



**CIVIL SOCIETY RECOMMENDATIONS
TO THE OSCE EXECUTIVE AND POLITICAL BODIES,
INSTITUTIONS, AND PARTICIPATING STATES**

**Adopted by the participants of the
OSCE Parallel Civil Society Conference 2018**

Milano, 5 December 2018

Contents

Introduction	1
Listen to the voice of civil society: Appeal to the OSCE political and executive bodies, autonomous institutions, and participating States	3
Safeguarding NGO participation in OSCE events	5
Themes and issues addressed in the outcome documents of the OSCE Parallel Civil Society Conferences from 2010-2018	7
Content of and links to the outcome documents of the OSCE Parallel Civil Society Conferences from 2010-2018	11

Copyright 2018, the Civic Solidarity Platform

The Civic Solidarity Platform is a network of independent civic groups from across the OSCE region, bringing together non-governmental organizations, activists and experts committed to improving the situation with human rights, rule of law, and democratic institutions in Europe, Eurasia and North America. Its aim is to serve as a conduit through which civic activists can build alliances, strengthen mutual support and solidarity, and improve their influence on national and international human rights policy.

Website: <http://civicsolidarity.org>
Twitter: twitter.com/CivicSolidarity
Facebook: www.facebook.com/CivicSolidarity
Instagram: www.instagram.com/civic_solidarity
YouTube: www.youtube.com/user/CivicSolidarity

INTRODUCTION

The Civic Solidarity Platform, a network of around 90 human rights NGOs from throughout the OSCE region,¹ convened the 2018 OSCE Parallel Civil Society Conference in Milano on 5 December, building upon the tradition of OSCE Parallel Civil Society Conferences held in Astana, Vilnius, Dublin, Kiev, Basel, Belgrade, Hamburg, and Vienna from 2010-2017. At the 2018 conference, activists and experts from Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, the Netherlands, Poland, Russia, Serbia, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, the United Kingdom and the USA discussed and adopted the outcome documents of the conference, developed by the Civic Solidarity Platform.

The outcome documents include the Milano Declaration on “Reviving the OSCE comprehensive security concept, rebuilding democratic institutions, revitalising resilience of our societies” and Civil Society Recommendations. The outcome documents are addressed to the governments of the OSCE participating States that will be gathering in Milano for this year’s meeting of the OSCE Ministerial Council, as well as to all OSCE political bodies and institutions, including the current and the incoming Chairmanships, Secretary General, the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media, the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, the Human Dimension Committee, the OSCE Secretariat, and the OSCE field missions.

We hope that this analysis and the recommendations that flow from it will be studied carefully at the OSCE Ministerial Council meeting and further on throughout the year by all OSCE actors. We look forward to reactions from all interested stakeholders. We express our commitment as civil society actors to continue actively engaging in the work of the OSCE in the spirit of the Helsinki Principles, and are determined to contribute to the full realization of the OSCE comprehensive security concept, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, democracy and the rule of law throughout the OSCE region.

¹ The Civic Solidarity Platform was established in Vilnius in December 2011 on the eve of the OSCE Parallel Civil Society Conference. Since then, it has grown to around 90 member organisations from across the OSCE region. For more information about the Civic Solidarity Platform, please visit the Platform’s web site civicsolidarity.org. The core group of the Platform founders had earlier organised the OSCE Parallel Civil Society Conference in Astana on the eve of the OSCE Summit in 2010. The Civic Solidarity Platform has been organising OSCE Parallel Civil Society Conferences since then. For outcome documents of the OSCE Parallel Conferences in Astana, Vilnius, Dublin, Kiev, Basel, Belgrade, Hamburg and Vienna please visit <http://civicsolidarity.org/page/osce-parallel-civil-society-conferences-outcome-documents>.

