

PC.DEL/951/10  
23 September 2010

ENGLISH  
Original: RUSSIAN

Delegation of the Russian Federation

**STATEMENT BY MR. ANVAR AZIMOV,  
PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION,  
AT THE MEETING OF THE OSCE PERMANENT COUNCIL**

23 September 2010

**In response to the report by the Director of the  
OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre**

Mr. Chairperson,

We are grateful to Ambassador Herbert Salber, Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC), for his detailed report on various aspects of the operations of this key structure in dealing with crises, supporting the field missions and the work of the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC), and ensuring border security. We also thank the Kazakh Chairmanship for continuing the practice of having the heads of the various departments of the Secretariat deliver regular reports to the Permanent Council. This not only increases the transparency of our Organization's work but is also conducive to an open discussion of pressing issues concerning its operational activities.

In accordance with its mandate, one of the CPC's main tasks is to help reduce the risk of conflicts breaking out. Unfortunately, an impartial analysis of the OSCE Secretariat's work over a period of many years, including during the tragic events of August 2008 in the Caucasus and the protracted crisis in Kyrgyzstan, shows that the resources and tools available to our Organization for conflict prevention and crisis management are by no means always put to effective use.

Like the majority of participating States, Russia is interested in increasing the OSCE's potential in this area. We believe that this can be achieved by ensuring that consensus is observed at all stages of the crisis cycle, by strengthening the capabilities of the collective decision-making bodies, by ensuring that the parties to a conflict give their clearly expressed consent to the OSCE's proposed measures for resolving an acute situation, and by adapting the Organization's anti-crisis mechanisms and procedures to the needs of the present day. It is also important that the OSCE's conflict response mechanisms should not be limited to the post-Soviet area and the Balkans and that proper attention should be paid to crisis spots to the west of Vienna.

As for the role of the executive structures, including the CPC, we are in favour of increasing the co-ordination of their activities to deal with conflicts under the joint guidance of the Secretary General and the Chairmanship, and of ensuring transparency with respect to

their reporting and the provision of information to the participating States on potential threats, conflict situations and plans for post-crisis rehabilitation. The participating States' attention needs to be called more regularly and actively to the potential threat of an escalation in tension. There is also a need for the impartial analysis of situations to predict how they might develop, with the Permanent Council automatically informed of the various options for responding to particular events, and proposals need to be made as regards the advisability of using the OSCE's existing instruments and mechanisms. In this connection, the Secretariat's analytical and forecasting capabilities should be enhanced.

We attach great significance to the CPC's efforts to support the OSCE in its field activities. It is important that the Centre should continue to carefully monitor the missions' fulfilment of their mandates and should ensure an operational link between the field presences, the Chairmanship and the participating States. In this context the practice of mission reports deserves separate mention. We all well remember the inadmissible cases of "filtration" of reports and the keeping of sensitive information from participating States. The information made available to the Permanent Council must be as complete, clear and objective as possible.

The crisis in Kyrgyzstan has confirmed the need to improve the skills employed by the field missions in preventive diplomacy. Despite heightened monitoring of the internal political situation and close co-operation with civil society, field operations frequently appear unable to predict, let alone prevent, crisis-like situations. This means we are justified in saying that increasing the effectiveness of the anti-crisis work of the OSCE field missions is something that is long overdue.

The OSCE's field activities are on the whole in need of constant improvement and adaptation to changing conditions. We should remember that the main task of the field operations is to provide the host country with assistance in building its national capacity and expertise to resolve on its own the questions falling under the OSCE field presence's mandate with a view to the gradual transfer of functions to the authorities of the host country.

Among the important tasks ahead of the CPC in terms of ensuring border security, we might mention the countering of terrorism, organized crime, drug trafficking, illegal migration, trafficking in human beings and the illicit arms trade as well as ensuring freedom of movement for people, goods, services and investments and assistance in the liberalization of visa regimes.

We support the efforts of the CPC to further develop the OSCE Border Security and Management National Focal Point Network. Like a number of other countries, Russia has nominated its national focal point, namely a representative from the Border Service of the Federal Security Service. We intend to play an active part in the forthcoming annual meeting of the national focal points scheduled for 12 to 14 October.

We take the position that all of the OSCE's project activities in the area of strengthening border security and improving border regimes must be carried out in a transparent, geographically balanced and purposeful manner, under the guidance of the CPC's Borders Team, in close co-operation with the field missions and specialized international and regional organizations and, it goes without saying, in accordance with the requirements and interests of the host countries.

We should like to warn the CPC against a persistent focus in the work of its Borders Team on co-operation with Afghanistan and an artificial “Afghanization” of its Central Asian projects. In view of the fact that Afghanistan is not a member of our Organization, the work on the implementation of the well-known decision of the Madrid Ministerial Council must be of an auxiliary nature. In the light of the continuing difficult situation in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the threats emanating from that country, the implementation of border security projects in Central Asia has value in and of itself to the States of the region.

We welcome the efforts to launch a border security course at the OSCE Border Management Staff College in Dushanbe. In choosing an instruction method, this institution’s senior officials would do well to make use of best practices specially adapted to the situation in Central Asia. We confirm the interest of Russian experts in playing as active a role as possible in the instruction programmes.

We once again note that the OSCE should not reduce the attention it is paying to border security issues in the Western Balkans, especially in the context of ensuring the strict implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement.

On the whole we are satisfied with the work of the CPC’s FSC Support Section in such areas as confidence- and security-building measures, small arms and light weapons, and the disposal of conventional ammunition and mélange. The CPC is now facing new challenges connected with the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. We trust that the work of the adviser on issues connected with the implementation of United Nations Security Council resolution 1540 will be in keeping with his official functions.

In conclusion, we should like to wish Ambassador Salber and all the staff at the CPC continued success in their difficult but extremely useful work.

Thank you for your attention.