

Chairmanship: Kazakhstan**2010 REVIEW CONFERENCE (WARSAW)****Review sessions****Plenary session (open)**

1. Date: Thursday, 30 September 2010

Opened: 10.10 a.m.

Suspended: 1 p.m.

2. Chairperson: Ambassador K. Abdrakhmanov (Kazakhstan)

3. Subjects discussed – Statements:

Agenda item 1: FORMAL OPENING

The Chairperson formally opened the 2010 Review Conference of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe.

Agenda item 2: *Opening statements*

(a) STATEMENT BY MR. KANAT SAUDABAYEV, OSCE
CHAIRPERSON-IN-OFFICE

H.E. K. Zhigalov, Special Envoy of the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office and Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan, addressed the Conference on behalf of the Chairperson-in-Office (RC.DEL/1/10).

(b) STATEMENT BY A HIGH REPRESENTATIVE OF THE HOST
COUNTRY

H.E. G. Bernatowicz, Under-Secretary of State, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Poland, addressed the Conference (RC.DEL/3/10).

(c) STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE OSCE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

H.E. P. Efthymiou, President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, addressed the Conference (RC.GAL/5/10).

(d) STATEMENT BY THE OSCE SECRETARY GENERAL

H.E. M. Perrin de Brichambaut, Secretary General of the OSCE, addressed the Conference (RC.GAL/7/10).

Agenda item 3: REPORTS BY:

(a) DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE FOR DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS (RC.GAL/3/10)

(b) HIGH COMMISSIONER ON NATIONAL MINORITIES

(c) OSCE REPRESENTATIVE ON FREEDOM OF THE MEDIA

(d) PRESIDENT OF THE COURT OF CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION

(e) CHAIRPERSON OF THE HUMAN DIMENSION COMMITTEE OF THE PERMANENT COUNCIL (RC.DEL/31/10)

Agenda item 4: GENERAL DEBATE AMONG THE PARTICIPATING STATES

Russian Federation (RC.DEL/40/10), Belgium-European Union (with the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland and Turkey; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; as well as Andorra, Azerbaijan, Moldova, San Marino and Ukraine, in alignment) (RC.DEL/2/10), United States of America (RC.DEL/5/10), Chairperson, Belarus (RC.DEL/4/10), Canada (RC.DEL/9/10), Norway (RC.DEL/7/10), Switzerland, Uzbekistan (RC.DEL/69/10), Holy See

4. Continuation of the plenary session:

Thursday, 30 September 2010, at 3 p.m., in the plenary hall

Review sessions

Plenary session (continued) (open)

1. Date: Thursday, 30 September 2010

Resumed: 3.10 p.m.
Closed: 4 p.m.

2. Chairperson: Ambassador K. Abdrakhmanov (Kazakhstan)
Ambassador-at-Large M. Jarbussynova (Kazakhstan)

3. Subjects discussed – Statements:

Agenda item 4: GENERAL DEBATE AMONG THE PARTICIPATING STATES (continued)

Georgia (RC.DEL/45/10), Armenia (RC.DEL/18/10), Chairperson, Tajikistan (RC.DEL/6/10), Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Russian Federation (RC.DEL/41/10)

Agenda item 5: CONTRIBUTIONS BY:

(a) OSCE PARTNERS FOR CO-OPERATION: Thailand (Partner for Co-operation) (RC.DEL/8/10), Australia (Partner for Co-operation)

(b) UNITED NATIONS: None

(c) OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, INSTITUTIONS AND ENTITIES: None

4. Next session:

Friday, 1 October 2010, at 10 a.m., in the plenary hall

Review sessions

Session 1

1. Date: Friday, 1 October 2010

Opened: 10.05 a.m.
Closed: 1 p.m.

2. Chairperson: Ambassador-at-Large M. Jarbussynova (Kazakhstan)

3. Subjects discussed – Statements:

Agenda item 6: WORKING SESSIONS FOR REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF OSCE PRINCIPLES AND COMMITMENTS, INCLUDING A FOCUS ON RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTION AND GREATER CO-OPERATION AMONG PARTICIPATING STATES

