



Chairmanship: Switzerland

1031st PLENARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

1. Date: Thursday, 18 December 2014

Opened: 10.10 a.m.
Suspended: 12.40 p.m.
Resumed: 3.20 p.m.
Closed: 5.05 p.m.

2. Chairperson: Ambassador T. Greminger

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

Agenda item 1: REPORT BY THE OSCE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE
AND CO-ORDINATOR FOR COMBATING TRAFFICKING
IN HUMAN BEINGS

Chairperson, OSCE Special Representative and Co-ordinator for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings (SEC.GAL/204/14), Italy-European Union (with the candidate countries Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland, Montenegro and Serbia; the country of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate country Bosnia and Herzegovina; the European Free Trade Association countries Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area; as well as Andorra, Georgia, Moldova, Monaco, San Marino and Ukraine, in alignment) (PC.DEL/1479/14), United States of America (PC.DEL/1471/14), Russian Federation, Turkey, Canada, Ukraine (PC.DEL/1493/14 OSCE+), Serbia, Belarus, Kazakhstan (PC.DEL/1492/14 OSCE+), Azerbaijan, Holy See

Agenda item 2: DECISION ON THE EXTENSION OF THE OSCE ERP
UPGRADE FUND

Chairperson

Decision: The Permanent Council adopted Decision No. 1150 (PC.DEC/1150) on the extension of the OSCE ERP Upgrade Fund, the text of which is appended to this journal.

Agenda item 3: DECISION ON THE REVISION OF THE 2014 UNIFIED BUDGET

Chairperson

Decision: The Permanent Council adopted Decision No. 1151 (PC.DEC/1151) on the revision of the 2014 Unified Budget, the text of which is appended to this journal.

Agenda item 4: DECISION ON THE EXTENSION OF THE MANDATE OF THE OSCE OFFICE IN TAJIKISTAN

Chairperson

Decision: The Permanent Council adopted Decision No. 1152 (PC.DEC/1152) on the extension of the mandate of the OSCE Office in Tajikistan, the text of which is appended to this journal.

Agenda item 5: DECISION ON AN OSCE PROGRAMME OFFICE IN ASTANA

Chairperson

Decision: The Permanent Council adopted Decision No. 1153 (PC.DEC/1153/Corr.1) on an OSCE Programme Office in Astana, the text of which is appended to this journal.

Kazakhstan (PC.DEL/1495/14 Restr.) (interpretative statement, see attachment 1 to the decision), United States of America (interpretative statement, see attachment 2 to the decision), Italy-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 Liechtenstein, member of the European Economic Area; as well as Andorra, Georgia, Moldova, Monaco, San Marino and Ukraine, in alignment) (interpretative statement, see attachment 3 to the decision)

Agenda item 6: DECISION ON THE DATES AND VENUE OF THE 2015 OSCE ASIAN CONFERENCE

Chairperson

Decision: The Permanent Council adopted Decision No. 1154 (PC.DEC/1154) on the dates and venue of the 2015 OSCE Asian Conference, the text of which is appended to this journal.

Republic of Korea (Partner for Co-operation), Chairperson

Agenda item 7: 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. 1155 (PC.DEC/1155) 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.

Ukraine (interpretative statement, see attachment 1 to the decision), Italy-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 and Moldova, in alignment) (interpretative statement, see attachment 2 to the decision), United States of America (interpretative statement, see attachment 3 to the decision), Russian Federation (interpretative statement, see attachment 4 to the decision)

Agenda item 8: DECISION ON THE EXTENSION OF THE MANDATE OF THE OSCE PROJECT CO-ORDINATOR IN UZBEKISTAN

Chairperson

Decision: The Permanent Council adopted Decision No. 1156 (PC.DEC/1156) on the extension of the mandate of the OSCE Project Co-ordinator in Uzbekistan, the text of which is appended to this journal.

Agenda item 9: REVIEW OF CURRENT ISSUES

Chairperson

- (a) *Ongoing violations of OSCE principles and commitments by the Russian Federation and the situation in Ukraine:* Ukraine (PC.DEL/1490/14 OSCE+), Italy-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 countries Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area; as well as Georgia, Moldova, San Marino and Ukraine, in alignment)

(PC.DEL/1480/14), United States of America (PC.DEL/1475/14), Turkey, Canada

- (b) *Situation in Ukraine and violation of the Minsk agreements by the Central Government of Ukraine*: Russian Federation (PC.DEL/1489/14), Ukraine (PC.DEL/1491/14 OSCE+), United States of America
- (c) *Foreign terrorist fighters from the Russian Federation in eastern Ukraine*: Ukraine (PC.DEL/1488/14 OSCE+), United States of America (PC.DEL/1478/14), Russian Federation
- (d) *Thirtieth round of the Geneva International Discussions, held on 9 and 10 December 2014*: Italy-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 countries Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area; as well as Moldova and Ukraine, in alignment) (PC.DEL/1482/14), United States of America (PC.DEL/1476/14), Russian Federation, Georgia
- (e) *Freedom of the media in Turkey*: Italy-European Union (with the candidate countries Montenegro and Serbia; the country of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate country Bosnia and Herzegovina; the European Free Trade Association countries Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area; as well as San Marino, in alignment) (PC.DEL/1481/14), United States of America (PC.DEL/1477/14), Canada, Turkey (Annex)
- (f) *“Committee Study of the Central Intelligence Agency’s Detention and Interrogation Program”*, published by the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence on 9 December 2014: Italy-European Union (with the candidate countries Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia; the country of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate country Bosnia and Herzegovina; the European Free Trade Association country Liechtenstein, member of the European Economic Area; as well as Georgia, Moldova, San Marino and Ukraine, in alignment) (PC.DEL/1483/14)
- (g) *Human rights situation in Sweden*: Russian Federation, Sweden
- (h) *Protection of the rights of children in the United States of America*: Russian Federation, United States of America
- (i) *Rights of national minorities in Lithuania*: Russian Federation, Lithuania, Ukraine

Agenda item 9: REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE
 CHAIRPERSON-IN-OFFICE

Distribution of the Swiss OSCE Chairmanship's perception paper on the prevention of torture (CIO.GAL/231/14): Chairperson (CIO.GAL/234/14), Italy-European Union (PC.DEL/1487/14)

