
Chairmanship: Serbia**1060th PLENARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL**

1. Date: Thursday, 18 June 2015

Opened: 10.05 a.m.
Suspended: 1.15 p.m.
Resumed: 3.20 p.m.
Closed: 5.15 p.m.

2. Chairperson: Ambassador V. Žugić

Prior to taking up the agenda, the Chairperson, Latvia-European Union (PC.DEL/810/15), the Russian Federation, the United States of America, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Turkey, Armenia and the Holy See extended condolences to Georgia in connection with the recent flooding in Tbilisi. Georgia thanked delegations for their expressions of condolences (PC.DEL/833/15 OSCE+).

3. Subjects discussed – Statements – Decisions/documents adopted:

Agenda item 1: **REPORT BY THE OSCE REPRESENTATIVE ON
FREEDOM OF THE MEDIA**

Chairperson, Representative on Freedom of the Media (FOM/GAL/2/15/Rev.1), Latvia-European Union (with the candidate countries Albania, Iceland and Montenegro; and the country of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate country Bosnia and Herzegovina, in alignment) (PC.DEL/809/15), Canada (PC.DEL/808/15 OSCE+), Uzbekistan, Turkey (PC.DEL/823/15 OSCE+), Switzerland (PC.DEL/832/15 OSCE+), France (PC.DEL/840/15), United States of America (PC.DEL/807/15) (PC.DEL/830/15), Ukraine (PC.DEL/829/15 OSCE+), United Kingdom, Russian Federation (PC.DEL/816/15), Norway, Mongolia, Azerbaijan (PC.DEL/815/15 OSCE+), Bosnia and Herzegovina (PC.DEL/806/15 OSCE+), Turkmenistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Georgia (PC.DEL/835/15 OSCE+), Belarus

Agenda item 2: DECISION ON THE AGENDA AND ORGANIZATIONAL
 MODALITIES OF THE 2015 ANNUAL SECURITY
 REVIEW CONFERENCE (ASRC)

Chairperson

Decision: The Permanent Council adopted Decision No. 1171 (PC.DEC/1171) on the agenda and organizational modalities of the 2015 Annual Security Review Conference (ASRC), the text of which is appended to this journal.

Latvia-European Union (with the candidate countries Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Montenegro; the country of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate country Bosnia and Herzegovina; the European Free Trade Association country Norway, member of the European Economic Area; as well as San Marino, in alignment) (interpretative statement, see attachment 1 to the decision), Moldova (interpretative statement, see attachment 2 to the decision), United States of America (interpretative statement, see attachment 3 to the decision), Ukraine (interpretative statement, see attachment 4 to the decision), Georgia (interpretative statement, see attachment 5 to the decision), Russian Federation (Annex 1)

Agenda item 3: DECISION ON THE EXTENSION OF THE DEPLOYMENT
 OF OSCE OBSERVERS TO TWO RUSSIAN
 CHECKPOINTS ON THE RUSSIAN-UKRAINIAN
 BORDER

Chairperson

Decision: The Permanent Council adopted Decision No. 1172 (PC.DEC/1172) on the extension of the deployment of OSCE observers to two Russian checkpoints on the Russian-Ukrainian border, the text of which is appended to this journal.

United States of America (interpretative statement, see attachment 1 to the decision), Ukraine (interpretative statement, see attachment 2 to the decision), Latvia-European Union (with the candidate countries Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Montenegro; the country of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate country Bosnia and Herzegovina; the European Free Trade Association country Norway, member of the European Economic Area; as well as Georgia, Moldova and San Marino, in alignment) (interpretative statement, see attachment 3 to the decision), Russian Federation (interpretative statement, see attachment 4 to the decision)

Agenda item 4: DECISION ON THE EXTENSION OF THE MANDATE OF
 THE OSCE PROJECT CO-ORDINATOR IN UKRAINE

Chairperson

Decision: The Permanent Council adopted Decision No. 1173 (PC.DEC/1173) on the extension of the mandate of the OSCE Project Co-ordinator in Ukraine, the text of which is appended to this journal.

United States of America (interpretative statement, see attachment 1 to the decision), Canada (interpretative statement, see attachment 2 to the decision), Turkey (interpretative statement, see attachment 3 to the decision), Latvia-European Union (with the candidate countries Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Montenegro; the country of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate country Bosnia and Herzegovina; the European Free Trade Association country Norway, member of the European Economic Area; as well as Georgia, Moldova and San Marino, in alignment) (interpretative statement, see attachment 4 to the decision), Russian Federation (interpretative statement, see attachment 5 to the decision), Ukraine (interpretative statement, see attachment 6 to the decision)

Agenda item 5: REVIEW OF CURRENT ISSUES

Chairperson

- (a) *Ongoing aggression against Ukraine and violations of OSCE principles and commitments by the Russian Federation:* Ukraine (PC.DEL/828/15 OSCE+), Latvia-European Union (with the candidate countries Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland and Montenegro; the country of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate country Bosnia and Herzegovina; the European Free Trade Association country Norway, member of the European Economic Area; as well as Georgia, Moldova, San Marino and Ukraine, in alignment) (PC.DEL/837/15), United States of America (PC.DEL/822/15), Turkey (PC.DEL/825/15 OSCE+), Switzerland (PC.DEL/841/15 OSCE+), Canada
- (b) *Situation in Ukraine and the need to implement the Minsk agreements:* Russian Federation (PC.DEL/819/15), United States of America (PC.DEL/831/15), Ukraine, Turkey
- (c) *Abduction of Estonian police officer Mr. E. Kohver:* Latvia-European Union (with the candidate countries Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland and Montenegro; the country of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate country Bosnia and Herzegovina; the European Free Trade Association country Norway, member of the European Economic Area; as well as Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine, in alignment) (PC.DEL/811/15), United States of America (PC.DEL/820/15), Canada, Russian Federation (PC.DEL/824/15)
- (d) *Situation in the occupied territories of the Republic of Azerbaijan:* Azerbaijan (Annex 2)
- (e) *Fifth Congress of Leaders of World and Traditional Religions, held in Astana on 10 and 11 June 2015:* Kazakhstan (PC.DEL/839/15), Belarus