(a) REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ALL OSCE PRINCIPLES AND COMMITMENTS IN THE HUMAN DIMENSION (HDR)
 - DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS, INCLUDING:
 - DEMOCRATIC ELECTIONS
 - DEMOCRACY AT THE NATIONAL, REGIONAL AND LOCAL LEVELS
 - CITIZENSHIP AND POLITICAL RIGHTS
Chairperson, Director of the ODIHR (Moderator),
Mr. N. Kaczorowski (ODIHR) (Introducer) (RC.GAL/8/10),
Lithuania (also on behalf of the European Union (with the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland and Turkey; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; as well as Andorra, Georgia, Moldova, San Marino and Ukraine, in alignment)) (RC.DEL/23/10), OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, Baltic Centre of Historical and Socio-Political Research (RC.NGO/25/10), Western Thrace Minority University Graduates Association (RC.NGO/13/10), Council of Europe (RC.IO/1/10), Community of Democracies (Poland) (RC.IO/23/10), Regional Social Organization “Renessans” (RC.NGO/64/10), United States of America (RC.DEL/20/10), San Marino, Belarus (RC.DEL/14/10), United Kingdom,

Canada (RC.DEL/30/10), Human Rights Educational Centre, Committee of Voters of Ukraine, Human Rights Commission, Russian Federation (RC.DEL/11/10), Kazakhstan, Latvia, People's Party "Alga!", Romania (RC.DEL/76/10), Switzerland, Tajikistan (RC.DEL/10/10), Norway (RC.DEL/12/10), Uzbekistan (RC.DEL/65/10), Georgia (RC.DEL/26/10), Youth of the 21st Century (RC.NGO/151/10), Azerbaijan (RC.DEL/16/10), Norwegian Helsinki Committee (RC.NGO/23/10), Civil Activity Fund, Albania (RC.DEL/13/10), International Society for Fair Elections and Democracy, Belarusian Helsinki Committee, Kyrgyzstan, Societal and Political Research Centre, Constitutional Council of the Republic of Kazakhstan

Right of reply: Greece, Ukraine, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan (RC.DEL/17/10)

4. Next session:

Friday, 1 October 2010, at 3 p.m., in the plenary hall

Review sessions

Session 2

1. Date: Friday, 1 October 2010

Opened: 3.10 p.m.
Closed: 6.10 p.m.

2. Chairperson: Ambassador-at-Large M. Jarbussynova (Kazakhstan)

3. Subjects discussed – Statements:

Agenda item 6: WORKING SESSIONS FOR REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF OSCE PRINCIPLES AND COMMITMENTS, INCLUDING A FOCUS ON RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTION AND GREATER CO-OPERATION AMONG PARTICIPATING STATES

(a) REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ALL OSCE PRINCIPLES AND COMMITMENTS IN THE HUMAN DIMENSION (HDR) (continued)

– FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS I, INCLUDING:

– FREEDOM OF THOUGHT, CONSCIENCE, RELIGION OR BELIEF

– PRESENTATION OF ACTIVITIES OF THE ODIHR AND OTHER OSCE INSTITUTIONS AND FIELD OPERATIONS TO IMPLEMENT PRIORITIES AND TASKS CONTAINED IN THE OSCE DECISIONS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS

Chairperson, Chairperson of the Human Dimension Committee of the Permanent Council (Moderator), Mr. M. Evans (University of Bristol) (Introducer) (RC.NGO/43/10), Mr. D. Wake (ODIHR) (Introducer), Netherlands (also on behalf of the European Union (with the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland and Turkey; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; 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)) (RC.DEL/24/10), Ireland (also on behalf of the European Union (with the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of