Agenda item 10: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY GENERAL

- (a) *Announcement of the distribution of a written report of the Secretary General (SEC.GAL/207/14 OSCE+): Secretary General*
- (b) *Regional seminar on the prevention of corruption held in Batumi, Georgia, on 16 and 17 December 2014: Secretary General (SEC.GAL/207/14 OSCE+)*
- (c) *Appeal for the nomination of seconded candidates for the post of Director of the OSCE Border Management Staff College in Dushanbe: Secretary General (SEC.GAL/207/14 OSCE+)*
- (d) *Donors' conference for the Border Management Staff College, to be held on 14 January 2015: Secretary General (SEC.GAL/207/14 OSCE+)*
- (e) *Appeal for the nomination of seconded candidates for the post of Deputy Head of Office in Tajikistan: Secretary General (SEC.GAL/207/14 OSCE+)*
- (f) *Informal briefing on security related to the Special Monitoring Mission to Ukraine, to be held on 19 December 2014: Secretary General*

Agenda item 11: ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- (a) *Security situation in Libya: Italy-European Union (with the candidate countries Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia; 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 Andorra, Moldova, Monaco, San Marino and Ukraine, in alignment) (PC.DEL/1484/14), Turkey (PC.DEL/1499/14 OSCE+)*
- (b) *Farewell statement by the Swiss Chairmanship: Chairperson, Serbia*

4. Next meeting:

To be announced



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

PC.JOUR/1031
18 December 2014
Annex

Original: ENGLISH

1031st Plenary Meeting

PC Journal No. 1031, Agenda item 9(e)

STATEMENT BY THE DELEGATION OF TURKEY

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson,

I would like to thank the European Union, the United States and Canada for bringing up the matter of the recent detentions in my country, thereby giving me the opportunity to clarify the issue in question – as much as the fact that it is part of an ongoing judicial process allows me – in order to avoid any misunderstandings and misconceptions.

At the outset, let me emphasize that it is misleading to use generalizing terms such as “detained journalists” or “arrests of members of the media” in this context. Some of the persons taken into custody on 14 December are indeed journalists by profession. Yet the overwhelming majority are police officers. Twelve detainees working for the media sector and seven detained police officers have in fact been released following their initial interviews by the Public Prosecutor’s office. Of the remaining 11 detainees concerning whom inquiries are still underway, nine are members of the police force. Early this morning, these 11 detainees were referred to court for arrest.

Information provided by the Istanbul Chief Public Prosecutor’s office reveals that the reasons for taking these persons into custody were not related to their activities as journalists. It goes without saying that journalists, just like all other citizens, do not enjoy immunity from criminal prosecution in Turkey. Let me also state that the detainees are naturally granted the full exercise of their defence rights, including the right to see their lawyers at any stage without restrictions. The necessary sensitivity for the protection of the right against self-incrimination and respect for the presumption of innocence are being fully observed in the proceedings. Health checks are also being done regularly. We hope that the judicial process will be completed swiftly.

Mr. Chairperson,

There is also a broader issue which I feel compelled to emphasize on this occasion. In democracies governed by the rule of law, the judiciary is independent and impartial. This is a fundamental tenet of the separation of powers. Yet, we are in the midst of an incidence where my Government is asked to release persons detained upon the request of the Public Prosecutor. The question I want to raise in this juncture is: how do you reconcile the rule of law, the separation of powers and the independence of the judiciary with imperious calls on governments to “immediately release” suspects in ongoing judicial investigations? Even the

most well-intentioned requests should refrain from trampling on one of the most fundamental pillars of democracy and one of the basic principles upon which this Organization is founded. After all, if we want each other to play by democratic rules, then we must all respect those rules in their entirety. Furthermore, I would also like to express disappointment over the fact that those who decided to criticize Turkey proceeded to do so without even waiting for the 48-hour initial detention period to be over. This does not bolster the criticism's purported constructive character.

Let me emphasize that within the framework of the fruitful co-operation we entertain with the Representative on Freedom of the Media, we attach importance to her valuable role and always take her recommendations into careful consideration. However, we also expect her to respect the fundamental democratic principles I have just referred to, such as the separation of powers and judicial independence, while discharging her mandate. Due deference to the rule of law and all other tenets of democracy is to be expected not only from participating States but also from our Organization and all its institutions, including the Representative on Freedom of the Media.

Mr. Chairperson,

I request that this statement be attached to the journal of the day so as to provide a reference point in our future deliberations.

Thank you.



1031st Plenary Meeting

PC Journal No. 1031, Agenda item 2

**DECISION No. 1150
EXTENSION OF THE OSCE ERP UPGRADE FUND**

The Permanent Council,

Recalling Permanent Council Decision No. 1033 of 22 March 2012 to establish a separate ERP upgrade Fund for the financing of 3.93 million euros in project funding to be used through March 2015,

Recalling OSCE Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Upgrade Project Quarterly Reports to the Advisory Committee on Management and Finance PC.ACMF/3/14 of 31 January 2014, PC.ACMF/23/14 of 10 July 2014 and PC.ACMF/47/14 of 14 November 2014,

Decides:

- To extend the duration of ERP Upgrade Fund until 31 December 2015;

Further decides that:

- Every effort will be made to ensure that the activities foreseen under this Fund are completed in the most cost-effective and timely manner;
- Any funds remaining available in the Fund at the time of completion of the activities will be treated in accordance with Financial Regulation 7.07;

Requests:

- The Secretary General as Fund Manager to continue to provide reports on the implementation of the Fund quarterly, or more frequently if required.



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

PC.DEC/1151
18 December 2014

Original: ENGLISH

1031st Plenary Meeting
PC Journal No. 1031, Agenda item 3

**DECISION No. 1151
REVISION OF THE 2014 UNIFIED BUDGET**

The Permanent Council,

Recalling Decision No. 1123 of 22 May 2014 on the approval of the 2014 Unified Budget,

Taking note of the budget revision proposed in document PC.ACMF/49/14 of 3 December 2014,

Approves the budget revision as contained in the attached annex.

