contribution to NATO Curricula*

The OSCE regularly contributes to the teaching programme of the NATO School at Oberammergau (including the courses on Environmental Management for Military Forces and European Security Co-operation). Since 2013, the OSCE has participated in the Comprehensive Approach Awareness Course, which is aimed at facilitating a shared understanding of the complex strategic considerations in contemporary crisis management processes among NATO partner organizations. The OSCE contribution to the activities of the NATO Defense College in Rome has also been regular and substantial. OSCE Secretary General Zannier gave an Eisenhower Lecture at the College on 31 October 2014, on “Current European Security Challenges and the Role of the OSCE”.

As for the OSCE Academy in Bishkek (Kyrgyzstan), despite some efforts, it has not yet managed to attract NATO’s involvement through provision of expertise and participation in high-level conferences, and, hence, to become a platform for consultations between NATO and regional experts, notably on Afghanistan-related issues.

Security sector governance and reform, a topic in which both NATO and the OSCE strive to enhance the co-ordination of their activities as well as the coherence of the support they deliver, and energy security, where NATO’s views are directly compatible with those of the OSCE, especially on the protection of critical energy infrastructures from terrorist attacks,<sup>126</sup> could offer avenues for further co-operation and joint activities.

#### *New Perspectives to Explore*

“History will judge this Conference not by what we say here today, but by what we do tomorrow”, Gerald Ford, the President of the United States, said at the signing of the Helsinki Final Act in 1975.<sup>127</sup> Will security around the Mediterranean one day be a matter of common concern between the OSCE and the Atlantic Alliance, in line with NATO’s new “Southern Strategy”? Above all, is there a need for a new framework for discussion between the two actors that would institutionalize what is, at present, a generally pragmatic and informal relationship?

---

126 Cf. Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Ministerial Council, Madrid 2007, *Decision No. 6/07, Protecting Critical Energy Infrastructure from Terrorist Attacks*, MC.DEC/6/07, 30 November 2007, at: <http://www.osce.org/mc/29482>.

127 Address before the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, CSCE/III/PV.5, p. 11.

*The Mediterranean, a New Horizon for NATO-OSCE Co-operation?*

The 1967 “Report of the Council on the Future Tasks of the Alliance”, also known as the Harmel Report, already encouraged the Allies to examine with particular attention the defence problems of the Mediterranean as an “exposed area”.<sup>128</sup> Fifty years after this milestone document, NATO’s “Southern flank” is again under scrutiny.

The geographical scope of the NATO Mediterranean Dialogue, launched in 1994 by the NAC with the aim of contributing to regional security and stability through improved mutual understanding, corresponds to the OSCE Mediterranean Partnership, with one exception: Mauritania, which is included in the NATO initiative, is not an OSCE Partner for Co-operation.<sup>129</sup> Many of the areas of NATO partners’ engagement mirror areas of OSCE interaction with its own partners. However, security around the Mediterranean has rarely been the basis for exchanges between the two organizations.

In 2002, at the invitation of the Chairman of NATO’s Mediterranean Co-operation Group, a representative of the OSCE Secretariat briefed delegates of the then 19 NATO nations on the OSCE Mediterranean Dialogue, two weeks after a representative of the NATO International Secretariat briefed the OSCE Mediterranean Contact Group on NATO’s own dialogue.<sup>130</sup> During the latter meeting, it was suggested that expert-level meetings be convened between NATO and the OSCE on matters of common concern with reference to Mediterranean-related issues. A periodical (annual or twice-yearly) exchange of views and expertise among the OSCE, NATO, and the EU with respect to their complementary Mediterranean dialogues and partnerships was also proposed. As a result of a decision taken at the NATO Prague Summit to strengthen the existing complementarity between the Alliance’s Mediterranean Dialogue and other international efforts, NATO-OSCE staff talks in 2003 offered, for the first time, the opportunity to discuss the two organizations’ Mediterranean dialogues. But nothing substantial happened until 2013, when the OSCE Secretariat took part in the NATO Policy Advisory Group meeting on the Mediterranean Dialogue.<sup>131</sup> Similarly, little practical co-operation has been implemented, with the noticeable exception of the above-mentioned workshop on “Water Scarcity”.