Macedonia, Iceland and Turkey; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; the European Free Trade Association countries Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area; as well as Andorra, Georgia, Moldova, San Marino and Ukraine, in alignment)) (RC.DEL/25/10), Order of St. Andrew the Apostle (RC.NGO/3/10), Human Rights without Frontiers (RC.NGO/18/10), Alliance Defence Fund (RC.NGO/19/10) (RC.NGO/22/10), United States of America (PC.DEL/21/10/Rev.1), Russian Federation (RC.DEL/22/10), Associazione Culturale “Giuseppe Dossetti: i Valori” (Cultural Association Giuseppe Dossetti: i Valori) – Observatory for Religious Tolerance and Freedom (RC.NGO/20/10) (RC.NGO/20/10/Add.1), Holy See (RC.DEL/15/10), Human Rights First (RC.NGO/21/10), Administrative Centre of Jehovah’s Witnesses in Russia (RC.NGO/27/10), Co-ordination of Associations and Individuals for Freedom of Conscience (RC.NGO/9/10), Politique de Vie (RC.NGO/42/10), Western Thrace Minority University Graduates Association (RC.NGO/14/10), Association Protecting the Rights of Native Minorities in Central Asia (RC.NGO/69/10), Church of Scientology (European Human Rights Office) (RC.NGO/30/10/Rev.1), Church of Scientology (Russian Federation) (RC.NGO/10/10), Association of Religious Organizations of Kazakhstan (RC.NGO/80/10), Norwegian Helsinki Committee (RC.NGO/39/10), European Humanist Federation (RC.NGO/7/10), Russian Federation, European Association of Jehovah’s Christian Witnesses (RC.NGO/28/10), Forum 18 (RC.NGO/15/10), Unione degli Atei e degli Agnostici Razionalisti (Union of Atheists and Rational Agnostics) (RC.NGO/2/10), Swedish Mission Council, Civic Chamber of the Russian Federation, Belarus (RC.DEL/19/10), European Centre for Law and Justice (RC.NGO/35/10), Profesionales por la Ética (Professionals for Ethics) (RC.NGO/34/10), Kazakhstan, Redeemed Lives, Inc. (RC.NGO/41/10), Informational Fund on Religious Questions in Kazakhstan (RC.NGO/67/10), Muslim Committee on Human Rights in Central Asia (RC.NGO/125/10), Moscow Patriarchate, Information and Consultative Group “Perspective” (RC.NGO/33/10), Tajikistan (RC.DEL/33/10), Observatory on Intolerance and Discrimination against Christians in Europe (RC.NGO/37/10), FECRIS (European Federation of Centres of Research and Information on Sectarianism) (RC.NGO/31/10), “Happy Family”, Human Rights Commission, Agency of Social Technologies “Epicentre”, Uzbekistan (RC.DEL/66/10), Kyrgyzstan

Right of reply: Russian Federation, France (RC.DEL/47/10),
Turkey (RC.DEL/35/10), Azerbaijan (RC.DEL/36/10),
Holy See (RC.DEL/34/10), Belgium, United Kingdom,
Kazakhstan

4. Next session:

Monday, 4 October 2010, at 10 a.m., in the plenary hall

Review sessions

Session 3

1. Date: Monday, 4 October 2010

Opened: 10.05 a.m.

Closed: 1.15 p.m.

2. Chairperson: Ambassador-at-Large M. Jarbussynova (Kazakhstan)

3. Subjects discussed – Statements:

Agenda item 6: WORKING SESSIONS FOR REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF OSCE PRINCIPLES AND COMMITMENTS, INCLUDING A FOCUS ON RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTION AND GREATER CO-OPERATION AMONG PARTICIPATING STATES

(a) REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ALL OSCE PRINCIPLES AND COMMITMENTS IN THE HUMAN DIMENSION (HDR) (continued)

– FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS II, INCLUDING:

- FREEDOM OF ASSEMBLY AND ASSOCIATION
- NATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS INSTITUTIONS AND THE ROLE OF CIVIL SOCIETY IN THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS
- FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT

Chairperson, Ms. H. Machinska (Council of Europe) (Moderator), Mr. S. Ostaf (Resource Centre for Human Rights, Moldova) (Introducer), Order of St. Andrew the Apostle (RC.NGO/4/10), United Kingdom (also on behalf of the European Union (with the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland and Turkey; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; the European Free Trade Association countries Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area; as well as Andorra, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, San Marino and Ukraine, in alignment)) (RC.DEL/37/10), Hermitage Capital Management (RC.NGO/55/10), Council of Europe (RC.IO/7/10) (RC.IO/8/10), Youth for Human Rights International

(RC.NGO/50/10), European Raelian Movement
(RC.NGO/100/10), Western Thrace Minority University
Graduates Association (RC.NGO/54/10), Netherlands Helsinki
Committee, Legal Information Centre for Human Rights
(RC.NGO/65/10), Russian Federation (RC.DEL/42/10)
(RC.DEL/43/10), Human Rights First (RC.NGO/52/10),
San Marino, Front Line – The International Foundation for the
Protection of Human Rights Defenders (RC.NGO/89/10),
International Federation for Human Rights, Switzerland
(RC.DEL/39/10), Finnish-Russian Civic Forum
(RC.NGO/76/10), Ombudsman of the Republic of Tajikistan
(RC.DEL/138/10), Ombudsman of the Republic of Kazakhstan,
Centre for the Support of Migrants (RC.NGO/195/10), People’s
Party “Alga!”, Human Rights Commission, United States
of America (RC.DEL/59/10), Civic Engagement Foundation,
International Bureau for Human Rights and Rule of Law,
Judges’ Association of Serbia, Armenia (RC.DEL/38/10),
Kazakh Community Association, Uzbekistan (RC.DEL/67/10),
Public Foundation “Journalists in Trouble” (RC.NGO/53/10),
Kazakhstan (RC.DEL/56/10), Association Protecting the Rights
of Native Minorities in Central Asia, Expert Working Group,
Georgia (RC.DEL/46/10), Human Rights Monitoring Institute
(RC.NGO/157/10), Algeria (Partner for Co-operation)

