PC.DEL/574/13 26 June 2013

ENGLISH only



PERMANENT DELEGATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA TO THE OSCE

STATEMENT

by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova at the Annual Security Review Conference 2013, Vienna, 20 June 2013

Working session II: early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management, conflict resolution and post-conflict rehabilitation: lessons learned and way ahead.

Mr. Chairman,

I would like to join the previous delegations in thanking our distinguished speakers for their comprehensive presentations on very actual issues related to security and stability in the OSCE area. Today's session provides a good opportunity to assess the current challenges and ways to move forward in solving the protracted conflicts. In this regard, let me share some views/ideas on the current state of affairs and prospective for the Transnistrian conflict settlement.

A year ago, at the previous ASRC we were expressing a moderate optimism with the settlement process of the Transnistrian conflict. Our hopes were based on the change of leadership in Tiraspol, on the constant dialogue at all levels as well as some positive results achieved in the confidence building measures. However, since the second half of the year 2012 we have witnessed signs that the dynamic of the settlement process is slowing down due to several unilateral actions undertaken by the regime in Tiraspol and lack of progress in the 5+2 negotiation format.

Currently, the settlement process is passing through a period of stagnation and needs a new political impetus. The dialogue is not producing results and the atmosphere of trust has been undermined. In parallel, throughout the first half of this year Tiraspol has been undertaking a series of unilateral steps triggering tensions in the Security Zone, which affect adversely the settlement process.

The international actors play an important role in facilitating the dialogue between Chişinău and Tiraspol. But still a single political agenda and joint efforts towards achieving final comprehensive settlement are necessary. In this regard, the adoption of the OSCE Ministerial Council Statement in Dublin on the Transnistrian settlement process in the 5+2 format is an encouraging step that emphasizes the key-role of mediators and observers in making full use of their potential to promote progress in the resolution of the conflict. We fully share the recent assessment of the President of the European Council Herman Van Rompuy at the EU-

Russia Summit in Yekaterinburg for the need to start working on the basic principles for a comprehensive settlement of the Transnistrian conflict.

Mr. Chairman,

Let me now focus on the political negotiations in the 5+2 format. Since the resumption of the official negotiations eight rounds took place and the ninth is scheduled for the second half of July this year. Although, in April last year the principles and agenda of negotiations in the 5+2 format were agreed, we have not managed, yet, to start proper discussions on all thematic baskets. Unfortunately, we have seen that Russian and Transnistrian sides categorically rejects any discussions on the political and institutional issues related to the settlement of the Transnistrian conflict, thus, complicating the negotiation process. We hear from those sides that the negotiations should focus purely on socio-economic issues and later on to start discussions on the political settlement. In this regard, it is worth noting that solutions of socio-economic issues should have be identified in the framework of political steps of the conflict resolution as well as Moldova's international commitments.

The 5+2 format was set as a framework for discussing the political settlement of the Transnistrian conflict and it should not substitute the activity of the working groups on confidence building measures that deal with the socio-economic issues. The blackmail of leaving the room in case discussions are opened on the certain basket of the agreed agenda are not appropriate for negotiations in good faith and hardly can be seen as a sign of commitment to positively contribute to the resolution of the conflict.

The "philosophy" of the negotiations should be changed – from resolving separate technical issues – towards giving a strategic perspective to the settlement process. Policies should be aimed at increasing interaction between the two banks of the Nistru River and discouraging separation. We believe that there is an increasing need for discussion on political matters. We can start from discussing general principles and elements that would lay the foundation of a future political settlement. Let me remind that the solution should be in line with the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova allowing for a special status for the Transnistrian region within the Moldova's internationally recognized borders.

Developments in the Security Zone remain a serious concern for us. As it was mentioned previously, Tiraspol has been undertaking lately a serie of unilateral actions that aim at changing the realities on the ground and undermines the atmosphere in the negotiation process. In this regard, the adoption of the so-called "state border" of Transnistria is a serious challenge for all of us, who aim at bringing closer the two banks of the Nistru River and identifying a viable solution to the conflict instead of setting new dividing lines on the territory of the Republic of Moldova.

In some of our previous statements at Permanent Council we have expressed our concerns with the intensified efforts of the Tiraspol administration to unilaterally increase their military presence and to create additional difficulties for representatives of Moldova's law enforcement institutions to activate normally in the city of Bender as it is prescribed by the Agreement between the Republic of Moldova and Russian Federation from 21 July 1992 and related documents. The unilateral introduction of additional military unit in the city of Bender by the authorities in Tiraspol led basically to a three weeks deadlock in the Joint Control Commission – the decision making institution of the peacekeeping operation.

Furthermore, the supervisory body of the peacekeeping mechanism has not been capable to provide solutions on most issues that are on the agenda for several years. We note that the peacekeeping mechanism has not been reacting properly at the existing challenges in the Security Zone. This emphasize once more the need for transformation of the current peacekeeping operation into a multinational civilian mission under an appropriate international mandate, that would correspond to the realities on the ground and would enjoy the necessary credibility and legitimacy.

Mr. Chairman,

The pace of the settlement process has slowed down, but we have to redouble our efforts to bring back the momentum of increased dynamic and to avoid possible blockages in negotiations. We would like to thank the mediators and observers for their assistance in advancing the settlement of the Transnistrian conflict.

Thank you