The OSCE was not the only organization surprised by the Arab Spring: “The uprising against the regimes came as a surprise even for an institution

---

128 Cf. North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *The Future Tasks of the Alliance. Report of the Council – “The Harmel Report”*, 13 December 1967, para. 14, at: [https://www.nato.int/cps/ua/natohq/official\\_texts\\_26700.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/ua/natohq/official_texts_26700.htm).

129 On the OSCE Mediterranean Partnership for Co-operation, cf. Loïc Simonet, *The OSCE Mediterranean Partnership Four Years after the Start of the “Arab Spring”*, in: *OSCE Yearbook 2014*, cited above (Note 81), pp. 315-337.

130 Cf. SEC.GAL/139/02, 19 July 2002.

131 The OSCE was again invited to the 2017 edition of the NATO Policy Advisory Group meeting, in Nouakchott, Mauritania.

like NATO”,<sup>132</sup> the Research Division of NATO Defense College in Rome confessed. Shortly thereafter, on 25 October 2011, the International Peace Institute’s (IPI) Vienna office hosted a workshop on how the uprisings and changes in the Arab world affect the partnership between the OSCE and its Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation.<sup>133</sup>

NATO’s new “Southern Strategy”, as defined at the Warsaw Summit, could lead to closer co-operation with the OSCE. Migration issues, where the impact of EU policies is important, could become a field of more interconnection between the organizations acting in the Mediterranean, as could security sector reform capacity, mediation, interfaith dialogue, transnational threats (in particular managing challenges deriving from the situation in the Sahel) and enhancing interaction with regional organizations (African Union, ECOWAS). The situation in Libya, which applied to become an OSCE Partner for Co-operation in 2013 – so far to no avail – should also be a matter of joint concern. On 11 February 2004, at the Munich Security Conference, the then OSCE Chairman-in-Office, Bulgarian Foreign Minister Solomon Passy, suggested that an EU-NATO-OSCE Mediterranean conference could, perhaps, provide a good start for intensifying co-operation in the region.<sup>134</sup> This idea could be revisited.

The Alliance’s new anti-terrorism hub in Naples, whose blueprint was approved in February 2017 and which will serve as a focal point for monitoring threats growing along the Alliance’s southern doorstep, could offer a platform for interaction with other security organizations. Planned to be active by the end of 2017, it will be a centre of co-ordination for anti-terrorism, intelligence, and defence capacity-building to stabilize North Africa and the Middle East as well as warding off threats from the south.

#### *Are New Forums and Tools for Co-operation Needed?*

Inventing co-ordination mechanisms for international organizations has always been a difficult exercise, whatever the confident and constructive relationship they might enjoy. The 1999 Platform for Co-operative Security has remained a merely theoretical framework. Further to it, the OSCE Strategy to Address Threats to Security and Stability in the Twenty-First Century (2003) had envisaged the creation of an ad hoc consultative mechanism between international organizations mandated to provide threat analysis and response. However, that mechanism never came into being due to a lack of interest on the part of some of the OSCE’s partner organizations.

Interestingly enough, such a mechanism does exist between NATO and the OSCE, but has recently been “frozen”. Created in 1997 as the successor

---

132 Florence Gaub/Sandy Guptill/Karl-Heinz Kamp/Pierre Razoux/Rolf Schwarz, *The Arab Explosion: Questions and Options for NATO*, Research Division, NATO Defense College, Rome, 23 February 2011, p. 1.

133 Cf. IPI, *The OSCE-Mediterranean Partnership and the Arab Uprisings*, December 2011.

134 Cf. SEC.PR/45/04, 11 February 2004.

to the NACC, the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) has long been a forum for dialogue, political consultation, and co-operation between NATO and its partners and is critically important to European security in many areas, including regional issues, arms control and SALW,<sup>135</sup> peacekeeping, defence economic issues, civil emergency planning, and scientific and environmental issues. It was able to identify and discuss early warning and conflict prevention matters and provide contributions to confidence building in the Euro-Atlantic area, and was instrumental in promoting political change, assisting defence reform, and fostering a common security culture.<sup>136</sup>

It is not easy to assess why the EAPC has declined and was finally made dormant. In 2000, Secretary General Robertson had suggested: “We should use the EAPC’s flexibility to explore innovative ways of addressing security challenges”, belying claims of the EAPC’s irrelevance.<sup>137</sup> Along similar lines, in 2001, the Romanian OSCE Chairmanship forwarded to NATO a Non-Paper on “Enhancing NATO-OSCE Co-operation with the EAPC Contribution”, prepared by the ambassadors of Austria, Portugal, and Romania. However, the Council’s briefing by the Chairperson of the PC in November 2013 seems to have been the last interaction between the OSCE and this body. Critics of the EAPC said that the Council played more or less the same role as the OSCE, with almost identical membership.<sup>138</sup> But the main reason for its downfall could simply be, once again, the deterioration of the NATO-Russia relationship.