Right of reply: Greece, Tajikistan, Serbia, Estonia,
Russian Federation, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan,
Azerbaijan (RC.DEL/99/10)

4. Next session:

Monday, 4 October 2010, at 3 p.m., in the plenary hall

Review sessions

Session 4

1. Date: Monday, 4 October 2010

Opened: 3.15 p.m.
Closed: 6 p.m.

2. Chairperson: Ambassador-at-Large M. Jarbussynova (Kazakhstan)

3. Subjects discussed – Statements:

Agenda item 6: WORKING SESSIONS FOR REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF OSCE PRINCIPLES AND COMMITMENTS, INCLUDING A FOCUS ON RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTION AND GREATER CO-OPERATION AMONG PARTICIPATING STATES

(a) REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ALL OSCE PRINCIPLES AND COMMITMENTS IN THE HUMAN DIMENSION (HDR) (continued)

– RULE OF LAW I, INCLUDING:

– LEGISLATIVE TRANSPARENCY
– INDEPENDENCE OF THE JUDICIARY
– RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL

Chairperson, Mr. D. Petit (independent expert) (Moderator), Ms. L. Bachmaier-Winter (Complutense University of Madrid) (Introducer), United States of America (RC.DEL/103/10/Rev.1), Kazakhstan, Interregional Public Organization “Committee against Torture” (RC.NGO/91/10), Spain (also on behalf of the European Union (with the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland and Turkey; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; the European Free Trade Association countries Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area; as well as Andorra, Armenia, Georgia, Moldova, San Marino and Ukraine, in alignment)) (RC.DEL/55/10), Tajikistan (RC.DEL/32/10) (RC.DEL/139/10), Sipar Collegium of Advocates (RC.NGO/170/10), Regional Social Organization “Renessans”

(RC.NGO/153/10), Civic Chamber of the Russian Federation, International Association of Independent Democrats against Authoritarian Regimes (RC.NGO/127/10) (RC.NGO/129/10), Russian Federation (RC.DEL/44/10), Canada (RC.DEL/48/10), Union of European Turkish Democrats (RC.NGO/87/10), American Civil Liberties Union (RC.NGO/74/10), Bureau on Human Rights and Rule of Law (RC.NGO/60/10), Social Fund “Centre of Law Development”, Public Fund “Prometheus” (RC.NGO/81/10), Newspaper “Golos Respubliki”, Newspaper “Almaty Info” (RC.NGO/61/10), Armenia (RC.DEL/60/10), Public Foundation “Journalists in Trouble” (RC.NGO/73/10), Norwegian Helsinki Committee (RC.NGO/66/10), People’s Party “Alga!”, Uzbekistan, Judges’ Association of Serbia, Right Prospective Centre “Rectum Esse”, Public Fund “Legal Aid”, Civil Activity Fund, Centre for Social and Political Research, Kazakh Community Organization

Right of reply: Russian Federation, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan (RC.DEL/100/10)

4. Next session:

Tuesday, 5 October 2010, at 10 a.m., in the plenary hall

Review sessions

Session 5

1. Date: Tuesday, 5 October 2010

Opened: 10.05 a.m.

Closed: 1.05 p.m.

2. Chairperson: Ambassador-at-Large M. Jarbussynova (Kazakhstan)

Point of order: Belgium-European Union (RC.DEL/53/10), Canada (RC.DEL/52/10), United States of America (Annex 1), Norway, Chairperson (Annex 2), Representative of the Office of the Secretary General

3. Subjects discussed – Statements:

Agenda item 6: WORKING SESSIONS FOR REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF OSCE PRINCIPLES AND COMMITMENTS, INCLUDING A FOCUS ON RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTION AND GREATER CO-OPERATION AMONG PARTICIPATING STATES

(a) REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ALL OSCE PRINCIPLES AND COMMITMENTS IN THE HUMAN DIMENSION (HDR) (continued)