LISTEN TO THE VOICE OF CIVIL SOCIETY: APPEAL TO OSCE EXECUTIVE AND POLITICAL BODIES, AUTONOMOUS INSTITUTIONS AND PARTICIPATING STATES

For many years, civil society organizations engaged in the OSCE framework have worked hard to actively contribute to the activities of the OSCE, and enhance the effectiveness and relevance of its work in relation to the current challenges to our common comprehensive security. NGOs have presented results of their monitoring on the ground, their analysis and recommendations both at numerous human dimension events and directly to OSCE executive and political bodies, autonomous institutions, and delegations of participating States.

Since the 2010 OSCE Summit in Astana, NGOs have organized annual OSCE Parallel Civil Society Conferences on the eve of the OSCE Ministerial Council meetings. Each Parallel Conference has adopted outcome documents, including Declarations, Statements, and a set of concrete recommendations to all OSCE actors addressing a wide range of concerns in the human and other dimensions. Over these nine years, the total number of concrete recommendations by civil society amounts to several hundred.

We are strongly disappointed that only a small number of our recommendations have been heard and taken on board. Positive examples include:

- the elaboration and adoption of the OSCE/ODIHR Guidelines on Security of Human Rights Defenders (2014);
- the elaboration and adoption of the joint OSCE/ODIHR and Venice Commission Guidelines on Freedom of Association (2015);
- the close interaction and cooperation with civil society by some Chairmanships (since 2013);
- the introduction of an informal process of annual self-evaluation of implementation of human dimension commitments by the Chairmanship country (2014-2018);
- the introduction of changes in the modalities of the work of the Human Dimension Committee to ensure more systematic and meaningful voluntary reporting by participating States, stronger input by civil society, and increased transparency of the HDC work (since 2014);
- the establishment of a focal point on torture prevention at OSCE/ODIHR, leading to a more systematic focus in the work of ODIHR on this subject (since 2015);
- the consistent attention of a number of participating States to the problem of enforced disappearances in the OSCE region (since 2015);
- attention of the OSCE RFoM to the problem of abuse of freedom of expression in the form of propaganda and publication of a report on this issue (2015);
- the beginning of substantive dialogue between the Conflict Prevention Centre at the OSCE Secretariat and civil society organizations (since 2016);

- the application of the OSCE Mechanisms of response to crises in the human dimension, namely the Vienna and the Moscow Mechanisms (2018) and the increased focus on a follow-up to previously released Moscow Mechanism reports (since 2015);
- launching of initiatives by some member states in support of civil society and independent media, including the Democracy Defenders Initiative and Friends of Journalists Initiative (since 2016);
- the adoption by a group of participating States of a Declaration in support of civil society (2016) and their consistent efforts to ensure open access of civil society to human dimension events;
- Initiation of substantive dialogue of the OSCE Secretary General with civil society organizations (since 2018).

However, we regret that these positive examples are rare exceptions and that the overwhelming majority of our recommendations made over the last nine years have not been heard or seriously considered. We appreciate the attention of the OSCE leadership to the Parallel Conferences and their coming to these events to publicly accept civil society recommendations and comment on them, but we are disappointed that no follow up and proper attention is given to them. In the absence of a genuine intent to analyze and discuss our recommendations and the prospects for their practical implementation, such encounters remain no more than polite gestures.

At challenging times when progress in the OSCE work in all three dimensions is obstructed by growing divisions among participating States, civil society initiatives and proposals may assist all stakeholders to identify solutions to the deadlock thus ensuring progress in the OSCE work and its relevance to current common challenges.

For the reasons outlined above and to express our frustration, this year we have decided not to submit a new document with recommendations in a broad set of issues and opted to reiterate recommendations from the previous years that all remain highly relevant and deserve attention. Therefore, in addition to the Milano Declaration and the Statement on safeguarding NGO participation in human dimension events, we include this year a list of all recommendations made by the participants of OSCE Parallel Civil Society Conferences since 2010 broken down by themes, and a list of content of all documents adopted by Parallel Conferences in chronological order with links to their full texts.

We hope that representatives of the OSCE political and executive bodies, autonomous institutions, and participating States will finally find time to study and consider these recommendations seriously. The voice of civil society should be heard, at last.