(PC.DEL/827/15 OSCE+), Holy See (PC.DEL/836/15 OSCE+), Russian Federation (PC.DEL/817/15)

Agenda item 6: REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE
 CHAIRPERSON-IN-OFFICE

- (a) *Address by the Chairperson-in-Office at the conference “Journalist’s Safety, Media Freedom and Pluralism in Times of Conflict”, held in Vienna on 15 and 16 June 2015: Chairperson (CIO.GAL/91/15)*
- (b) *Address by the Chairperson-in-Office at the seventh MSC (Munich Security Conference) Core Group Meeting, held in Vienna on 16 and 17 June 2015: Chairperson (CIO.GAL/91/15)*
- (c) *Visit of the Special Representative of the Chairperson-in-Office for the Southern Caucasus, Ambassador A. Gnädinger, to Moscow on 16 June 2015: Chairperson (CIO.GAL/91/15)*
- (d) *Fifty-sixth meeting of the Ergneti Incident Prevention and Response Mechanism (IPRM), to be held on 24 June 2015: Chairperson (CIO.GAL/91/15)*
- (e) *Visit of the Special Representative of the Chairperson-in-Office for the Transnistrian Settlement Process, Ambassador R. Bogojević, to Ukraine: Chairperson (CIO.GAL/91/15)*

Agenda item 7: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY GENERAL

- (a) *Announcement of the distribution of a written report of the Secretary General: Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre*
- (b) *Discontinuation of the operations of the OSCE Project Co-ordinator in Baku: Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre*
- (c) *Address by the Secretary General at the Vienna Energy Forum on 18 June 2015: Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre*
- (d) *Seventh MSC (Munich Security Conference) Core Group Meeting, held in Vienna on 16 and 17 June 2015: Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre*
- (e) *Visit of the Secretary General to Minsk on 15 and 16 June 2015: Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre*

Agenda item 8: ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- (a) *Farewell to the Permanent Representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the OSCE, Ambassador T. Leko: Dean of the Permanent Council (Liechtenstein), Chairperson, Bosnia and Herzegovina*

- (b) *Farewell to the Permanent Representative of Slovenia, Ambassador B. Jamnišek: Dean of the Permanent Council (Liechtenstein), Chairperson, Slovenia*
- (c) *Municipal and county council elections in Norway, to be held on 14 September 2015: Norway*
- (d) *Distribution of the Interim Report of the Panel of Eminent Persons on European Security as a Common Project (CIO.GAL/86/15 Restr.): Chairperson*

4. Next meeting:

Thursday, 2 July 2015, at 10 a.m., in the Neuer Saal



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Permanent Council**

PC.JOUR/1060
18 June 2015
Annex 1

ENGLISH
Original: RUSSIAN

1060th Plenary Meeting
PC Journal No. 1060, Agenda item 2

**STATEMENT BY
THE DELEGATION OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

In view of the attempts by the Ukrainian delegation to put the blame on Russia for the problem with reaching agreement on the wording of the title of the special session on Ukraine at the OSCE Annual Security Review Conference, we emphasize the groundlessness of these assertions.

It was Russia that proposed the wording, which reflected the key principles of a settlement of the crisis in Ukraine – by peaceful means on the basis of the Minsk agreements. At the same time, we supported the compromise proposal of the Serbian Chairmanship, which was also blocked by the Ukrainian delegation.

During the consultations we proposed various versions, including the formulation that was reflected in the decision just adopted. Unfortunately, attempts by individual delegations, including the United States of America, Canada and Ukraine, to politicize this technical question and introduce elements that distort the essence of the problem into the session's title resulted in the consultations being dragged out.

Russia is firmly committed to all its international obligations, including those within the framework of the Package of Measures signed in Minsk on 12 February 2015.

I request that this statement be appended to the Permanent Council decision adopted, and included in the journal of the day.



1060th Plenary Meeting

PC Journal No. 1060, Agenda item 5(d)

STATEMENT BY THE DELEGATION OF AZERBAIJAN

Mr. Chairperson,

The delegation of the Republic of Azerbaijan would like to inform the Permanent Council that on 16 June 2015 the Grand Chamber of the European Court of Human Rights declared its judgment on the case of “Chiragov and others v. Armenia” (Application no. 13216/05), which was lodged with the Court on 6 April 2005 by six Azerbaijani nationals forcibly displaced from the occupied Lachin district of Azerbaijan during the Armenian aggression. In this connection, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Azerbaijan issued the following statement:

“The Court ruled in favour of the applicants, recognizing continuing violations by Armenia of a number of their rights under the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, namely, those relating to the protection of property (Article 1 of Protocol No. 1), the right to respect for private and family life (Article 8 of the Convention) and the right to an effective remedy (Article 13 of the Convention). Furthermore, the judgment effectively put an end to Armenia’s persistent denial of its responsibility for the unlawful occupation of and military presence in the territories of Azerbaijan.

In the course of the Court’s proceedings, in its usual attempts to mislead the international community and distort the root causes and essence of the conflict, Armenia submitted that its jurisdiction did not extend to the territory of Nagorno-Karabakh and the surrounding territories; that it did not and could not have effective control of or exercise any public power on those territories; that it had not participated in the military conflict in question; that it had not taken part in the seizure of the Lachin district and in any later military actions; and that it did not have any military presence in Nagorno-Karabakh and the surrounding territories. Armenia further asserted that “the ‘NKR’ was a sovereign, independent State possessing all the characteristics of an independent State under international law”; that “it exercised control and jurisdiction over Nagorno-Karabakh and the territories surrounding it”; that “the Republic of Armenia and the ‘NKR’ were different countries”, and that “the ‘NKR’, since its formation, had carried out its political, social and financial policies independently”.