– RULE OF LAW II, INCLUDING:

- EXCHANGE OF VIEWS ON ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT
- PREVENTION OF TORTURE
- PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FIGHTING TERRORISM

Chairperson, Mr. J. Dakwar (American Civil Liberties Union) (Moderator), Mr. E. Svanidze (Council of Europe) (Introducer), Muslim Committee on Human Rights in Central Asia, Denmark (also on behalf of the European Union (with the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland and Turkey; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; the European Free Trade Association countries Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area; as well as Andorra, Moldova, San Marino and

Ukraine, in alignment)) (RC.DEL/72/10), United States of America (RC.DEL/107/10), Areal Kazakhstan, Russian Federation (RC.DEL/49/10), Switzerland (RC.DEL/61/10), Tajikistan (RC.DEL/57/10) (RC.DEL/58/10) (RC.DEL/140/10) (RC.DEL/141/10), Interregional Public Organization “Committee against Torture” (RC.NGO/92/10), Human Rights Commission, Public Foundation “Nota Bene” (RC.NGO/83/10), Republican NGO “Law Initiative”, Perspectiva (RC.NGO/130/10), Almaty Confederation of NGOs “Ariptes” (RC.NGO/105/10), OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, World Coalition against the Death Penalty (RC.NGO/84/10), Penal Reform International – Central Asia Office (RC.NGO/196/10), Centre of Human Rights (Tajikistan) (RC.NGO/171/10), “Amansauilyk”, Public Fund “Prometheus”, Kazakhstan, “Happy Family”, Regional Social Organization “Renessans” (RC.NGO/154/10), Armenian Helsinki Committee, Moldovan Institute for Human Rights, Uzbekistan, Ezgulik Human Rights Society of Uzbekistan, Social Fund “Centre of Law Development”, Expert Working Group, National Centre for Human Rights, International Association of Independent Democrats against Authoritarian Regimes, Poland (RC.DEL/62/10), International Institute of Regional Researches “Open Society”, International Bureau for Human Rights and Rule of Law, Council of Europe, Legal Initiative Belarus, Human Rights Centre “Citizens against Corruption” (RC.NGO/51/10) (RC.NGO/194/10), Public Association “Nurjolber”

Right of reply: Belarus, United States of America (RC.DEL/104/10), Austria, Tajikistan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Armenia

4. Next session:

Tuesday, 5 October 2010, at 3 p.m., in the plenary hall

Review sessions

Session 6

1. Date: Tuesday, 5 October 2010

Opened: 3.10 p.m.

Closed: 6 p.m.

2. Chairperson: Ambassador-at-Large M. Jarbussynova (Kazakhstan)

Point of order: United States of America (RC.DEL/105/10), Belgium-European Union (Annex 3), Canada, Switzerland, Norway, Chairperson

3. Subjects discussed – Statements:

Agenda item 6: WORKING SESSIONS FOR REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF OSCE PRINCIPLES AND COMMITMENTS, INCLUDING A FOCUS ON RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTION AND GREATER CO-OPERATION AMONG PARTICIPATING STATES

(a) REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ALL OSCE PRINCIPLES AND COMMITMENTS IN THE HUMAN DIMENSION (HDR) (continued)

– HUMANITARIAN ISSUES AND OTHER COMMITMENTS, INCLUDING:

- REFUGEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS
- TREATMENT OF CITIZENS OF OTHER PARTICIPATING STATES
- HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION

Chairperson, Ms. A. Rostocka (International Organization for Migration) (Moderator), Mr. G. Kofner (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees) (Introducer), France (also on behalf of the European Union (with the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland and Turkey; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; the European Free Trade Association countries Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area; as well as Armenia, Georgia, Moldova, San Marino and Ukraine, in alignment)) (RC.DEL/74/10), Grupa 484