REVISION OF THE 2014 UNIFIED BUDGET

<u>Fund</u> Main Programme Programme	Approved Budget	Transfers as per Fin.Reg. 3.02(b)	Revised Budget after Transfers	Proposed Budget Increases/ (Decreases)	Proposed Revised Budget
<u>I. FUNDS RELATED TO THE SECRETARIAT AND INSTITUTIONS</u>					
<u>The Secretariat</u>					
Secretary General and Central Services					
Executive Management	1,042,400	50,000	1,092,400	-	1,092,400
Security Management	392,000	(10,000)	382,000	(100,000)	282,000
External Co-operation	680,900	-	680,900	-	680,900
Legal Services	540,600	(5,200)	535,400	(30,000)	505,400
Communication and Media Relations Section	1,219,100	-	1,219,100	-	1,219,100
Conference and Language Services	4,947,200	-	4,947,200	130,000	5,077,200
Records Management	255,800	-	255,800	-	255,800
Prague Office	402,400	(40,000)	362,400	-	362,400
Gender Issues	<u>363,600</u>	<u>5,200</u>	<u>368,800</u>	-	<u>368,800</u>
Total	9,844,000	-	9,844,000	-	9,844,000
Chairperson-in-Office					
Short-Term Mission/Visits of CiO and PR of the CiO					
Advisory Committee on Management and Finance (ACMF)	440,000	-	440,000	-	440,000
Panel of Adjudicators	15,000	-	15,000	-	15,000
Audit Committee	39,000	-	39,000	-	39,000
External Auditors	49,200	-	49,200	-	49,200
Total	643,200	-	643,200	-	643,200
Internal Oversight					
Internal Oversight	<u>1,363,400</u>	-	<u>1,363,400</u>	<u>(35,000)</u>	<u>1,328,400</u>
Total	1,363,400	-	1,363,400	(35,000)	1,328,400
Office of the Special Representative/Co-ordinator for Combating Trafficking					
Office of the Special Representative/Co-ordinator for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings					
Total	<u>756,800</u>	-	<u>756,800</u>	-	<u>756,800</u>

Fund	Approved Budget	Transfers as per Fin.Reg. 3.02(b)	Revised Budget after Transfers	Proposed Budget Increases/ (Decreases)	Proposed Revised Budget
Main Programme					
Programme					
Addressing Transnational Threats					
Co-ordination of TNT Activities	525,000	(25,000)	500,000	-	500,000
Strategic Police Matters Unit	618,300	-	618,300	-	618,300
Action against Terrorism	783,400	-	783,400	-	783,400
Borders Security and Management	<u>428,700</u>	<u>25,000</u>	<u>453,700</u>	-	<u>453,700</u>
Total	2,355,400	-	2,355,400	-	2,355,400
Activities Relating to the Economic and Environmental Aspects of Security					
Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities	1,512,400	8,300	1,520,700	35,000	1,555,700
Economic and Environmental Forum	<u>448,800</u>	<u>(8,300)</u>	<u>440,500</u>	-	<u>440,500</u>
Total	1,961,200	-	1,961,200	35,000	1,996,200
Conflict Prevention					
CPC Direction and Management	414,200	(8,000)	406,200	-	406,200
Policy Support Service	907,100	-	907,100	-	907,100
Operations Service	698,100	-	698,100	-	698,100
Programming and Evaluation Support Unit	363,200	-	363,200	-	363,200
FSC Chairmanship	33,100	-	33,100	-	33,100
FSC Support	571,200	-	571,200	-	571,200
Communications Network	<u>573,200</u>	<u>8,000</u>	<u>581,200</u>	-	<u>581,200</u>
Total	3,560,100	-	3,560,100	-	3,560,100
Human Resources Management					
HR Direction and Management	449,600	-	449,600	-	449,600
Personnel Management and Payroll Administration	1,183,800	-	1,183,800	-	1,183,800
Common Staff Costs	1,908,500	-	1,908,500	-	1,908,500
Recruitment	547,900	-	547,900	-	547,900
Training Section	<u>996,600</u>	-	<u>996,600</u>	-	<u>996,600</u>
Total	5,086,400	-	5,086,400	-	5,086,400
Department of Management and Finance					
DMF Direction and Management	313,800	3,000	316,800	-	316,800
Budget and Internal Control Services	641,700	(24,100)	617,600	-	617,600
Financial Accounting and Treasury Services	838,600	77,100	915,700	-	915,700
Information and Communication Technology Services	1,965,100	20,000	1,985,100	-	1,985,100
Mission Support Service	1,447,800	(108,000)	1,339,800	-	1,339,800
Secretariat Common Operational Costs	<u>3,293,700</u>	<u>32,000</u>	<u>3,325,700</u>	-	<u>3,325,700</u>
Total	8,500,700	-	8,500,700	-	8,500,700

Fund Main Programme Programme	Approved Budget	Transfers as per Fin.Reg. 3.02(b)	Revised Budget after Transfers	Proposed Budget Increases/ (Decreases)	Proposed Revised Budget
TOTAL FOR THE SECRETARIAT	34,071,200	-	34,071,200	-	34,071,200
<u>Office for Democratic</u>					
<u>Institutions and Human Rights</u>					
Direction and Policy	1,293,000	75,000	1,368,000	-	1,368,000
Fund Administration Unit	2,151,900	(50,000)	2,101,900	-	2,101,900
Common Operational Costs	769,700	-	769,700	-	769,700
Human Dimension Meetings	605,900	-	605,900	-	605,900
Democratization	1,520,200	-	1,520,200	-	1,520,200
Human Rights	1,202,300	(25,000)	1,177,300	-	1,177,300
Elections	6,405,200	-	6,405,200	-	6,405,200
Tolerance and					
Non-Discrimination	1,306,300	-	1,306,300	-	1,306,300
Roma and Sinti Issues	<u>550,700</u>	-	<u>550,700</u>	-	<u>550,700</u>
Total	15,805,200	-	15,805,200	-	15,805,200
<u>High Commissioner on</u>					
<u>National Minorities</u>					
Fund Administration Unit	369,700	2,000	371,700	-	371,700
Common Operational Costs	176,400	-	176,400	-	176,400
Office of the High					
Commissioner	<u>2,861,500</u>	<u>(2,000)</u>	<u>2,859,500</u>	-	<u>2,859,500</u>
Total	3,407,600	-	3,407,600	-	3,407,600
<u>Representative on Freedom of</u>					
<u>the Media</u>					
Freedom of the Media	<u>1,481,600</u>	-	<u>1,481,600</u>	-	<u>1,481,600</u>
Total	1,481,600	-	1,481,600	-	1,481,600
TOTAL FOR FUNDS RELATED TO THE SECRETARIAT AND INSTITUTIONS	54,765,600	-	54,765,600	-	54,765,600
<u>II. FUNDS RELATED TO</u>					
<u>OSCE FIELD OPERATIONS</u>					
<u>Augmentations</u>					
Secretariat Augmentations					
Communication and Media					
Relations Section	273,000	-	273,000	-	273,000
Internal Oversight	291,400	-	291,400	(55,000)	236,400
Policy Support Service	401,300	(500)	400,800	(22,000)	378,800
Operations Service	186,600	-	186,600	-	186,600
Programming and Evaluation					
Support Unit	62,200	500	62,700	8,000	70,700
Personnel Management and					
Payroll Administration	354,300	30,000	384,300	-	384,300
Recruitment	449,700	(30,000)	419,700	-	419,700
Budget and Internal Control					
Services	321,600	-	321,600	(61,000)	260,600

