

---

FSC Chairmanship: Serbia

OSCE Chairmanship: Austria

**67th JOINT MEETING OF THE  
FORUM FOR SECURITY CO-OPERATION  
AND THE PERMANENT COUNCIL**

1. Date: Wednesday, 29 November 2017  
  
Opened: 10.05 a.m.  
Closed: 12 noon
  
2. Chairperson: Ambassador R. Ninčić (FSC) (Serbia)  
Ambassador C. Koja (PC) (Austria)
  
3. Subjects discussed – Statements – Decisions/documents adopted:  
  
Agenda item 1: SECURITY DIALOGUE: ASSESSMENT OF THE  
STRUCTURED DIALOGUE IN VIEW OF THE  
MINISTERIAL COUNCIL

Chairperson (FSC), Chairperson (PC), Chairmanship's Co-ordinator for the Structured Dialogue (Austria) (CIO.GAL/225/17 Restr.), Chairperson of the Informal Working Group Structured Dialogue (Germany) (CIO.GAL/225/17 Restr.), Estonia-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 Iceland and Liechtenstein, members of the European Economic Area; as well as Andorra, Moldova, San Marino and Ukraine, in alignment) (FSC-PC.DEL/23/17), Norway (FSC-PC.DEL/26/17), Switzerland (FSC-PC.DEL/28/17 OSCE+), Italy, Canada, Turkey, Armenia, France, Azerbaijan, Belgium, United Kingdom, Belarus (FSC-PC.DEL/27/17 OSCE+), Spain (Annex 1), Poland, Ukraine (FSC-PC.DEL/24/17 OSCE+), Slovenia, Russian Federation (Annex 2), Netherlands, United States of America (FSC-PC.DEL/25/17/Rev.1), Sweden

---

1 Includes annex 2 omitted due to a technical error.

Agenda item 2: PRESENTATION OF THE LETTER FROM THE  
CHAIRPERSON OF THE FORUM FOR SECURITY  
CO-OPERATION TO THE FEDERAL MINISTER FOR  
EUROPE, INTEGRATION AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF  
AUSTRIA, CHAIRPERSON OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH  
MEETING OF THE MINISTERIAL COUNCIL OF THE  
OSCE

Chairperson (FSC) (MC.GAL/3/17)

Agenda item 3: ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None

4. Next meeting:

To be announced



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

FSC-PC.JOUR/54/Corr.1  
29 November 2017  
Annex 1

ENGLISH  
Original: SPANISH

---

**67th Joint Meeting of the FSC and the PC**  
FSC-PC Journal No. 54, Agenda item 1

## **STATEMENT BY THE DELEGATION OF SPAIN**

Mr. Chairperson,

I am grateful to the Austrian OSCE Chairmanship and the Serbian Chairmanship of the Forum for Security Co-operation for organizing this joint meeting on the Structured Dialogue. I am also particularly grateful to Ambassador Eberhard Pohl for the excellent summary he has just presented us on the work to date in the framework of the Structured Dialogue, which, together with the outlook for the future, will provide us with the best possible preparation for the Ministerial Council next week.

Spain aligns itself fully with the statement by the European Union and would like at the same time to share some thoughts in a national capacity.

It seems appropriate to us, almost a year after our ministers issued the declaration “From Lisbon to Hamburg: Declaration on the Twentieth Anniversary of the OSCE Framework for Arms Control”, to acknowledge the value of this document as one of the few current consensus instruments reflecting the concern by the OSCE participating States about the risks and threats in Europe.

Since then, Spain has been fully committed to the process of Structured Dialogue in the conviction that it will enable us to address the new threats and challenges confronting us. For that reason, I am very pleased to announce the recent approval of a contribution by Spain of 20,000 euros to the Informal Working Group on Structured Dialogue.

Spain believes that the Structured Dialogue offers a good opportunity for relaunching conventional arms control and confidence- and security-building measures in Europe. We therefore see this exercise as a way of strengthening our co-operative security without undermining the security of any country, but rather strengthening the security of all through our concerted efforts. We strongly believe that it will serve to restore stability, predictability, transparency and arms control and reduce the risks that a mistaken interpretation or calculation could lead to an unwanted escalation of tension.

I reiterate our belief in the importance of not prejudging the final outcome nor of setting artificial limits, while nevertheless maintaining an overall sense of direction. We also

defend ownership of the process by the participating States, without ignoring the support that other organizations might contribute to the final objective.

I sincerely believe that the four meetings to date, on threat perceptions, military doctrines, military force postures and contacts, have been useful and productive and have given us a greater understanding of the points of view of the individual participating States on these matters. I also believe that the results of the meetings, although seemingly only small steps on a long road, are strong steps in the right direction. We know that it is a complex process that could take several years, but the aim being pursued warrants the maintenance of the necessary political stimulus, in addition to the support of experts from the capitals.

We very much appreciate the choice of topics, focusing in cluster 1 on challenges to a rules-based European security order and in cluster 3 on inter-State tension of a politico-military nature and believe that we should continue in this direction. In that regard, we consider that it would be sufficient to hold two meetings every six months with the involvement of the capitals, which would enable us to discuss the specific issues in depth. The holding of technical workshops would provide a basis for these meetings.