The fate of the Partnership Interoperability Initiative, launched by NATO in 2014 as part of the implementation of the Strategic Concept adopted at the 2010 Lisbon Summit, has not, so far, been more positive. The initiative included two key elements. First, an Interoperability Platform: a framework for dialogue on co-operation and the compatibility of operational and strategic objectives between NATO and its partners in crisis management operations. This serves a similar purpose as the OSCE’s Platform for Co-operative Security, namely the advancement of strategic and operational coherence among intergovernmental organizations, though it is narrower in scope and audience than the OSCE initiative.<sup>139</sup> Second, a set of proposals to enhance NATO’s co-operation with the UN, the EU, and the OSCE in places where they have been deployed side-by-side with NATO, which included:

---

135 The EAPC had created an Ad Hoc Working Group on Small Arms and Light Weapons and Mine Action, which was addressed by the FSC Co-ordinator on that issue on 17 November 2004. An EAPC-OSCE co-sponsored Synergy Conference for Regional Organizations on the Implementation of the UN Programme of Action on SALW, was held at NATO headquarters on 28-30 May 2008.

136 OSCE Secretary General Perrin de Brichambaut addressed the EAPC on 11 July 2007.

137 *Intervention by Secretary General at the OSCE Permanent Council*, cited above (Note 8).

138 André Dumoulin, *Enjeux et signifiants de l’extension de l’OTAN*, in: *Etudes internationales* 3/1999, pp. 547-570, here: p. 568.

139 The main addressees of the Platform were NATO’s partner states; however, the ministers had agreed to invite the OSCE, the UN, and the EU to attend Platform meetings when relevant.

staff-to-staff contacts to share situation assessments and exchange information; exchange of good practices and lessons learnt related to training and operations; analysis of lessons learnt, including through NATO's Joint Analysis and Lessons Learnt Centre (JALLC), and proposals for corrective measures if necessary; and continued engagement of international organizations in NATO's crisis management exercises. To our knowledge, no concrete steps for the implementation of the Interoperability Platform have yet been taken and it is difficult to assess how it has been received by other key players.

Is there a need to persevere and design a dedicated platform for the dialogue between the Atlantic Alliance and its partners, including the OSCE? "What speaks against a European Security Forum convening regularly in Brussels with an agenda that also affects all other institutions in which political strategies are discussed, tasks distributed, synergies produced and frictional losses avoided?", a German diplomat asked.<sup>140</sup> Ad hoc, informal, and pragmatic co-operation has its merits for sure, especially given that the current political context might impede any further institutionalization, but a more formal structure would undoubtedly have a decisive advantage, both for the organizations and for their member states. In the same vein, although the co-operation between the EU and NATO since the Berlin Plus Agreement in 2003, which culminated in the joint declaration signed on 8 July 2016,<sup>141</sup> is unlikely to be matched, nothing should prevent the OSCE from at least engaging with the Alliance via a declaration on Secretariat co-operation, following the model of the UN-NATO 2008 declaration,<sup>142</sup> if deemed useful and necessary by the two parties.

### Conclusion

In his book *Security Without Nuclear Deterrence*, Commander Robert Green, a retired Royal Navy officer and an outspoken opponent of nuclear weapons, imagines an Atlantic Alliance merged into the OSCE, the only organization able, in his opinion, to "provide a way out of what is known as the 'security dilemma', whereby unilateral pursuit of security leads to more insecurity in others who take measures to defend themselves, leading to perpetual hostility and arms racing [...] NATO would be transformed into a common safety net for all fifty-seven states 'from Vancouver to Vladivostok'. This would merit

---

140 Reinhard Bettzuege, *The OSCE of the 21st Century – A Departure for New Horizons?* In: Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg/IFSH (ed.), *OSCE Yearbook 2002*, Baden-Baden 2003, pp. 39-45, here p. 44.