Fund	Approved	Transfers as	Revised	Proposed	Proposed
Main Programme	Budget	per Fin.Reg.	Budget	Budget	Revised
Programme		3.02(b)	after	Increases/	Budget
			Transfers	(Decreases)	
Financial Accounting and Treasury Services	471,600	-	471,600	-	471,600
Information and Communication Technology Services	1,311,100	-	1,311,100	61,000	1,372,100
Mission Support Services	<u>1,063,400</u>	-	<u>1,063,400</u>	<u>69,000</u>	<u>1,132,400</u>
Total	5,186,200	-	5,186,200	-	5,186,200
ODIHR Augmentations					
ODIHR Democratization	<u>234,100</u>	-	<u>234,100</u>	-	<u>234,100</u>
Total	234,100	-	234,100	-	234,100
Total for Augmentations	5,420,300	-	5,420,300	-	5,420,300
SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE					
<u>Mission in Kosovo</u>					
Office of Head of Mission	2,991,600	-	2,991,600	-	2,991,600
Fund Administration Unit	2,580,900	13,500	2,594,400	-	2,594,400
Common Operational Costs	3,627,500	(13,500)	3,614,000	-	3,614,000
Security and Public Safety	1,311,800	-	1,311,800	-	1,311,800
Democratization	2,365,600	-	2,365,600	-	2,365,600
Human Rights and Communities	<u>6,802,500</u>	-	<u>6,802,500</u>	-	<u>6,802,500</u>
Total	19,679,900	-	19,679,900	-	19,679,900
<u>Tasks in Bosnia and Herzegovina</u>					
Office of Head of Mission	1,286,600	(30,000)	1,256,600	-	1,256,600
Fund Administration Unit	1,864,600	48,000	1,912,600	-	1,912,600
Common Operational Costs	2,385,800	214,800	2,600,600	-	2,600,600
Security Co-operation	511,700	17,200	528,900	-	528,900
Human Dimension	<u>6,119,200</u>	<u>(250,000)</u>	<u>5,869,200</u>	-	<u>5,869,200</u>
Total for the Mission	12,167,900	-	12,167,900	-	12,167,900
Regional Stabilization/Arms Control					
Implementation of Article IV	<u>219,400</u>	-	<u>219,400</u>	-	<u>219,400</u>
Total for regional Stabilization/Arms Control	219,400	-	219,400	-	219,400
Grand Total for Tasks in Bosnia and Herzegovina	12,387,300	-	12,387,300	-	12,387,300
<u>Mission to Serbia</u>					
Office of Head of Mission	931,000	-	931,000	-	931,000
Fund Administration Unit	677,000	(17,500)	659,500	-	659,500
Common Operational Costs	1,180,600	(109,000)	1,071,600	-	1,071,600
Police Affairs	1,125,300	97,500	1,222,800	-	1,222,800
Democratization	1,163,600	65,000	1,228,600	-	1,228,600
Media	414,500	39,000	453,500	-	453,500
Rule of Law and Human Rights	<u>1,086,500</u>	<u>(75,000)</u>	<u>1,011,500</u>	-	<u>1,011,500</u>
Total	6,578,500	-	6,578,500	-	6,578,500

Fund	Approved	Transfers as	Revised	Proposed	Proposed
Main Programme	Budget	per Fin.Reg.	Budget	Budget	Revised
Programme		3.02(b)	after	Increases/	Budget
			Transfers	(Decreases)	
<u>Presence in Albania</u>					
Office of Head of Mission	474,900	(18,000)	456,900	-	456,900
Fund Administration Unit	420,300	33,700	454,000	-	454,000
Common Operational Costs	652,300	(46,700)	605,600	-	605,600
Security Co-operation	357,300	(14,500)	342,800	-	342,800
Governance in Economic and Environmental Issues	302,800	-	302,800	-	302,800
Democratization	432,700	31,000	463,700	-	463,700
Rule of Law and Human Rights	<u>342,100</u>	<u>14,500</u>	<u>356,600</u>	-	<u>356,600</u>
Total	2,982,400	-	2,982,400	-	2,982,400
<u>Mission to Skopje</u>					
Office of Head of Mission	994,400	(6,800)	987,600	-	987,600
Fund Administration Unit	849,800	13,300	863,100	-	863,100
Common Operational Costs	972,200	95,000	1,067,200	-	1,067,200
Public Safety and Community Outreach	1,808,200	(34,000)	1,774,200	-	1,774,200
Human Dimension	<u>1,803,100</u>	<u>(67,500)</u>	<u>1,735,600</u>	-	<u>1,735,600</u>
Total	6,427,700	-	6,427,700	-	6,427,700
<u>Mission to Montenegro</u>					
Office of Head of Mission	335,700	-	335,700	-	335,700
Fund Administration Unit	270,500	(11,000)	259,500	-	259,500
Common Operational Costs	416,100	7,000	423,100	-	423,100
Police Affairs	375,900	7,000	382,900	-	382,900
Democratization	411,300	-	411,300	-	411,300
Media	118,600	-	118,600	-	118,600
Rule of Law and Human Rights	<u>255,800</u>	<u>(3,000)</u>	<u>252,800</u>	-	<u>252,800</u>
Total	2,183,900	-	2,183,900	-	2,183,900
TOTAL FOR SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE	50,239,700	-	50,239,700	-	50,239,700
EASTERN EUROPE					
<u>Mission to Moldova</u>					
Office of Head of Mission	434,700	(24,000)	410,700	-	410,700
Fund Administration Unit	224,600	10,000	234,600	-	234,600
Common Operational Costs	497,000	39,000	536,000	-	536,000
Conflict Prevention/Resolution	461,500	-	461,500	-	461,500
Human Rights					
Monitoring/Democratization	294,600	(19,000)	275,600	-	275,600
Anti-Trafficking/Gender	<u>267,600</u>	<u>(6,000)</u>	<u>261,600</u>	-	<u>261,600</u>
Total	2,180,000	-	2,180,000	-	2,180,000
<u>Project Co-ordinator in Ukraine</u>					
Office of Head of Mission	262,100	(5,000)	257,100	-	257,100
Fund Administration Unit	330,100	22,000	352,100	-	352,100
Common Operational Costs	393,200	-	393,200	-	393,200
Democratization and Good Governance	304,900	-	304,900	-	304,900
Rule of Law and Human Rights	864,900	(17,000)	847,900	-	847,900