In response to these and other allegations submitted by Armenia, the Court noted in particular that the war had started with calls for the incorporation of Nagorno-Karabakh into Armenia and specifically referred in that regard to a joint resolution on the “reunification”

adopted in December 1989 by the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR and the Nagorno-Karabakh regional council. The Court established that the citizens of Azerbaijan were forced to leave Lachin as a result of military attack on the district in May 1992. The Court stated that Nagorno-Karabakh and the district of Lachin and the other surrounding territories are now under occupation and that the international law of belligerent occupation, as laid down in the relevant provisions of the 1907 Hague Regulations concerning the Laws and Customs of War on Land and the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, applies to a given situation.

The Court confirmed its conclusion from the admissibility decision of 14 December 2011, according to which “the ‘NKR’ is not recognized as a State under international law by any countries or international organizations...”, thus reaffirming the position of the international community that overwhelmingly rejected this entity and refused to recognize as legitimate the situation created through the use of force against the territorial integrity of Azerbaijan, accompanied by the notorious practice of ethnic cleansing and other flagrant violations of the peremptory norms of international law.

Furthermore, having examined the evidence presented, the Court confirmed that “the Republic of Armenia, through its military presence and the provision of military equipment and expertise, has been significantly involved in the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict from an early date”, that “[t]his military support has been – and continues to be – decisive for the conquest of and continued control over the territories in issue” and that “...the evidence ... convincingly shows that the armed forces of Armenia and the ‘NKR’ are highly integrated”. Based on this and other evidence testifying to the political, financial and other dependence of the separatist entity from Armenia, the Court concluded that “... the Republic of Armenia, from the early days of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, has had a significant and decisive influence over the ‘NKR’, that the two entities are highly integrated in virtually all important matters and that this situation persists to this day” and that “the ‘NKR’ and its administration survives by virtue of the military, political, financial and other support given to it by Armenia which, consequently, exercises effective control over Nagorno-Karabakh and the surrounding territories, including the district of Lachin”.

The Court reaffirmed the right of displaced persons to return to their homes or places of habitual residence and recalled the relevant standards and principles under international humanitarian and human rights law relating to the legal and technical issues surrounding housing and property restitution. In the Court’s view, it is not realistic in practice for Azerbaijanis to return to their homes in the current circumstances, which include, *inter alia*, the continued presence of Armenian and Armenian-backed troops and ceasefire breaches. At the same time, the Court made it clear that the ongoing negotiations within the OSCE Minsk Group do not provide a legal justification for the interference with the rights of the Azerbaijani internally displaced persons, including the proprietary rights that are still valid, and recalled Armenia’s obligations towards Azerbaijani citizens who had to flee during the conflict. According to the Court, attempts of the Armenian side to extinguish the land rights of the Azerbaijani displaced persons who had fled the occupied territories cannot be considered legally valid. Having found the violation by Armenia of the rights of the Azerbaijani internally displaced persons, the Court concluded that Armenia had failed to discharge the burden of proving the availability to the applicants of a remedy capable of providing redress in respect of their Convention complaints and offering reasonable prospects of success. For the same reasons, the Court found that there was no available effective

remedy in respect of the denial of access to the applicants' possessions and homes in the district of Lachin.

Accordingly, the conclusion must be that due to its initial and continuing aggression against Azerbaijan and military occupation of its internationally recognized territory (Nagorno-Karabakh and the surrounding areas), expulsion of hundreds of thousands of the citizens of Azerbaijan from the occupied territory and the denial of their return to their homes and access to their property in those areas, the Republic of Armenia bears full international responsibility for the breaches of international law that have occurred and continue to occur. A key element of State responsibility, and one particularly significant for present purposes, is the obligation to cease violations, to offer appropriate assurances and guarantees that they will not recur and to provide full reparation for injury. Consequently, Armenia is under the obligation, in the first place, to put an end to the occupation of the territories of Azerbaijan and to withdraw immediately, completely and unconditionally its armed forces from these territories. The implementation of that obligation, which would create necessary conditions for the return of Azerbaijani internally displaced persons, can in no way be considered or introduced as a compromise and, *a fortiori*, used as a bargaining chip in the conflict settlement process. It is an established principle of general international law that no territorial acquisition resulting from the threat or use of force shall be recognized as legal, as reaffirmed by UN Security Council resolutions 822 (1993), 853 (1993), 874 (1993) and 884 (1993) adopted with regard to the armed conflict in question. This understanding also applies to individual rights and freedoms, the violation of which can in no way produce the outcome that was *ab initio* designed by the perpetrator and that would serve for its benefit.

The Republic of Azerbaijan finds it expedient to remind that serious breaches of obligations under peremptory norms of general international law give rise to additional consequences affecting not only Armenia, but also all other States, which include, *inter alia*, duties of States to co-operate in order to bring to an end such breaches by lawful means and not to recognize as lawful a situation created by a serious breach, nor render aid or assistance in maintaining that situation. It is therefore critical that the international community insist on the implementation of UN Security Council resolutions 822 (1993), 853 (1993), 874 (1993) and 884 (1993) demanding the withdrawal of the Armenian occupying forces from the occupied territories of Azerbaijan and supporting the return of displaced persons to their places of origin in safety and dignity.