SAFEGUARDING NGO PARTICIPATION IN OSCE EVENTS

Statement by the Civic Solidarity Platform

For four decades, civil society has played a crucial role in the OSCE human dimension work. But in recent months, NGO participation has become an issue of heated debate, as some governments that restrict civil society space in their own countries, are pushing for the adoption of new procedures to limit NGO access to OSCE events. They demand the right to veto and a guarantee that NGOs they do not like to see there will be blocked.

The Civic Solidarity Platform, an OSCE-wide NGO coalition, believes that restricting NGO participation in OSCE events on an arbitrary and politically-motivated basis would be a tremendous setback for the Helsinki process and a betrayal of OSCE founding values. Any procedure which provides for state approval of NGOs would be contrary to the basic principle of unhindered and equal NGO participation in OSCE events and would open the door for arbitrary, selective, discriminatory and politically-motivated decisions.

Paragraph 16, Chapter IV of the 1992 Helsinki Document, outlines the only grounds for restricting NGO participation, stating that access to OSCE meetings will not be allowed for “persons or organizations which resort to the use of violence or publicly condone terrorism or the use of violence.”²

As has been widely reported, some states have prosecuted NGOs on the basis of vaguely worded anti-extremism and anti-terrorism legislation that does not meet rule of law standards. This legislation is increasingly used to prosecute NGOs and activists who have nothing to do with violence and are targeted merely for exercising their fundamental rights in a peaceful and legitimate way. States are now using these same unfounded claims to justify restricting NGO access to OSCE.

Currently, there is no procedure for implementing Paragraph 16, although traditionally it has fallen to the Chairperson-in-Office and/or ODIHR to take decisions in cases when a state has raised an objection to the presence of a specific NGO. In the past, some Chairmanships have given in to such pressure, to avoid retaliation by states in other areas of the OSCE’s consensus-based decisions. And indeed, states have retaliated in the past. This experience shows that *in the absence of a clear procedure to review states’ calls to block the participation of certain NGOs, the consensus-based nature of the OSCE means it can easily be taken hostage to the will of those few states that insist on their demands being met.*

Our recommendations on this important matter are as follows:

1. Implementation of Paragraph 16 should be ensured through the *establishment of a transparent, predictable, and rule-of-law based procedure* to prevent arbitrariness and

² CSCE Helsinki Document 1992. The Challenges of Change. <https://www.osce.org/mc/39530?download=true>, p. 18

ad hoc decisions being taken under threats of blackmail and political pressure. It should be made clear that invoking this procedure is exceptional, not routine.

2. This procedure should by no means be based on a consensus decision by participating States (either “consensus in favour” or “consensus against”) which will be arbitrary and politicized, but instead entrusted to one of the organization’s official mandate holders.
3. In our view, it is preferable that *the role of arbiter*, responsible for reviewing the state claim and taking a final decision on the participation of a particular NGO *is not given to a political stakeholder* such as the Chairmanship, which might be sensitive to political pressure (be it in bilateral or multilateral frameworks). Instead, *it should be entrusted to OSCE executive structures* such as the Secretary General, the “guardian of the OSCE acquis”, or the ODIHR, which maintains regular cooperation with NGOs and works on protecting freedom of association. Both bodies have the necessary in-house expertise (the Anti-terrorism Unit at the Secretariat and Advisor on Anti-Terrorism Issues at the ODIHR Human Rights Department) and are not subject to direct political influence. If participating States do not support either of these two options, we suggest creating a special inter-institutional commission involving representatives of both bodies.
4. States should outline *precise, compelling and evidence-based claims that an NGO in question has been involved in, or condones terrorism or violence* (mere references to national “terrorist lists” or decisions by domestic courts should not be regarded as sufficient). The NGO in question should be notified of the claims and given an opportunity to respond, before the claims are reviewed by internal and, where necessary, external experts based on clear agreed criteria.
5. The final decision should be made in close consultation with the Chairmanship, Troika and experts, including civil society experts, and be communicated with an explanation to the state and the NGO, within a set timeframe.