Fund	Approved Budget	Transfers as per Fin.Reg. 3.02(b)	Revised Budget after Transfers	Proposed Budget Increases/ (Decreases)	Proposed Revised Budget
Main Programme Programme					
Economic, Environmental and Politico-Military Projects	<u>717,800</u>	-	<u>717,800</u>	-	<u>717,800</u>
Total	2,873,000	-	2,873,000	-	2,873,000
<u>Representative to the Latvian-Russian Joint Commission on Military Pensioners</u>					
Office of Head of Mission	<u>9,300</u>	-	<u>9,300</u>	-	<u>9,300</u>
Total	9,300	-	9,300	-	9,300
TOTAL FOR EASTERN EUROPE	5,062,300	-	5,062,300	-	5,062,300
CAUCASUS					
<u>Office in Yerevan</u>					
Office of Head of Mission	308,500	(6,000)	302,500	-	302,500
Fund Administration Unit	220,600	(10,600)	210,000	-	210,000
Common Operational Costs	396,700	(15,800)	380,900	-	380,900
Politico-Military Activities	533,400	-	533,400	-	533,400
Economic and Environmental Activities	491,400	(10,000)	481,400	-	481,400
Democratization	292,200	29,000	321,200	-	321,200
Human Rights	305,000	12,400	317,400	-	317,400
Good Governance	<u>314,200</u>	<u>1,000</u>	<u>315,200</u>	-	<u>315,200</u>
Total	2,862,000	-	2,862,000	-	2,862,000
<u>Project Co-ordinator in Baku</u>					
Office of Head of Mission	213,300	-	213,300	-	213,300
Fund Administration Unit	239,800	6,000	245,800	-	245,800
Common Operational Costs	430,000	35,900	465,900	-	465,900
Politico-Military Activities	272,800	(25,600)	247,200	-	247,200
Economic and Environmental Activities	254,100	(23,800)	230,300	-	230,300
Human Dimension Activities	<u>390,000</u>	<u>7,500</u>	<u>397,500</u>	-	<u>397,500</u>
Total	1,800,000	-	1,800,000	-	1,800,000
<u>High-Level Planning Group</u>					
Office of Head of Mission	<u>250,600</u>	-	<u>250,600</u>	-	<u>250,600</u>
Total	250,600	-	250,600	-	250,600
<u>The Minsk Process</u>					
Office of Head of Mission	<u>927,500</u>	-	<u>927,500</u>	-	<u>927,500</u>
Total	927,500	-	927,500	-	927,500
<u>Personal Representative of the CiO on the Conflict Dealt with by the Minsk Conference</u>					
Office of Head of Mission	529,700	(21,000)	508,700	-	508,700
Fund Administration Unit	225,200	6,000	231,200	-	231,200

Fund Main Programme Programme	Approved Budget	Transfers as per Fin.Reg. 3.02(b)	Revised Budget after Transfers	Proposed Budget Increases/ (Decreases)	Proposed Revised Budget
Common Operational Costs	<u>438,100</u>	<u>15,000</u>	<u>453,100</u>	-	<u>453,100</u>
Total	1,193,000	-	1,193,000	-	1,193,000
TOTAL FOR CAUCASUS	7,033,100	-	7,033,100	-	7,033,100
CENTRAL ASIA					
<u>Centre in Astana</u>					
Office of Head of Mission	212,000	(20,000)	192,000	-	192,000
Fund Administration Unit	250,600	(11,000)	239,600	-	239,600
Common Operational Costs	421,000	(42,000)	379,000	-	379,000
Politico-Military Activities	420,400	24,000	444,400	-	444,400
Economic and Environmental Activities	424,000	23,000	447,000	-	447,000
Human Dimension Activities	<u>420,400</u>	<u>26,000</u>	<u>446,400</u>	-	<u>446,400</u>
Total	2,148,400	-	2,148,400	-	2,148,400
<u>Centre in Ashgabat</u>					
Office of Head of Mission	323,000	6,400	329,400	-	329,400
Fund Administration Unit	176,800	(3,900)	172,900	-	172,900
Common Operational Costs	272,100	-	272,100	-	272,100
Conflict Prevention and Confidence and Security Building	260,700	(3,000)	257,700	-	257,700
Economic and Environmental Activities	240,600	(1,500)	239,100	-	239,100
Human Dimension Activities	<u>253,700</u>	<u>2,000</u>	<u>255,700</u>	-	<u>255,700</u>
Total	1,526,900	-	1,526,900	-	1,526,900
<u>Centre in Bishkek</u>					
Office of Head of Mission	1,008,800	57,000	1,065,800	-	1,065,800
Fund Administration Unit	561,600	10,000	571,600	-	571,600
Common Operational Costs	854,000	(10,000)	844,000	-	844,000
Politico-Military Activities	1,541,200	(9,000)	1,532,200	-	1,532,200
Economic and Environmental Activities	1,246,400	15,000	1,261,400	-	1,261,400
Human Dimension Activities	1,046,500	(43,000)	1,003,500	-	1,003,500
Police Matters Programme	<u>651,100</u>	<u>(20,000)</u>	<u>631,100</u>	-	<u>631,100</u>
Total	6,909,600	-	6,909,600	-	6,909,600
<u>Project Co-ordinator in</u>					
<u>Uzbekistan</u>					
Office of Head of Mission	184,700	(8,700)	176,000	-	176,000
Fund Administration Unit	102,800	6,000	108,800	-	108,800
Common Operational Costs	281,200	9,200	290,400	-	290,400
Politico-Military Activities	403,200	5,900	409,100	-	409,100
Economic and Environmental Activities	523,800	(11,500)	512,300	-	512,300
Human Dimension Activities	<u>484,300</u>	<u>(900)</u>	<u>483,400</u>	-	<u>483,400</u>
Total	1,980,000	-	1,980,000	-	1,980,000
<u>Office in Tajikistan</u>					
Office of Head of Mission	1,161,100	-	1,161,100	-	1,161,100

Fund Main Programme Programme	Approved Budget	Transfers as per Fin.Reg. 3.02(b)	Revised Budget after Transfers	Proposed Budget Increases/ (Decreases)	Proposed Revised Budget
Fund Administration Unit	605,400	(15,000)	590,400	-	590,400
Common Operational Costs	1,567,600	15,000	1,582,600	-	1,582,600
Political and Military Aspects of Security	1,745,400	-	1,745,400	-	1,745,400
Economic and Environmental Activities	1,080,400	-	1,080,400	-	1,080,400
Human Dimension Activities	<u>1,058,300</u>	-	<u>1,058,300</u>	-	<u>1,058,300</u>
Total	7,218,200	-	7,218,200	-	7,218,200
TOTAL FOR CENTRAL ASIA	19,783,100	-	19,783,100	-	19,783,100
TOTAL FOR FUNDS RELATED TO THE OSCE FIELD OPERATIONS	87,538,500	-	87,538,500	-	87,538,500
TOTAL OSCE UNIFIED BUDGET	142,304,100	-	142,304,100	-	142,304,100



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

PC.DEC/1152
18 December 2014

Original: ENGLISH

1031st Plenary Meeting
PC Journal No. 1031, Agenda item 4

**DECISION No. 1152
EXTENSION OF THE MANDATE OF THE
OSCE OFFICE IN TAJIKISTAN**

The Permanent Council,

Decides to extend the mandate of the OSCE Office in Tajikistan until
31 December 2015.