The resolution of the conflict is possible only on the basis of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Azerbaijan within its internationally recognized borders. The territorial integrity of Azerbaijan has never been and will never be a subject of negotiations. Azerbaijan remains committed to the conflict settlement process based on this understanding. The sooner Armenia reconciles with this reality, the earlier the conflict will be resolved and the countries and peoples in the region will benefit from the prospects of co-operation and economic development.”

I ask that this statement be duly registered in the journal of the day.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Permanent Council**

PC.DEC/1171
18 June 2015

Original: ENGLISH

1060th Plenary Meeting
PC Journal No. 1060, Agenda item 2

DECISION No. 1171
AGENDA AND ORGANIZATIONAL MODALITIES OF THE 2015
ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE (ASRC)

The Permanent Council,

Recalling Porto Ministerial Council Decision No. 3 on the Annual Security Review Conference,

Taking into account its Decision No. 1166 on the dates of the 2015 Annual Security Review Conference,

Taking into account the recommendation of the Forum for Security Co-operation,

Decides to organize the 2015 Annual Security Review Conference in accordance with the agenda and organizational modalities contained in the annexes to this decision.

2015 ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE

Vienna, 23–25 June 2015

Agenda

Tuesday, 23 June 2015

- | | |
|----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 10 a.m.–1 p.m. | Opening session |
| 3–6 p.m. | Special session: Ensuring security and stability in the OSCE region in light of developments with respect to Ukraine |

Wednesday, 24 June 2015

- | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 9.30 a.m.–12.30 p.m. | Working session I: Early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management, conflict resolution and post-conflict rehabilitation: lessons learned and the way ahead |
| 2–4 p.m. | Working session II: Transnational threats and challenges |
| 4–6 p.m. | Working session III: The OSCE and its neighbourhood |

Thursday, 25 June 2015

- | | |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 10 a.m.–1 p.m. | Working session IV: Arms control and confidence- and security-building measures: challenges and opportunities |
| 3–5 p.m. | Special session: European security and the role of the OSCE |
| 5–6 p.m. | Closing session |

ORGANIZATIONAL MODALITIES OF THE 2015 ANNUAL SECURITY REVIEW CONFERENCE

Vienna, 23–25 June 2015

Background

The Tenth Meeting of the OSCE Ministerial Council, at Porto, by adopting its Decision No.3, dated 7 December 2002, established the Annual Security Review Conference (ASRC) to provide a framework for enhancing security dialogue and for reviewing security work undertaken by the OSCE and its participating States, to provide an opportunity to exchange views on issues related to arms control and confidence- and security-building measures, and to promote the exchange of information and co-operation with relevant international and regional organizations and institutions.

Organization

A representative of the Chairperson-in-Office will chair the opening and closing sessions. The Secretariat will issue a journal of the Conference.

Each working session will have one moderator and one rapporteur. The Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC) will serve as co-ordinator for preparing the sessions.

The contribution of the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC) will be made in accordance with its procedures, mandate and competences. The FSC contribution to the ASRC includes the chairing of the fourth working session by a member of the FSC Troika or the Director of the CPC.

The Rules of Procedure of the OSCE will be followed, *mutatis mutandis*, at the Conference. Also, the guidelines for organizing OSCE meetings (Permanent Council Decision No. 762) will be taken into account.

Interpretation from and into all six working languages of the OSCE will be provided at the opening, special, working and closing sessions.

The Chairmanship will co-ordinate the preparation of the ASRC with the FSC Chairperson and the OSCE Secretariat.

The Chairperson-in-Office will distribute a comprehensive report on the Conference before the summer recess.

The Communication and Media Relations Section (COMMS) will inform the press, as appropriate.

Participation

The participating States are encouraged to be represented at a high level, by senior officials from capitals, responsible for security-related policy in the OSCE area.

The OSCE institutions will participate in the Conference, as will the Secretary General and the CPC. The OSCE Parliamentary Assembly and the Partners for Co-operation will be invited to participate.

The Chairmanship may also invite some heads of OSCE field operations to participate in the Conference. Consideration should be given to the possibility of inviting heads of field operations to be present as keynote speakers or moderators.

The international organizations that may be invited are the security-related organizations mentioned in Permanent Council Decision No. 951 of 29 July 2010.

Consideration is to be given to the possibility of inviting security-related scientific institutes, think tanks of international standing, and NGOs to send keynote speakers, moderators or to be represented as members of national delegations.

General guidelines for participants

The work of the ASRC will be conducted in eight sessions. The opening session is intended to provide an opportunity for formal statements to be delivered and to set the stage for substantive, focused and interactive discussions at the special and working sessions. The opening session will include the welcoming remarks by the Chairperson-in-Office or his representative and the report by the FSC Chairperson. The Chairmanship will explore the possibility of inviting high-level special guest(s) to address the Conference.

The four working sessions and the two special sessions will each concentrate on a different topic, introduced by up to two keynote speakers, whose addresses will be followed by a discussion of relevant topics that are mentioned in the agenda.

The aim is an interactive and free-flowing discussion.

In order to reinforce the effectiveness of security activities across all three dimensions of the OSCE, it is expected that, at each of the sessions, the interfaces of security, and also the question of co-operation with other international and regional organizations, will be addressed.

To promote interactive discussion, the formal statements at the opening session and the interventions at the special and working sessions should be as concise as possible and should not exceed five minutes in length. Moderators will be asked to strictly enforce these time limits. Prior circulation of statements and interventions will enhance the possibility for engaging in discussion.

By 15 June 2015, the participants in the Conference should inform the OSCE Secretariat of the composition of their delegations to the ASRC, in response to the

information circular regarding organizational aspects of the Conference which will be sent out by the OSCE Secretariat.

By 15 June 2015, the participating States and other participants in the Conference are invited to submit any written contributions they may have, including those that contain reactions to the keynote speeches.