141 North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *Joint declaration by the President of the European Council, the President of the European Commission, and the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization*, 8 July 2016, at: [http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official\\_texts\\_133163.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_133163.htm).

142 Cf. *Joint Declaration on UN/NATO secretariat Cooperation*, signed in New York on 23 September 2008, at: <http://streitcouncil.org/uploads/PDF/UN-NATO%20Joint%20Declaration.pdf>.

a new name: perhaps the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe, North Asia and North America (OSCENANA)?”<sup>143</sup>

OSCENANA is unlikely to see daylight in the near future, but NATO and the OSCE must continue to work together on shared security concerns, optimizing the complementarity of their core activities under a co-operative security logic in a mutually beneficial way and in full respect of the institutional autonomy of each other. Such continued interaction is indispensable, as evidenced by the letter sent on 14 July 2017 to NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg and OSCE Chairman-in-Office Sebastian Kurz by 50 European parliamentarians from 13 countries, urging these two key European security organizations to pursue dialogue, détente, and nuclear risk reduction in Europe.<sup>144</sup>

Beyond the close and confident day-to-day co-operation between NATO and the OSCE, there is obviously a need for new “success stories”. Although continuing in 2017, the two organizations’ fruitful co-operation in the Balkans is largely behind us and it is arguably unlikely that their association in Kosovo could be repeated in the near future, given the controversy it raised. The fact that the OSCE Chairmanship will be held by two NATO member states in 2018 (Italy) and 2019 (Slovakia) might offer opportunities for new developments. But, the OSCE should also be courageous in aiming to transcend the political divides and free itself from (often self-imposed) constraints. As rightly pointed out in a recent paper discussing international crisis management, “the OSCE must find a formula for maintaining close interaction with other international organizations, especially the EU and NATO”. It must also “demonstrate constructive practical action in the re-establishing of cooperative European security”.<sup>145</sup> The situation that prevented NATO from taking the floor at the OSCE Ministerial Councils in 2015 and 2016, breaking a long-established tradition, is unacceptable and should be solved as a matter of urgency. The opening of a small OSCE liaison office in Brussels, which could cover both the EU and NATO, would facilitate this process. This would place the Organization in closer contact with the decision-shaping process and strategic thinking and enable it to react quickly to new measures, and to develop a network of contacts. This idea, which has been proposed several times in the past,<sup>146</sup> should no longer be

---

143 Commander Robert Green, Royal Navy (Ret’d), *Security Without Nuclear Deterrence*, Christchurch 2010, p. 122.

144 Cf. Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament (PNND), *European parliamentarians call on NATO and OSCE to reduce nuclear threats and support disarmament*, 14 July 2017, at: <http://www.pnnd.org/article/european-parliamentarians-call-nato-and-osce-reduce-nuclear-threats-and-support-disarmament>.

145 Tytarchuk/Khylko, cited above (Note 84), p. 97.

146 Cf. Gérard Stoudmann, *The OSCE: Still relevant to the new global security environment?* In: *Helsinki Monitor* 3/2005, pp. 199-203, here: pp. 199-200, and Lars-Erik Lundin, “*Working together: the OSCE’s relationship with other relevant international organisations*”. *Nine steps to effective OSCE engagement*, *Food-for-thought paper commissioned by the CiO*, CIO.GAL/83/12/Corr.1\*, 9 July 2012.

taboo. A similar and equal opportunity should also be offered to international organizations “East of Vienna”, if desired by them. The 50th anniversary of the Harmel Report,<sup>147</sup> a key political and strategic document, which urged that détente and dialogue join defence as equal major functions of the Atlantic Alliance, is a timely moment to call for invention, pragmatism, and renewed political solutions.

Relations between the OSCE and NATO have been crucial in developing the security architecture of post-Cold War Europe. “NATO and the OSCE have a shared past in making Europe more stable and secure. Our job now, is to make tomorrow even more secure.”<sup>148</sup>

---

147 North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *The Future Tasks of the Alliance*, cited above (Note 128).

148 “NATO and the OSCE: building security together”, cited above (Note 89).