1031st Plenary Meeting

PC Journal No. 1031, Agenda item 5

**DECISION No. 1153
OSCE PROGRAMME OFFICE IN ASTANA**

The Permanent Council,

Recalling its Decisions Nos. 231, 243, 462, 771 and 797, related to, *inter alia*, the establishment and the mandate of the OSCE Centre in Astana, formerly the OSCE Centre in Almaty,

Following up on its intention to hold regular reviews of the implementation of this mandate and the activities of the Centre, as set out in paragraph 4 of its Decision No. 797,

Willing to further improve forms of co-operation between the OSCE and Kazakhstan based on mutual understanding and close co-operation; to focus, streamline, prioritize and enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of the activities of this OSCE field operation; and to further align these activities with the evolving needs and priorities of the host country related to the implementation of OSCE commitments,

Decides that:

1. The OSCE Centre in Astana is hereby transformed into an “OSCE Programme Office in Astana”, with effect from 1 January 2015;
2. The OSCE Programme Office in Astana, hereinafter referred to as “the Office”, shall develop, implement and report on programmatic activities within all three OSCE dimensions of security, which are:
 - Consistent with OSCE principles and commitments and designed to assist the host country in the implementation of OSCE commitments in the areas outlined in paragraph 3 below; and
 - Requested by the relevant authorities or civil society of Kazakhstan and in consent with its Ministry of Foreign Affairs;

¹ Reissued due to a technical error.

3. The Office shall implement projects in the following priority areas, in particular:
 - (a) Transnational threats to security, focusing on the fight against terrorism and violent extremism, combating organized crime and drug trafficking, or combating trafficking in human beings;
 - (b) Politico-military dimension, focusing on regional security or OSCE commitments in the framework of the Forum for Security Co-operation;
 - (c) Economic and environmental dimension, focusing on good governance; the fight against corruption and money-laundering; public and private partnerships; development of small and medium enterprises; transport, border crossing and customs control; energy security; management of water resources; protection of the environment; disaster risk reduction; or needs of landlocked developing countries;
 - (d) Human dimension, focusing on the development of civil society, rule of law, the election system, freedom of the media, or rights of persons belonging to national minorities;
 - (e) Regional projects in any of the above-mentioned areas which may include assistance in arranging OSCE regional events, visits to the area by OSCE delegations, or other events with OSCE participation;
4. In the implementation of its mandate as set out in paragraphs 2 and 3 above, the Office shall facilitate contacts and develop relationships between the authorities, civil society and academic institutions of Kazakhstan on the one hand and the Chairmanship-in-Office and relevant OSCE executive structures on the other, as well as maintain contacts with the central and local authorities, civil society and academic institutions of Kazakhstan and concerned international organizations;
5. Subject to any further changes to be approved within the 2015 OSCE Unified Budget, the newly established Fund “OSCE Programme Office in Astana” will have the same budget structure and the same post table as the former Fund “OSCE Centre in Astana”;
6. This mandate of the Office will apply until 31 December 2015 and its prolongation or any changes to it will be subject to new decisions of the Permanent Council to be taken on the basis of annual reviews by the Permanent Council of the activities of the Office and the relevance of its mandate to current realities;

Requests the Government of Kazakhstan and the OSCE Secretary General to update, in accordance with this decision, the Memorandum of Understanding between the Government of Kazakhstan and the OSCE on the Establishment of an OSCE Centre in Almaty, dated 2 December 1998, and the protocol on amendments to this memorandum, dated 21 March 2003, and requests the Government of Kazakhstan to apply the aforementioned memorandum, as amended in 2003, until the ratification of an updated memorandum concerning the Office.

**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 Kazakhstan:

“Mr. Chairperson, the delegation of Kazakhstan would like to make the following interpretative statement under paragraph IV.1(A)6 of the OSCE Rules of Procedure in connection with the adoption of the Permanent Council decision on an OSCE Programme Office in Astana.

1. Kazakhstan will apply the following interpretation of the mandate of the newly established Office with regard to the scope of its mandated activities and to the scope of its reporting.
 - (a) According to tick one of operational paragraph 2, the Office shall implement programmatic activities designed in the priority areas outlined in operational paragraph 3. Any activity in an area other than those listed there shall be treated as a non-priority activity and may be implemented by the Office provided that all priority areas listed in operational paragraph 3 are fully addressed by the Office.
 - (b) Operational paragraph 2 of this decision shall be understood as restricting the scope of reporting of the Office only to its own programmatic activities. While the Office must closely follow and keep itself informed about developments in the host country in order to be able to implement its project activities, the Office must refrain from reporting on or assessment of any political, social, economic or other contextual developments in the host country in all its written and oral reports to the OSCE Permanent Council or its informal subsidiary bodies or in any other types of communication to all the participating States or general public.
2. Tick two of operational paragraph 2 should not be understood as creating a bottleneck in approval of project activities of the Office by the host country. To the contrary, the Office will benefit from having a focal point, single “clearing house” or “one-stop shop” within the Government of Kazakhstan, namely the Foreign Ministry, which will ensure that all project activities of the Office match the needs and priorities of the host country, that OSCE resources are used in the most effective, efficient and transparent way, and that projects of the Office are approved as fast as possible.
3. With regard to operational paragraph 6 of this decision, which represents a commitment by the Permanent Council, Kazakhstan calls on incoming OSCE Chairmanships

to ensure that annual reviews by the Permanent Council of the relevance of this mandate to current realities be held sufficiently in advance of the submission of the OSCE Unified Budget Proposal on 1 October of a given year, so that the Office was able to submit its annual resource requirements on the basis of the most updated mandate.