Written contributions should be submitted to Conference Services, which will then distribute them. The information could also include contributions from OSCE institutions and other international organizations, if appropriate.

Guidelines for keynote speakers

The contributions of the keynote speakers should be focused on the subject of the relevant session, thus setting the scene for the discussion at the sessions, and should stimulate debate among delegations by raising appropriate questions and suggesting potential recommendations based on OSCE realities.

The maximum available speaking time is 15 minutes per keynote speaker.

Keynote speakers should be present during the entire session at which they are speaking, and should be ready to engage in the debate following their presentation.

To enable delegations to prepare themselves, keynote speakers should provide a written contribution and their biographical synopsis to the CPC by 15 June 2015. In their presentations, keynote speakers should touch on the highlights of their written contribution.

Guidelines for moderators and rapporteurs

The moderator chairs the session and should facilitate and focus the dialogue among delegations. The moderator should stimulate the debate by introducing items related to the subject of the opening and working sessions, as appropriate, in order to broaden or focus the scope of the discussion. When appropriate, moderators may call on speakers out of order to facilitate a genuine discussion.

The rapporteurs' written reports should address issues raised during the relevant sessions, and should cover problem areas, improvements, suggestions made at the session, and other relevant information. Personal views shall not be advanced.

Moderators and rapporteurs should seek to identify and summarise specific recommendations made in each of the sessions.

Guidelines for the participation of other international organizations

International organizations may participate in all the sessions. They are invited to concentrate their contributions on aspects of co-operation with the OSCE within the scope of the relevant session.

International and regional organizations should provide factual information, useful for the participants of the ASRC, to Conference Services by 15 June 2015.

**INTERPRETATIVE STATEMENT UNDER
PARAGRAPH IV.1(A)6 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE
OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND
CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE**

The delegation of Latvia, in its capacity as EU Presidency, passed the floor to the representative of the European Union, who delivered the following statement:

“In connection with the decision of the Permanent Council on the agenda and modalities on of the Annual Security Review Conference, the European Union would like to make the following interpretative statement under the relevant provisions of the Rules of Procedure:

The European Union has joined consensus on this decision to ensure that this very important event can be organized in line with the tasking set by our ministers in Porto. The Annual Security Review Conference is the central event on the annual calendar of the politico-military dimension and we look forward to it. Nevertheless, we very much regret that, despite efforts by the Chairmanship and others, it was not possible to find consensus on a more detailed agenda which would have allowed us to better focus our discussions in the different sessions. In the context of the challenges to security and stability posed by Russia’s violation of Ukraine’s territorial integrity and sovereignty, the ASRC will be an opportunity to address the current crisis in and around Ukraine and emphasize the necessity of restoring respect for the fundamental OSCE commitments and founding principles and for Ukraine’s territorial integrity and sovereignty.

The resolution of the protracted conflicts in the Republic of Moldova, Georgia and of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict remains a top priority for the EU and putting this objective high on the political agenda is of utmost importance, in order to prevent the increase of regional instability. Even if the agenda does not explicitly reflect them, it will not prevent us to address the protracted conflicts during our debate. And in this context, we expect that the annotated document to be issued by the Chairmanship in addition to the agenda will properly reflect the issue of the protracted conflicts.”

The candidate countries the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia¹, Montenegro¹ and Albania¹, the country of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the EFTA country Norway, member of the European Economic Area, as well as San Marino align themselves with this statement.

1 The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Albania continue to be part of the Stabilisation and Association Process.

PC.DEC/1171
18 June 2015
Attachment 2

Original: ENGLISH

**INTERPRETATIVE STATEMENT UNDER
PARAGRAPH IV.1(A)6 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE
OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND
CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE**

By the delegation of Moldova:

“Mr. Chairperson,

In accordance with the relevant provisions of the rules and procedures of the OSCE, we would like to make the following interpretative statement.

We welcome the consensus reached this morning and the adoption by the Permanent Council of the decision on agenda and organizational modalities of the 2015 Annual Security Review Conference.

In our view, the Conference should address the most serious challenges to security and stability in the OSCE area and in particular to discuss ways to advance the settlement of the crisis in and around Ukraine based on full respect of its sovereignty and territorial integrity within its internationally recognized borders.

While joining the consensus, we expect that the Conference will, also, provide the opportunity to properly address the protracted conflicts and in this regard, we hope that the Chairmanship will find the possibility to adequately reflect the issue of existing conflict in the annotated agenda it will be issuing.

I kindly request to attach this interpretative statement to the decision and to the journal of the meeting.

Thank you.”

PC.DEC/1171
18 June 2015
Attachment 3

Original: ENGLISH

**INTERPRETATIVE STATEMENT UNDER
PARAGRAPH IV.1(A)6 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE
OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND
CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE**

By the delegation of the United States of America:

“We welcome today’s adoption of the agenda of the Annual Security Review Conference (ASRC) and look forward to participating next week. The conference serves as the Organization’s pinnacle political-military event and allows us to discuss the unprecedented security challenges we face in the OSCE region.

Russia’s ongoing violations of Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity, as well as its violations of other OSCE principles and commitments, draw increased attention to the ASRC.

We express our deep disappointment that a discussion on the resolution of the protracted conflicts was not included in the agenda. Growing tensions in the protracted conflicts, combined with regional instability stemming from Russia’s actions in Ukraine, make resolution of the protracted conflicts more important to the agenda of the OSCE now than ever before. Panelists and delegations should be prepared to discuss the protracted conflicts. We trust that the Chairmanship will make every effort to ensure that protracted conflicts are appropriately addressed at the conference. We would welcome an annotated agenda that reflects this effort.

I request that this interpretative statement be attached to the decision and to the journal of the day.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.”