Such a procedure would help to prevent this provision being abused by participating States intent on closing the doors of the OSCE to critical voices.

To ensure a more balanced approach, the ongoing discussions should not only focus on attempts to operationalize the implementation of Paragraph 16 to protect OSCE events from NGOs “which resort to the use of violence or publicly condone terrorism or the use of violence”. They should also cover the elaboration of effective ways to implement Paragraphs 14 and 15 of the 1992 Helsinki Document, which focus on ensuring increased, more meaningful and effective involvement of NGOs in OSCE activities. Many of specific measures suggested in these Paragraphs have not been implemented to date.

The OSCE has a responsibility to stand up for civil society organizations that are repressed at home, and to provide a platform for them to voice their positions, which is all the more important since they lack direct channels of communication with their governments.

THEMES AND ISSUES ADDRESSED IN THE OUTCOME DOCUMENTS OF THE OSCE PARALLEL CIVIL SOCIETY CONFERENCES FROM 2010-2018

1. Freedom of expression

2017: Recommendations of the Vienna Conference
2016: Recommendations of the Hamburg Conference
2015: The Belgrade Declaration
2015: Recommendations of the Belgrade Conference
2014: Recommendations of the Basel Conference
2013: Recommendations of the Kyiv Conference
2012: Recommendations of the Dublin Conference
2011: Recommendations of the Vilnius Conference
2010: Recommendations of the Astana Conference

2. Migration, xenophobia, intolerance, discrimination, and hate crimes

2017: Recommendations of the Vienna Conference
2016: Recommendations of the Hamburg Conference
2015: Recommendations of the Belgrade Conference
2014: The Basel Declaration
2014: Recommendations of the Basel Conference
2013: Recommendations of the Kyiv Conference
2012: Recommendations of the Dublin Conference
2010: Recommendations of the Astana Conference

3. Prevention of torture

2017: Recommendations of the Vienna Conference
2016: Recommendations of the Hamburg Conference
2015: Recommendations of the Belgrade Conference
2014: Recommendations of the Basel Conference
2013: The Kyiv Declaration
2013: Recommendations of the Kyiv Conference

4. Security of human rights defenders

2017: Recommendations of the Vienna Conference
2016: Recommendations of the Hamburg Conference
2014: Recommendations of the Basel Conference
2013: Recommendations of the Kyiv Conference
2012: The Dublin Declaration
2010: Recommendations of the Astana Conference

5. Rule of law

2017: Recommendations of the Vienna Conference
2016: Recommendations of the Hamburg Conference
2015: Recommendations of the Belgrade Conference
2014: Recommendations of the Basel Conference
2013: Recommendations of the Kyiv Conference
2011: Recommendations of the Vilnius Conference

6. Strengthening and developing the OSCE instruments and bodies

2017: Recommendations of the Vienna Conference
2015: Recommendations of the Belgrade Conference
2013: Recommendations of the Kyiv Conference
2012: Recommendations of the Dublin Conference
2011: Recommendations of the Vilnius Conference
2010: Recommendations of the Astana Conference

7. Protecting and expanding civil society space

2017: Recommendations of the Vienna Conference
2016: The Hamburg Declaration
2015: Recommendations of the Belgrade Conference
2011: Recommendations of the Vilnius Conference

8. Civil society participation in the OSCE work

2018: Statement in Milano
2017: Statement in Vienna
2014: Recommendations of the Basel Conference
2011: Recommendations of the Vilnius Conference

9. Human rights in the context of conflicts

2017: Recommendations of the Vienna Conference
2016: Recommendations of the Hamburg Conference
2013: Recommendations of the Kyiv Conference
2011: Recommendations of the Vilnius Conference

10. Democratic institutions

2016: Recommendations of the Hamburg Conference
2015: Recommendations of the Belgrade Conference
2013: Recommendations of the Kyiv Conference
2011: Recommendations of the Vilnius Conference