4. In general, the newly adopted mandate should be considered as an effort by Kazakhstan to contribute, in good faith, to strengthening the effectiveness, efficiency and transparency of all OSCE field activities and to the ongoing dialogue within the Helsinki+40 process.

Kazakhstan strongly believes that the mandate of any OSCE field operation must clearly define what it is mandated to do; must be kept up to date with the evolving needs and priorities of the host country and current realities; must enable the assessment of progress in the mandate implementation and eventual closure of the field operation; and must not be designed or updated on the basis of a “one-size-fits-all” approach or a dogmatic reliance on precedents.

In other words, the mandates of OSCE field operations must be SMART – specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound. Last but not least, OSCE field activities should not be restricted in their geographic scope and must be dispatched wherever need arises for the OSCE to ensure peace, security and compliance with OSCE principles and commitments.

Mr. Chairperson, I request that this interpretative statement be attached to the decision in question.”

**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 OSCE Programme Office in Astana, 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 has reluctantly joined consensus on the new mandate for the OSCE field presence in Kazakhstan, now called the Astana Programme Office. We did so despite deep reservations that the new mandate unduly restricts the ability of the Office both to respond flexibly to challenges as they arise and to engage in meaningful activity that addresses the full range of OSCE commitments, including those that are sometimes deemed “sensitive” by a number of participating States.

Hosting an OSCE presence is an opportunity for a participating State to demonstrate leadership and good faith in working toward full implementation of OSCE commitments. In order to provide effective support in this regard, an OSCE presence must be able to raise shortcomings and gaps honestly and straightforwardly with the host government and civil society. Problems that are ignored or swept under the rug don’t go away. We object to arrangements where OSCE presences are required to seek consent for particular projects because, as borne out by experience, governments often use this restriction to limit the activities of the presence. The prospect of “upsetting” the approval process has also impinged on the ability of the presence to be candid with the government and civil society about particular gaps or issues to be addressed. In order to be effective, an OSCE presence must be free to pursue openly and honestly its mandate to support implementation of the full range of OSCE commitments. This is not a concern limited to Kazakhstan; it is a general concern.

The government of Kazakhstan has repeatedly assured other participating States that it desires strong collaboration with the OSCE presence and that it will not curtail or limit its activities. We welcome these assurances. The United States urges the government of Kazakhstan to work collaboratively with the Programme Office to approve expeditiously project activities across all three dimensions of the OSCE’s comprehensive security concept. Project approval should be the norm and any concerns should be raised in a timely manner. An efficient approach would be to establish an approval timeframe period – perhaps two or three weeks – for government review, after which projects are presumed approved unless specific concerns are raised. In any case, we look to the government of Kazakhstan to make speedy decisions and not allow an unwieldy bureaucratic process to hinder OSCE activities in

Kazakhstan. We also look to the government of Kazakhstan to support projects in the human dimension, especially those that address improving implementation of OSCE commitments.

In order to ensure that we continue to support prudent allocation of resources, the United States intends to assess the quality and extent of the co-operation between the government of Kazakhstan and the Programme Office, and to share our assessment in an open letter to the Secretary General prior to the beginning of discussions on the 2016 Unified Budget.

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**

The delegation of Italy, 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 PC decision on an OSCE Programme Office in Astana, the European Union and its Member States would like to make the following interpretative statement under the relevant provisions of the Rules of Procedure:

It is with reluctance that the European Union joins consensus on this decision.

The EU considers OSCE field presences an important tool, which supports the host country in implementing its OSCE commitments to the benefit of the host country – both its government and, most importantly, people.

The OSCE has had field missions in Kazakhstan since 1999 which have carried out valuable work. We therefore welcome that the work of the field presence in Astana will continue.

In the course of negotiations, we have not heard convincing arguments from the host country on the need to change the name or mandate of the OSCE presence. We have advocated for a strong and flexible mandate for the OSCE presence in Astana in order to respond to developments as they arise. We have underlined that we do not consider the reference to the “consent” of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the Office’s activities, or the inclusion of a list, even if non-exhaustive, of activity areas, as necessary or desirable. We also do not consider these elements as a precedent for any future discussions within the OSCE, as we believe this approach limits the capacity of the OSCE presence to respond flexibly to the needs of the host country.

We are joining consensus on this decision on the understanding that the work of the OSCE presence in Astana will cover all three dimensions. We welcome the government’s stated desire for strong collaboration with the OSCE presence across all three OSCE dimensions and take particular note that it will not curtail or limit its activities. In this context, we welcome that the list contained in OP 3 of this decision is, as agreed with Kazakhstan in the negotiations, non-exhaustive.

The EU underlines that it is essential for the successful work of an OSCE presence, to be able to work freely with the civil society of the host country. We fully expect therefore

that access to NGOs will be unhindered, and that co-operation with the OSCE presence will have no detrimental consequences for NGOs.

The EU welcomes the continued OSCE presence in Kazakhstan and encourages the government to develop its co-operation with the OSCE to its full potential.

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

The candidate countries Montenegro¹, Iceland² and Albania¹, the country of the Stabilisation and Association Process and Potential Candidate Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the European Free Trade Association country Norway, member of the European Economic Area, align themselves with this statement.

1 Montenegro and Albania continue to be part of the Stabilisation and Association Process.

2 Iceland continues to be a member of the European Free Trade Association and of the European Economic Area.



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

PC.DEC/1154
18 December 2014

Original: ENGLISH

1031st Plenary Meeting
PC Journal No. 1031, Agenda item 6

**DECISION No. 1154
DATES AND VENUE OF THE 2015 OSCE ASIAN CONFERENCE**

(Republic of Korea, 1 and 2 June 2015)

The Permanent Council,

Welcoming the offer by the Republic of Korea to host the 2015 OSCE Asian Conference, and further to discussions with the Asian Partners for Co-operation,

Decides to hold the 2015 OSCE Asian Conference in the Republic of Korea, on 1 and 2 June 2015.

The agenda, timetable and other organizational modalities of the Conference will be further elaborated in the framework of the Contact Group with the Asian Partners for Co-operation and submitted to the Permanent Council for adoption.



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

PC.DEC/1155
18 December 2014

Original: ENGLISH

1031st Plenary Meeting

PC Journal No. 1031, Agenda item 7

**DECISION No. 1155
EXTENSION OF THE DEPLOYMENT OF OSCE OBSERVERS TO
TWO RUSSIAN CHECKPOINTS ON THE
RUSSIAN-UKRAINIAN BORDER**

The Permanent Council,

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 23 March 2015;
2. To approve the arrangements and the financial and human resources for the Observer Mission as contained in document PC.ACMF/52/14. In this respect, authorizes the use of the 2013 cash surplus to fund the proposed budget of 382,200 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 Ukraine:

“Mr. Chairperson,

In connection with adoption of the decision on 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.