**INTERPRETATIVE STATEMENT UNDER
PARAGRAPH IV.1(A)6 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE
OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND
CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE**

By the delegation of Ukraine:

“Mr. Chairperson,

In connection with the decision of the Permanent Council on the agenda and organizational modalities of the Annual Security Review Conference, the delegation of Ukraine would like to make the following interpretative statement under paragraph IV.1(A)6 of the Rules of Procedure of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe.

Ukraine has joined consensus on the Permanent Council decision on the agenda and organizational modalities of the Annual Security Review Conference which is the primary political-military event of the OSCE in 2015. However, we very much regret that despite considerable efforts and constructive approach of our and many other delegations it was not possible to reach consensus on a more detailed title devoted to resolving the crisis around Ukraine stemming from Russia’s aggression. The proposal for a title ‘Peaceful resolution of the crisis in and around Ukraine based on respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine and full implementation of international law, OSCE principles and the Minsk Agreements’, discussed at the PC Preparatory Committee on 16 June 2015 and enjoying broad support of the delegations, reflected well upon our collective approaches to resolving the crisis.

We regret that the Russian delegation refused to support this formulation.

We call on the Russian Federation to join other OSCE participating States in seeking the peaceful settlement of the crisis in and around Ukraine based on respect to Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity within its internationally recognized borders and full implementation of international law, OSCE principles as well as full implementation of the Minsk agreements. We call on Russia to engage in a constructive manner in the discussion at the 2015 ASRC.

We request, Mr. Chairperson, that this statement be attached to the decision adopted by the Permanent Council and included in the journal of the day.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.”

**INTERPRETATIVE STATEMENT UNDER
PARAGRAPH IV.1(A)6 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE
OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND
CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE**

By the delegation of Georgia:

“Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

Distinguished colleagues,

The Georgian delegation would like to make an interpretative statement under paragraph IV.1(A)6 of the Rules of Procedure of the OSCE.

Let me underline that Georgia agreed to join consensus on the adoption of the agenda and organizational modalities of this year’s ASRC out of constructiveness and importance we attach to the conference.

It is our principled position that in the future, the agenda of the ASRC should clearly and unambiguously reflect all existing conflicts in the OSCE area, as they continue to pose serious threats and challenges to the security and stability of Europe. I would also like to stress that these conflicts should be resolved based on full respect of sovereignty and territorial integrity within their internationally recognized borders.

Mr. Chairperson, I request that this statement be attached to the decision and to the journal of the day.

Thank you.”



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Permanent Council**

PC.DEC/1172
18 June 2015

Original: ENGLISH

1060th Plenary Meeting
PC Journal No. 1060, Agenda item 3

**DECISION No. 1172
EXTENSION OF THE DEPLOYMENT OF OSCE OBSERVERS TO
TWO RUSSIAN CHECKPOINTS ON THE
RUSSIAN-UKRAINIAN BORDER**

The Permanent Council,

Recalling its Decision No. 1130 of 24 July 2014 on the deployment of OSCE observers to two Russian checkpoints on the Russian-Ukrainian border (PC.DEC/1130),

Decides:

1. To extend the mandate of the deployment of OSCE observers to the two Russian border checkpoints of Donetsk and Gukovo on the Russian-Ukrainian border until 30 September 2015;
2. To approve the arrangements and the financial and human resources for the Observer Mission as contained in document PC.ACMF/38/15. In this respect, authorizes the use of the 2014 year-end revision to fund the proposed budget of 219,700 euros for the duration of the present mandate.

**INTERPRETATIVE STATEMENT UNDER
PARAGRAPH IV.1(A)6 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE
OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND
CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE**

By the delegation of the United States of America:

“The United States finds it deeply regrettable that, once again, the Russian Federation rejected expanding the geographic scope of the Observer Mission, despite the clear, strong, and continued support from other participating States for expanding the Mission – support that was again expressed in the Permanent Council and a meeting on the mandate for the Observer Mission last week. We once again have to accept a limited-scope mission covering just two border checkpoints, which account for just a few hundred meters of the 2,300 kilometer border.

Due to Russia’s unnecessary restrictions of its work, the Mission will continue to be unable to ascertain the extent to which Russia is participating in or facilitating the flow of illegal arms, funding, and personnel to support the separatists in eastern Ukraine, or to gather sufficient information that could indicate in any meaningful way the extent to which Russia is taking any action to stop that flow of support to those separatists.

We note that Step 4 of the 5 September Minsk Protocol delineates a clear role for the OSCE in monitoring and verification on both sides of the Ukrainian-Russian international border, and the creation of a security zone in the border areas of Russia and Ukraine. There are strong linkages between ceasefire monitoring and border monitoring, and it is tragic that the OSCE approach to these activities has been impeded by one participating State. The Russian Federation’s repeated refusal to allow expansion of the scope of this mission raises serious questions about its resolve to implement critical elements of the Minsk Protocol.

I request that this interpretative statement be attached to the decision and to the journal of the day.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.”

**INTERPRETATIVE STATEMENT UNDER
PARAGRAPH IV.1(A)6 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE
OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND
CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE**

By the delegation of Ukraine:

“Mr. Chairperson,

In connection with the decision on the extension of the deployment of OSCE observers to two Russian checkpoints on the Russian-Ukrainian Border, the delegation of Ukraine would like to make the following interpretative statement under paragraph IV.1(A)6 of the Rules of Procedure of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe.

We note that since the adoption of the Berlin Declaration of 2 July 2014, the security situation in the east of Ukraine has deteriorated due to the activities of the Russia-backed illegal armed groups operating in certain areas of Donetsk and Luhansk regions, which receive reinforcements and armaments from the territory of the Russian Federation.

This situation confirms that the deployment of the OSCE observers only to two Russian checkpoints will not allow to effectively address the existing grave challenges along the Ukrainian-Russian State border which was of primary concern at the meeting in Berlin.