11. Core role of the human dimension in the OSCE comprehensive security concept

2018: the Milano Declaration
2014: Recommendations of the Basel Conference

2010: Recommendations of the Astana Conference

12. Freedom of association

2014: Recommendations of the Basel Conference

2013: Recommendations of the Kyiv Conference

2010: Recommendations of the Astana Conference

13. Freedom of assembly

2014: Recommendations of the Basel Conference

2013: Recommendations of the Kyiv Conference

2010: Recommendations of the Astana Conference

14. Freedom of movement

2013: Recommendations of the Kyiv Conference

2011: Recommendations of the Vilnius Conference

2010: Recommendations of the Astana Conference

15. The right to free and fair elections

2014: Recommendations of the Basel Conference

2013: Recommendations of the Kyiv Conference

2010: Recommendations of the Astana Conference

16. Protecting human rights in the context of combating terrorism

2017: The Vienna Declaration

2010: Recommendations of the Astana Conference

17. Enforced disappearances

2017: Recommendations of the Vienna Conference

2014: Recommendations of the Basel Conference

18. Gender implications for the OSCE activities

2017: Recommendations of the Vienna Conference

19. The right to privacy and protection of personal data

2014: Recommendations of the Basel Conference

20. The rights and freedoms of soldiers

2013: Recommendations of the Kyiv Conference

21. Human rights and extractive industries

2010: Recommendations of the Astana Conference

22. Implementation of the human dimension commitments across the OSCE region

2017: Resolution of the Minsk OSCE Parallel Civil Society Forum

2016: Recommendations of the Hamburg Conference

2012: Recommendations of the Dublin Conference

23. Country situations:

- *Ukraine* (including Donbas and Crimea): 2017, Recommendations of the Vienna Conference; 2016: Recommendations of the Hamburg Conference; 2013: Recommendations of the Kyiv Conference; 2012: Recommendations of the Dublin Conference
- *Austria*: 2017, Recommendations of the Vienna Conference; 2016, Recommendations of the Hamburg Conference
- *Italy*: 2017, Recommendations of the Vienna Conference
- *Belarus*: 2017, Resolution of the Minsk OSCE Parallel Civil Society Forum
- *Serbia*: 2015: Recommendations of the Belgrade Conference; 2014, Recommendations of the Basel Conference
- *Switzerland*: 2014, Recommendations of the Basel Conference
- *Post-Soviet Region, Including Central Asia*: 2010, Recommendations of the Astana Conference

CONTENT OF AND LINKS TO THE OUTCOME DOCUMENTS OF THE OSCE PARALLEL CIVIL SOCIETY CONFERENCES FROM 2010-2018

2018 – Milano

Declaration: Reviving the OSCE comprehensive security concept, rebuilding democratic institutions, revitalising resilience of our societies

Statement: Safeguarding NGO participation in OSCE events

Recommendations

- Listen to the voice of civil society: Appeal to the OSCE political and executive bodies, autonomous institutions, and participating States
- Themes and issues addressed in the outcome documents of the OSCE Parallel Civil Society Conferences from 2010-2018
- Content of the outcome documents of the OSCE Parallel Civil Society Conferences from 2010-2018

2017 – Vienna

Declaration: Preventing Security Measures from Eclipsing Human Rights. Human Rights Are the Core of the Answer rather than an Obstacle to Addressing Terrorism

http://civicsolidarity.org/sites/default/files/vienna_declaration_2017.pdf

Statement: Safeguarding civil society participation in the Helsinki process - a matter of the OSCE's raison d'être

<http://civicsolidarity.org/article/1520/safeguarding-civil-society-participation-helsinki-process-matter-osces-raison-detre>

Recommendations:

http://civicsolidarity.org/sites/default/files/recomendations_vienna_2017_3.12.pdf

- Shrinking space for civil society
- Selected cases of persecution of human rights defenders and other individuals exercising their fundamental rights in the OSCE Region
- Freedom of expression
- Migration, the “refugee crisis”, and xenophobia
- Human rights in the context of conflicts
- Prevention of torture and enforced disappearances
- Access to justice for victims of enforced disappearances and their families
- Backsliding in the rule of law: the deteriorating situation in selected countries of the OSCE region
- Gender implications for the OSCE activities