Since establishment of this OSCE presence pursuant to the Berlin Joint Declaration of 2 July 2014, the security situation in the east of Ukraine has deteriorated due to the activities of the terrorist organizations operating in Donetsk and Luhansk regions, which receive reinforcements and armaments from the territory of the Russian Federation.

Deterioration of the situation and reports of this very limited OSCE presence at two Russian checkpoints have confirmed the need for expansion of the mandate to effectively address the existing grave challenges along the Ukrainian-Russian State border which was the primary concern of the meeting in Berlin.

The Minsk Protocol of 5 September 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.

Full implementation of paragraph 4 of the Minsk protocol is inextricably linked to accomplishing the objectives of establishing a sustainable ceasefire regime and ultimate peaceful resolution in the east of Ukraine based on President Poroshenko’s Peace Plan, the Minsk arrangements, the OSCE principles and commitments.

We therefore deeply regret that the Russian Federation has again refused to support the proposal for significantly expanding the currently limited mandate of the 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 the east of Ukraine.

We remain convinced that the mandate of the OSCE Observation Mission in Russian border checkpoints “Gukovo” and “Donetsk” should be expanded to all sections of the border, adjacent to the terrorist-controlled areas of Donbas and which are now temporarily out of control of Ukrainian border guards. Given the current restrictive mandate, this mission cannot effectively perform the monitoring functions and thus contribute to stabilizing the situation along the border.

We call on the Russian Federation to demonstrate its commitment to implementation of the Minsk arrangements in good faith, to allow for proper and comprehensive permanent monitoring on the Ukrainian-Russian State border and verification by the OSCE and in this regard agree to expansion of the mandate of OSCE observers on the Russian side of the border.

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 Italy, 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 PC decision on the extension of the deployment of OSCE observers to two Russian checkpoints on the Ukrainian-Russian State border, the European Union and its Member States would like to make the following interpretative statement under the relevant provisions of the Rules of Procedure:

We once more recall that when the decision was taken to deploy observers to the two checkpoints on the Ukrainian-Russian State border not under Ukrainian control at the time, we underlined that this was a limited first step. Since then Ukrainian authorities have been forced to give up additional checkpoints. We also recall that when the PC decided in October and November to prolong by one month each time the mandate of the OSCE Observer Mission, we made clear that the Minsk Protocol had now given the OSCE a key role in ensuring permanent monitoring on both sides of the Russian-Ukrainian State border. We also made clear that we at that time already could only reluctantly join consensus on the two one-month prolongations.

We continue to call for a significant expansion to all relevant checkpoints as well as full access to monitor areas between checkpoints. This should be combined with border monitoring on the Ukrainian side of the border by the SMM. While we note some progress in regard to the implementation of some aspects of the Minsk agreements, we regret that no progress has been achieved in the area of border monitoring and we call for the implementation of the agreements in their entirety and without delay. We would like to reiterate that effective and comprehensive monitoring of the Russian-Ukrainian border should be an integral part of a sustainable political solution based on the respect for Ukraine’s independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity within its internationally recognized borders. Full and effective control by Ukraine of its borders is essential.

We deeply regret that the Russian Federation has again objected to a meaningful expansion of the Observer Mission. This once again puts Russia’s genuine resolve to implement its commitments under the Minsk Protocol into question.

We call again on the Russian Federation to fully implement its Berlin commitments and grant Ukrainian border guards access to the checkpoints at Donetsk and Gukovo to participate in the control of the border crossings.

Border and ceasefire monitoring remain closely interlinked and mutually dependant. There is a need for an overall coherent approach to border monitoring and we reiterate our call on the Chairmanship to actively consult in order to address relevant issues related to monitoring of the Ukrainian-Russian State border.

We reluctantly join consensus on extension of the Observer Mission by three months. This time must now be used for intensified, genuine and serious discussions on expansion of the Mission.

The decision taken today on the funding for the mandate extension should not set a precedent, and all options for funding should remain on the table for future mandate extensions.

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

The candidate countries the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia¹, Montenegro¹, Iceland² and Albania¹, the country of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the European Free Trade Association country Norway, member of the European Economic Area, as well as the Republic of Moldova and Georgia 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.

2 Iceland continues to be a member of the European Free Trade Association and of the European Economic Area.

**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 deployment of OSCE observers to two Russian checkpoints on the Russian-Ukrainian border, 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 finds it deeply regrettable that the Russian Federation would not consider expanding the geographic scope of the Observer Mission, despite numerous requests from other participating States. We once again have to accept a limited-scope mission, covering just two border checkpoints – which account for approximately one kilometre of the over 2,000 kilometre border. We are concerned that due to Russia’s undue restrictions of its work, the Mission will 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 the OSCE approach to these activities must not be impeded by one participating State. The Russian Federation has repeatedly prevented the expansion of this mandate to include other border checkpoints and monitoring between checkpoints and, in so doing, Russia raises serious questions about its resolve to implement critical elements of the Minsk Protocol.

Therefore, we call upon the Permanent Council to remain seized of the matter and to continue discussions with the aim of expanding the Mission sufficiently to permit a true accounting of the situation all along the Russian-Ukrainian border. We also call upon the Russian Federation to provide, on an urgent basis, the proper protection, privileges, and immunities for the Observer Mission and observers operating on the Russian side of the border.

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

PC.DEC/1155
18 December 2014
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:

“In joining 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 23 March 2015, we take the position that they are deployed there at the invitation of the Russian Federation of 14 July 2014 in the wake of the Berlin Declaration of 2 July 2014. The place of deployment and functions of the OSCE observers are clearly defined by the parameters of the team’s mandate approved by Permanent Council Decision No. 1130 of 24 July 2014. We regard the work of the team of OSCE observers as an important confidence-building measure.

The Minsk Protocol of 5 September 2014 does not touch upon questions regarding the deployment of OSCE observers on the Russian side of the border with Ukraine, which 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 controlling the situation on the ground on the deployment of international observers there.

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



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

PC.DEC/1156
18 December 2014

Original: ENGLISH

1031st Plenary Meeting
PC Journal No. 1031, Agenda item 8

**DECISION No. 1156
EXTENSION OF THE MANDATE OF THE
OSCE PROJECT CO-ORDINATOR IN UZBEKISTAN**

The Permanent Council,

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