The Minsk Protocol of 5 September 2014 which was also signed by representative of the Russian Federation envisages in paragraph 4 the OSCE permanent monitoring on the Ukrainian-Russian State border and verification with the creation of security zone in border areas of Ukraine and the Russian Federation.

We therefore deeply regret that the Russian Federation has again refused to support the proposal for significantly expanding the currently limited mandate of OSCE observers at two Russian checkpoints on the Russian-Ukrainian border which would provide consistency with the arrangements reached in Minsk. Such position of the Russian Federation has again put into serious question its commitment to implementing agreed arrangements, its commitment to de-escalation and peaceful resolution of the situation in certain areas of Donetsk and Luhansk regions.

We continue to deem it as imperative to have substantial and broad OSCE monitoring of the Russian-Ukrainian border. It is necessary for stabilization and peace to strengthen the OSCE monitoring on the Russian side of the Ukrainian-Russian border, expanding the mandate of the OSCE Observation Mission at the Russian border checkpoints ‘Gukovo’ and ‘Donetsk’ to all sections of the border, adjacent to the terrorist-controlled areas of Donbas.

We urge Russia to withdraw its military units from Donbas, halt reinforcements of its proxies in Donetsk and Luhansk, thus implementing the Minsk agreements it has signed.

We call on the Russian Federation to demonstrate its commitment to implementation of the Minsk agreements in good faith, to allow proper and comprehensive permanent monitoring on the Ukrainian-Russian State border and verification by the OSCE, and to agree to expansion of the mandate of the OSCE Mission at two Russian checkpoints.

We reiterate that resumption of efficient control at the Ukrainian-Russian border under the OSCE monitoring is critical for sustainable de-escalation and peaceful resolution of the situation in the east of Ukraine.

The delegation of Ukraine requests that this statement be attached to the decision and recorded in the journal of the day.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.”

**INTERPRETATIVE STATEMENT UNDER
PARAGRAPH IV.1(A)6 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE
OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND
CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE**

The delegation of Latvia, in its capacity as EU Presidency, passed the floor to the representative of the European Union, who delivered the following statement:

“In connection with the decision of the Permanent Council on the extension of the deployment of OSCE observers to two Russian checkpoints on the Ukrainian-Russian State border, the European Union would like to make the following interpretative statement under the relevant provisions of the Rules of Procedure:

The European Union’s views on the vital importance of border monitoring on the Ukrainian-Russian State border in view of information about the continuing inflow of military equipment and personnel into Ukraine from Russia are well known. Border and ceasefire monitoring remain very closely interlinked. Effective and comprehensive monitoring of the Russian-Ukrainian State border should be an integral part of a sustainable political solution, which fully upholds OSCE principles, and re-establishes Ukrainian control over its sovereign territory, including the border. We recall that the Minsk Protocol calls for effective monitoring of the border and verification by the OSCE and that the Minsk Package of implementation measures includes a commitment to re-establishing Ukrainian control over its border.

While highly valuing the work and dedication of Chief Observer Picard and his team, the OSCE Observer Mission’s currently very limited mandate and its small size does not provide for a comprehensive border monitoring. We therefore reiterate our call for a significant expansion of the Observer Mission to all border crossings currently not under control of the Ukrainian Government as well as monitoring between these border crossings. This should be supported and co-ordinated with border monitoring on the Ukrainian side of the border by the SMM. We therefore reiterate our call for the SMM to have safe, free and unfettered access to the Ukrainian side of the border currently under separatist control.

We regret that the Russian Federation continues to oppose an expansion of the Observer Mission.”

The candidate countries the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia¹, Montenegro¹ and Albania¹, the country of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the EFTA country Norway, member of the European Economic

1 The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Albania continue to be part of the Stabilisation and Association Process.

Area, as well as the Republic of Moldova, Georgia and San Marino align themselves with this statement.

PC.DEC/1172
18 June 2015
Attachment 4

ENGLISH
Original: RUSSIAN

**INTERPRETATIVE STATEMENT UNDER
PARAGRAPH IV.1(A)6 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE
OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND
CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE**

By the delegation of the Russian Federation:

“The Russian Federation joined the consensus on the Permanent Council decision on the extension of the mandate of the team of OSCE observers at the two Russian checkpoints of Gukovo and Donetsk on the Russian-Ukrainian border for three months until 30 September 2015 on the basis of the following considerations.

We continue to regard the work of this team as an important additional confidence-building measure. We were prepared to show flexibility and agree to an extension of its mandate for six months in view of the fact that short-term extensions only complicate the financial and personnel aspects of the work of the team of OSCE observers unnecessarily. We regret that despite the broad support for this option among the OSCE delegations, it was blocked by Ukraine for reasons that we do not understand. If there is no interest in the stable and long-term functioning of this team, we will take this position of the Ukrainian authorities into account when adopting a decision on the possible extension of the team’s mandate for the next period.

We reaffirm that the places of deployment and functions of the team of OSCE observers are clearly defined by the parameters of the team’s mandate approved by Permanent Council Decision No. 1130 of 24 July 2014, which is based on the invitation of the Russian Federation of 14 July 2014 made in the wake of the Berlin Declaration of 2 July 2014.

The agreements reached in Minsk in no way touch upon questions regarding the deployment of OSCE observers on the Russian side of the border with Ukraine. It is reliably patrolled by the Border Service of the Federal Security Service of the Russian Federation. The decision to allow OSCE observers on our territory and the presence of Ukrainian border guards and customs officers at Russian checkpoints in the absence of a full-scale peace settlement are solely a goodwill gesture on our part.

As for the Ukrainian side of the border, Ukraine bears complete responsibility for its security and for reaching agreements with the forces that control the situation on the ground on the deployment of international observers there.