We regard mapping as an innovative initiative and useful tool in relation to cluster 3. Even though the different postures with regard to methodology, parameters and scope are understandable, it is important to maintain dialogue and encourage results-oriented reflection and discussion. We see mapping as an instrument for generating transparency and confidence and helping to transcend the strategic bloc mentality of the Cold War.

We are aware of the complexity of this mapping exercise, whose management and co-ordination call for considerable effort and dedication. In view of this organizational requirement and the technical nature of the mapping exercise, it might be advisable to handle it separately within the wider framework of the Structured Dialogue.

Finally, I should like to express our total appreciation for the work of Ambassador Strohal as Special Representative for Structured Dialogue and Ambassador Pohl for his exemplary and efficient leadership of the Informal Working Group. His drive has kept us tremendously busy in the period between Hamburg and the Ministerial Council next week, but this demonstrates the importance that we have all attached to a process that has managed to change the negative dynamic of talks in Vienna. The OSCE has one basic tool for dealing with the complexity of the current security situation, namely dialogue. Let us not waste it.

Mr. Chairperson, I request that this annex be attached to the journal of the day.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.



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

FSC-PC.JOUR/54/Corr.1  
29 November 2017  
Annex 2

ENGLISH  
Original: RUSSIAN

---

**67th Joint Meeting of the FSC and the PC**  
FSC-PC Journal No. 54, Agenda item 1

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

Mr. Chairperson,  
Madam Chairperson,

First of all, we should like to express our gratitude to you for convening today's meeting and, of course, to Ambassador Eberhard Pohl for his skilful organization and leadership of the Informal Working Group on Structured Dialogue and also for his report summarizing the results of the work in this area in 2017.

The Structured Dialogue cannot be separated from the pan-European political process. Its development is possible only on the basis of equal rights and mutual consideration of one another's interests. It should serve to de-escalate the situation, restore trust and advance the goal set at the highest level – the building of an equal and indivisible security community. A joint mutually respectful discussion, without bellicose rhetoric and recriminations, should lead us to a general idea of the new model of European security overall, which takes into account everyone's interests, and of its key elements. This would create a platform for moving to the discussion of practical agreements.

Constructive, depoliticized discussion is particularly called for in the current difficult circumstances, and in this sense the progress of work within the Structured Dialogue is encouraging. We note the positive shift in tone in statements by European experts (primarily military experts), their gradual departure from unfounded accusations against Russia, and a readiness for constructive co-operation. It is important to stop trying to return to the futile discussions about who violated the rules and commitments and when, and to consolidate the positive trend of focusing the discussion on forming constructive common understandings in the area of "hard security".

In that context, the recently launched process of joint analysis of the trends in armed forces and military activities may also be useful. An objective systemic examination of the changes in the politico-military situation on the continent, taking into account the diversity of the factors affecting it historically (since the 1990s), on the basis of official sources could help to achieve a better understanding of the current balance of forces on the continent and the prospects for maintaining common security in the foreseeable future. We are ready for the continuation of this process, the discussion of specific issues in the sphere of the military

activities of participating States and politico-military alliances in Europe and of mutual concerns of individual countries. This is of course on the understanding that the goal of this joint work is not talking for talking's sake, not transparency for transparency's sake, but facilitating the achievement of understandings for the subsequent transition to discussing specific steps for a possible reduction of politico-military tension in the OSCE area and, in particular, in the contact zone of the armed forces of Russia and NATO countries (we cannot fail to take into account the existence of that politico-military alliance). There have been examples of such dialogue in history, and over time they have resulted in the elaboration of practical agreements on measures of restraint and confidence in the military-technical sphere. Needless to say, the discussion of this problem will depend on how the situation develops regarding the deployment by NATO countries of forward-based forces near Russia's borders.

I should also like to mention that it is precisely dialogue among military experts in various formats that is currently lacking as a result of the decision taken by the NATO countries to suspend practical military co-operation with Russia. If any of them thought that this would "punish" Russia, this undertaking failed – the real result of that step is the loss of communication channels through which problems of concern to all of us could be discussed. For our part, we have not "frozen" anything and have repeatedly confirmed our openness to dialogue. So it's up to our partners.

Russia's attitude to further work within the Structured Dialogue will largely depend on our partners' readiness to consolidate as the priorities for its work de-escalating the situation, reducing military confrontation and restoring military relations, and a readiness for specific steps in this area. These include putting an end to military activities and the deployment of forces and infrastructure near Russia's borders, stopping the building up of the foreign presence in the Baltic States and Eastern Europe, and returning at least to the lines occupied by NATO forces at the start of 2014. Taking this into consideration, it would be possible to move to the next stages of planning for joint work on conventional arms control in Europe and confidence- and security-building.

In conclusion, here are a few wishes for the future. We should avoid "going round in circles" and the duplication of discussions traditionally held in the OSCE Permanent Council and the Forum for Security Co-operation. We need to endeavour to move forward, to switch from asking "who is to blame?" to asking "what is to be done?" and to focus on achieving constructive common understandings. In that context, one of the priority themes for our future discussions should be de-escalating the situation and reducing military confrontation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson and Madam Chairperson. I request that this statement be appended to the journal of the day.