



NOTE NO. 18/2005

The Permanent Mission of Barbados to the Organization of American States presents its compliments to the General Secretariat of the Organization of the American States and has the honour to submit the position of Barbados, Bahamas, Trinidad And Tobago, St. Kitts and Nevis, Antigua and Barbuda and St. Vincent and the Grenadines on the Legal and Institutional Relationship between the OAS and The IADB.

The Permanent Mission of Barbados to the Organization of American States avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Organization of American States the assurances of its highest consideration.

Permanent Mission of Barbados to the Organization of American States,
Washington, D.C.

4th February 2005

POSITION OF BARBADOS, BAHAMAS, TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO, ST KITTS
AND NEVIS, ANTIGUA AND ST VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES
ON THE LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN THE OAS AND THE IADB

In the Declaration on Security in the Americas, the member states reiterated the need to clarify the juridical and institutional relationship between the Inter-American Defense Board (IADB) and the OAS (paragraph 49).

In the Declaration on Security the member states recommended that the Permanent Council through the committee on Hemispheric Security complete an analysis and submit recommendations to the General Assembly, so that it could determine the norms that govern that relationship and the mandate of the IADB.

In that Declaration, the member states also recommended that an analysis of that relationship be conducted in accordance with the criteria set forth in the General Assembly resolutions on this matter, in particular:

Resolution AG/RES. 1240 (XXIII-O/93): "advice and the delivery of consultancy services of a technical-military character which in no case may have an operational nature";

Resolution AG/RES. 1848 (XXXII-O/02): "including the principle of civilian oversight and the democratic formation of its authorities"; and AG/RES. 1908 (XXXII-O/02) and AG/RES. 1940 (XXXIII-O/03): "to provide the OAS with technical, advisory, and educational expertise on defense and security issues".

It is recognized that the requests made to the IADB by member states directly concerned, have focused on receiving advice and consultancy services of a technical and military, non-operational nature, which have been given in accordance with the criteria and with the due oversight of either the General Assembly, the Meeting of consultation of Ministers of foreign affairs, or the Permanent Council, as OAS political organs or bodies.

The IADB's reports on confidence and security-building measures, its positioning to provide assistance in cases of natural disasters, education for peace, its support through the Inter-American Defense College in devising guidelines for the preparation of "defense white papers" and its outstanding humanitarian demining programs, among others, have been carried out in accordance with the criteria set forth in the preceding paragraph.

It is also noted that for their relevance and clarity of commitment, the criterion reaffirmed in the aforementioned resolutions AG/RES. 1908 (XXXII-O/02) and AG/RES. 1940 (XXXIII-O/03), since its adoption was based on the recognition that change and modernization are needed for the OAS to support "the ongoing examination of the institutions of the inter-American system related to hemispheric security."

Both of these resolutions note that the OAS requires technical, advisory, and educational expertise on defense and security matters in order to lend that support.

Resolution AG/RES. 1848 (XXXII-O/02) refers to the recommendations of the Permanent Council to the General Assembly and the IADB to modify the structure and basic instruments of the Board "to the extent necessary to clarify and obtain consensus on its status with respect to the OAS."

The same resolution indicates that this will be a multidimensional exercise.

Any pragmatic and comprehensive review of the institutional relationship between the IADB and the OAS must be guided by the new reality of security in the hemisphere as interpreted and recognized by Ministers of foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegation and stated in the Bridgetown Declaration of 2002, and reemphasized in the Declaration on Security in the Americas (paragraph 4) that:

"security threats, concerns and other challenges in the hemispheric context are diverse in nature and multidimensional in scope, and that the traditional concept and approach must be expanded to encompass new and nontraditional threats, which include political, economic, social, health and environmental aspects"

This was reiterated in paragraph 2 of the shared values and common approaches" of the Declaration on Security in the Americas:

"our new concept of security in the Hemisphere is multidimensional in scope, includes traditional and new threats, concerns and other challenges to the security of the states of the Hemisphere, incorporate the priorities of each state, contributes to the consolidation of peace, integral development, and social justice, and is based on democratic values, respect for the promotion and defense of human rights, solidarity, cooperation, and respect for national sovereignty."

It is also important to note paragraph 4 (m):

"the security of states of the Hemisphere is affected, in different ways by traditional threats and the following new threats, concerns, and other challenges of a diverse nature [...]"

Consistent with the foregoing and pursuant to the mandates as outlined in paragraph 49 of the Declaration on Security in the Americas:

"we reiterate the need to clarify the juridical and institutional relationship between the Inter-American Defense Board (IADB) and the OAS [...]"

In the Declaration, the states acknowledge different perspectives on threats to their security and their relative priorities. For the Caribbean, security is multidimensional, with social, political, economic, military and other dimensions. It would be a fundamental error on the part of the hemisphere to limit our security to any one area.

It is therefore considered, that the definition of the legal and institutional relationship between the IADB and the OAS, and the IADB's mission, should take into

account the needs of the smallest states, whose level of vulnerability is greater in the face of the traditional and of the new threats, concerns and other challenges. In keeping with that view, the future mandate of the IADB should involve not only matters of defense, but also matters of security.

CP13876E