I request that this statement be appended to the decision adopted, and included as an annex to the journal of the day.”



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Permanent Council**

PC.DEC/1173
18 June 2015

Original: ENGLISH

1060th Plenary Meeting
PC Journal No. 1060, Agenda item 4

**DECISION No. 1173
EXTENSION OF THE MANDATE OF THE
OSCE PROJECT CO-ORDINATOR IN UKRAINE**

The Permanent Council,

Referring to the Memorandum of Understanding between the Government of Ukraine and the OSCE of 13 July 1999,

Decides to extend the mandate of the OSCE Project Co-ordinator in Ukraine until 31 December 2015.

PC.DEC/1173
18 June 2015
Attachment 1

Original: ENGLISH

**INTERPRETATIVE STATEMENT UNDER
PARAGRAPH IV.1(A)6 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE
OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND
CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE**

By the delegation of the United States of America:

“In connection with the adoption of the decision for the extension of the mandate of the OSCE Project Co-ordinator in Ukraine, the United States would like to make the following interpretative statement under paragraph IV.1(A)6 of the OSCE Rules of Procedure:

The United States notes that Crimea remains an integral part of Ukraine, despite Russia’s ongoing occupation. The mandate of the Project Co-ordinator in Ukraine applies to the entire country of Ukraine, including Crimea.

I request that this interpretative statement be attached to the decision and to the journal of the day.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.”

PC.DEC/1173
18 June 2015
Attachment 2

Original: ENGLISH

**INTERPRETATIVE STATEMENT UNDER
PARAGRAPH IV.1(A)6 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE
OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND
CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE**

By the delegation of Canada:

“Mr. Chairperson,

Canada wishes to make an interpretative statement in connection with the adoption of PC Decision No. 1173 under paragraph IV.1(A)6 of the OSCE Rules of Procedure.

Canada joins consensus on this PC decision and, in doing so, reaffirms its commitment to Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity within its internationally recognized borders, including Crimea. We reiterate that the mandate of the Project Co-ordinator in Ukraine applies to the entire territory of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders.

Mr. Chairperson, we request that this statement be attached to the decision adopted and reflected in the journal of the day.

Thank you.”

PC.DEC/1173
18 June 2015
Attachment 3

Original: ENGLISH

**INTERPRETATIVE STATEMENT UNDER
PARAGRAPH IV.1(A)6 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE
OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND
CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE**

By the delegation of Turkey:

“Mr. Chairperson,

In connection with the adoption of the decision of the Permanent Council on the extension of the mandate of the Project Co-ordinator in Ukraine, Turkey wishes to make an interpretative statement under the relevant provisions of the OSCE Rules of Procedure.

‘Turkey reiterates that the mandate of the OSCE Project Co-ordinator in Ukraine covers the entire territory of Ukraine, including the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, which Turkey continues to regard as part of Ukraine.’

I request that this statement be attached to the journal of the day as well as to the decision in question.

Thank you.”

**INTERPRETATIVE STATEMENT UNDER
PARAGRAPH IV.1(A)6 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE
OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND
CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE**

The delegation of Latvia, in its capacity as EU Presidency, passed the floor to the representative of the European Union, who delivered the following statement:

“In connection with the decision of the Permanent Council on the extension of the mandate of the Project Co-ordinator in Ukraine, the European Union would like to make the following interpretative statement under the relevant provisions of the Rules of Procedure:

The European Union stresses that the mandate of the OSCE Project Co-ordinator in Ukraine covers the whole territory of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders, including the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol.

We request that this statement be attached to the journal of the day as well as to the decision in question.”

The candidate countries the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia¹, Montenegro¹ and Albania¹, the country of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the EFTA country Norway, member of the European Economic Area, as well as the Republic of Moldova, Georgia and San Marino align themselves with this statement.

1 The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Albania continue to be part of the Stabilisation and Association Process.

PC.DEC/1173

18 June 2015

Attachment 5

ENGLISH

Original: RUSSIAN

**INTERPRETATIVE STATEMENT UNDER
PARAGRAPH IV.1(A)6 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE
OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND
CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE**

By the delegation of the Russian Federation:

“In joining the consensus on the Permanent Council decision on the extension of the mandate of the OSCE Project Co-ordinator in Ukraine, we assume that it corresponds to the new political and legal situation in the region, in accordance with which the Republic of Crimea and the federal city of Sevastopol are an integral part of Russia. Consequently, the Co-ordinator’s activities, including project activities, do not cover these constituent entities of the Russian Federation.

I request that this statement be appended to the Permanent Council decision adopted, and included in the journal of the day.”

**INTERPRETATIVE STATEMENT UNDER
PARAGRAPH IV.1(A)6 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE
OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND
CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE**

By the delegation of Ukraine:

“Mr. Chairperson,

In connection with the decision on the extension of the mandate of the OSCE Project Co-ordinator in Ukraine, and the statement of the delegation of the Russian Federation, the delegation of Ukraine would like to make the following interpretative statement under paragraph IV.1(A)6 of the Rules of Procedure of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe.

The Autonomous Republic of Crimea, which is an integral part of Ukraine, was illegally occupied and annexed by the Russian Federation in violation of the OSCE principles and commitments and norms of international law. The sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders are safeguarded by Constitution and legislation of Ukraine and norms of international law. The territorial integrity of Ukraine within its international recognized borders was reconfirmed by the UN General Assembly resolution 68/262 ‘Territorial integrity of Ukraine’ of 27 March 2014.

Ukraine stresses that the mandate of the OSCE Project Co-ordinator in Ukraine extends to the entire territory of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders, including the Autonomous Republic of Crimea.

The delegation of Ukraine requests that this statement be attached to the decision and recorded in the journal of the day.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.”