- Strengthening the OSCE work in the human dimension: A discussion on the effectiveness of instruments
- Conditions for peace in the grey zone of the Donbas conflict: Humanitarian aid, human rights protection, building trust
- Human dimension issues in Austria: Key areas of concern and recommendations
- Key Human Dimension Issues in Italy

2017 – Minsk

Resolution of the OSCE Parallel Civil Society Forum on the eve of the 26th annual session of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly

http://civicsolidarity.org/sites/default/files/parallel_cs_forum_resolution_minsk_4_july_2017_eng.pdf

- Situation across the OSCE Region
- Belarus: Six Years since the Publication of the OSCE Moscow Mechanism Report
- Recommendations

2016 – Hamburg

Declaration: Protecting and Expanding Civil Society Space

http://civicsolidarity.org/sites/default/files/parallel_civil_society_conference_outcome_documents_hamburg_december_2016_final.pdf

Recommendations:

http://civicsolidarity.org/sites/default/files/parallel_civil_society_conference_outcome_documents_hamburg_december_2016_final.pdf

- Alarming trends in the human dimension across the OSCE region in 2016
- The human rights situation in Ukraine, including Crimea and Donbas
- Key human dimension issues in Austria
- Migration, the “refugee crisis”, and xenophobia
- Freedom of expression
- Prevention of torture and enforced disappearances
- Human rights in the context of conflicts
- Anti-democratic constitutional changes, manipulation of constitutional provisions, and misuse of the state of emergency

Annexes:

- Human rights defenders at risk: Selected cases
- A list of selected publications by the Civic Solidarity Platform and its members in 2016
- Cessation of the armed conflict in eastern Ukraine and the effective overcoming of its legacies

2015 - Belgrade

Declaration: Freedom of Expression under Threat: A Strong Response from the OSCE and Its Participating States Is Vital

http://civicsolidarity.org/sites/default/files/parallel_civil_society_conference_outcome_documents_belgrade_december_2015_final.pdf

Recommendations:

http://civicsolidarity.org/sites/default/files/parallel_civil_society_conference_outcome_documents_belgrade_december_2015_final.pdf

- Alarming developments in the human dimension in 2015
- Encroachment on democratic institutions and processes
- Shrinking space for civil society and fundamental freedoms
- Erosion of the rule of law
- Human dimension on unrecognised, occupied and separatist-controlled territories
- Migration, refugee crisis, and xenophobia
- Development of protracted human dimension crises in some participating states
- Selected recommendations from the workshop “Reviewing evaluation instruments of implementation of OSCE human dimension commitments”
- Selected recommendations from the conference “Freedom of expression, media freedoms and (self) censorship in the OSCE area”
- Selected recommendations from the workshop “Developing OSCE approaches to the prevention of torture and enforced disappearances”
- Self-Evaluation of Implementation of Human Dimension Commitments in Serbia: Perspective of Serbian NGOs
- Civic Solidarity Platform’s Priorities for 2016

2014 – Basel

Declaration: Rising Intolerance, Discrimination, and Hate Crimes Pose a Major Risk for Security and Require a Coordinated Response from the OSCE

http://civicsolidarity.org/sites/default/files/basel_declaration.pdf

Recommendations:

http://www.civicsolidarity.org/sites/default/files/civil_society_recommendations_to_the_mcm_in_basel_december_2014_final.pdf

- Comprehensive Security in the OSCE region: The Effects of 2014 Events
- Civic Solidarity Platform’s Human Dimension Priorities for 2015
 - Alarming Trends in Observation of Fundamental Human Rights in the OSCE Region
 - Freedom of expression
 - Freedom of assembly
 - Freedom of association
 - Security of human rights defenders
 - Combating intolerance, discrimination, hate crime and hate speech

- Prevention of torture
- Enforced Disappearances
- Independence of the judiciary, right to fair trial and the problem of politically motivated persecution
- The right to privacy and protection of personal data
- The right to free and fair elections
- Human Dimension Issues in Switzerland
- Human Dimension Issues in Serbia, Requiring Special Attention
- Enhancing Civil Society Input in OSCE Activities

2013 – Kyiv

Declaration: The OSCE Should Make Combating Torture a Priority

http://civicsolidarity.org/sites/default/files/kiev_declaration_on_torture_0.pdf

Recommendations:

http://civicsolidarity.org/sites/default/files/civil_society_recommendations_to_the_mcm_in_kiev_december_2013_final.pdf

- On the application of the principles of international law in the field of human rights in the OSCE participating States
- Alarming trends with fundamental human rights in the OSCE region
- Democratic development
- Freedom of assembly
- Freedom of association
- Security of human rights defenders
- Politically motivated persecution of civic and political activists, journalists and opposition politicians and violations of the right to fair trial
- Freedom of expression
- Freedom of movement
- The right to free and fair elections
- Freedom from torture
- Human rights in conflict and post-conflict situations and territories
- Racism, intolerance, hate crimes and other forms of xenophobia
- The rights and freedoms of soldiers
- Human dimension issues in Ukraine, requiring special attention
- Meeting Helsinki +40 challenge: Strengthening human dimension implementation through systematic monitoring, voluntary reporting and follow-up action

2012 – Dublin

Declaration: Security of Human Rights Defenders: Time for OSCE to Act

http://civicsolidarity.org/sites/default/files/dublin_declaration_on_human_rights_defenders_final.pdf

Recommendations:

http://civicsolidarity.org/sites/default/files/civil_society_recommendations_for_mcm_in_dublin_final.pdf

- Freedom of Expression Situation in Europe and Central Asia
- Racism and Xenophobia in the OSCE Region
- Alarming Trends with Fundamental Human Rights in the OSCE Region
- Human Dimension Issues in Ukraine, Requiring Special Attention
- Civil Society Proposals on Reform of the OSCE Human Dimension Mechanisms

2011 – Vilnius

No declaration

Recommendations:

http://civicsolidarity.org/sites/default/files/osce_pc_vilnius_outcome_document_051211_final.pdf

- Strengthening of the Implementation of the Human Dimension:
 - Freedom of civil society to operate, including freedom of association, freedom of assembly, freedom of expression, and security of human rights defenders
 - Weakening of democratic institutions and processes
 - Rule of law
 - Freedom of movement
 - Ethnic conflicts and minority rights
 - Freedom of expression, including media freedom and freedom in the Internet
- OSCE reform:
 - Making institutional changes
 - Preventing and responding to emergency human rights situations
 - Preventing and responding to violent conflicts
 - Strengthening OSCE Interaction with Other International Organizations
 - Developing OSCE Engagement with Civil Society

2010 – Astana

No declaration

Recommendations:

http://civicsolidarity.org/sites/default/files/astana_outcome_document_of_the_parallel_conference_eng_final.pdf

- Values and Principles
- Strengthening of the Implementation of the Human Dimension as a Core Principle of Comprehensive Security
- Strengthening Institutions to more Effectively Implement the Human Dimension
- Freedom of Expression
- Freedoms of Association
- Freedom of Assembly
- Human Rights Defenders

- Freedom of Movement and Visa Regulations
- Election observation
- Protection of Human Rights in the Context of Combating Terrorism
- Human Rights and Extractive Industries
- Strengthening Operational Functions of the OSCE, Including Its Relationship with Civil Society
 - Chairman-in-Office
 - Civil Society
 - Field Presences
 - General Public
 - Geographical Representation
 - Cooperation with other International Structures
 - OSCE Institutions
- Increasing Effectiveness of the OSCE in Preventing and Responding to Political and Humanitarian Crises
 - Fighting Intolerance and Discrimination
 - Fight against Transnational Criminality
 - Minority Rights
 - Response to Early Warnings and to Erupting Crises
- Addressing Urgent Problems of Human Rights in the Post-Soviet Region, Including in the Central Asia Region