(RC.NGO/82/10), Coalition for Justice (RC.NGO/88/10), United States of America (RC.DEL/106/10), Regional Social Organization “Renessans” (RC.NGO/85/10), Slovenia (also on behalf of the European Union (with the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland and Turkey; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; the European Free Trade Association countries Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area; as well as Andorra, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, San Marino and Ukraine, in alignment)) (RC.DEL/73/10), Russian Federation (RC.DEL/94/10), Almaty Confederation of NGOs “Ariptes” (RC.NGO/106/10), Human Rights Commission (RC.NGO/86/10), Croatia (RC.DEL/124/10), Georgia (RC.DEL/115/10) (RC.DEL/116/10), Finnish-Russian Civic Forum (RC.NGO/90/10), International Institute of Futurology (RC.NGO/145/10), Commissariat for Refugees of Serbia (RC.DEL/64/10), International Bureau for Human Rights and Rule of Law, Youth Media Union of Kazakhstan (RC.NGO/179/10), Uzbekistan (RC.DEL/68/10), International Association of Independent Democrats against Authoritarian Regimes (RC.NGO/123/10), Amnesty International, Kazakhstan, Holy See (RC.DEL/75/10), Social Action Centre (RC.NGO/79/10), Romania, Armenia (RC.DEL/85/10), International Organization for Migration, Public Foundation “Local Self-Government Development Centre”, Azerbaijan (RC.DEL/101/10), Greece (RC.DEL/87/10), Tajikistan (RC.DEL/77/10), Human Rights Club “Flaming Hearts”, Ezgulik Human Rights Society of Uzbekistan

Right of reply: Greece, Russian Federation, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Georgia

4. Next session:

Wednesday, 6 October 2010, at 10 a.m., in the plenary hall

Review sessions

Session 7

1. Date: Wednesday, 6 October 2010

Opened: 10.10 a.m.

Closed: 1 p.m.

2. Chairperson: Ambassador-at-Large M. Jarbussynova (Kazakhstan)

3. Subjects discussed – Statements:

Agenda item 6: WORKING SESSIONS FOR REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF OSCE PRINCIPLES AND COMMITMENTS, INCLUDING A FOCUS ON RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTION AND GREATER CO-OPERATION AMONG PARTICIPATING STATES

(a) REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ALL OSCE PRINCIPLES AND COMMITMENTS IN THE HUMAN DIMENSION (HDR) (continued)

– TOLERANCE AND NON-DISCRIMINATION I, INCLUDING:

- IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OSCE ACTION PLAN ON ROMA AND SINTI
- NATIONAL MINORITIES
- PREVENTING AGGRESSIVE NATIONALISM, RACISM AND CHAUVINISM

Chairperson, Director of the Office of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities (Moderator), Mr. A. Mirga, (ODIHR) (Introducer) (RC.GAL/10/10), Romania (also on behalf of the European Union (with the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland and Turkey; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; the European Free Trade Association country Norway, member of the European Economic Area; as well as Armenia, Georgia, Moldova, San Marino and Ukraine, in alignment)) (RC.DEL/133/10), Magenta Foundation (RC.NGO/108/10), Stitching Magenta (RC.NGO/109/10), Constantinopolitan Society (RC.NGO/45/10), Finland, Poland (also on behalf of the European Union (with the candidate countries Croatia, the

former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland and Turkey; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; as well as Armenia, Georgia, Moldova, San Marino and Ukraine, in alignment)) (RC.DEL/109/10), National Board of Education (Finland), Slovenia (RC.DEL/89/10), Russian Federation (RC.DEL/78/10), Embargoed! (RC.NGO/113/10), Liechtenstein (RC.DEL/122/10), Muslim Committee on Human Rights in Central Asia, Western Thrace Minority University Graduates Association (RC.NGO/115/10), Avrupa Demokrasi Vakfi e.V. (European Democracy Foundation) (RC.NGO/104/10), Civic Chamber of the Russian Federation, United States of America (RC.DEL/168/10), Holy See (RC.DEL/82/10), Youth Media Union of Kazakhstan (RC.NGO/180/10), Kazakhstan (RC.DEL/95/10), Germany (RC.DEL/70/10), Human Rights First (RC.NGO/93/10) (RC.NGO/94/10), Federation of Western Thrace Turks in Europe (RC.NGO/70/10), Italy (RC.DEL/51/10), Regional Social Organization “Renessans” (RC.NGO/133/10), Canada (RC.DEL/112/10), Centre of Education and Development, Department of Constitutional Guarantees, Presidential Apparatus (Tajikistan), Amnesty International, Union of Balkan Egyptians (RC.NGO/175/10), Union Romani (RC.NGO/128/10), Pakiv-European Roma Reflexion Group (RC.NGO/152/10), Roma Christian Centre, Slovakia (RC.DEL/91/10), Humanitarian Legal Centre Uzbekistan, Federation of Roma Associations in Catalonia (RC.NGO/95/10) (RC.NGO/95/10/Add.1), International Institute of Futurology, European Roma Rights Centre (RC.NGO/161/10) (RC.NGO/162/10), Czech Republic (RC.DEL/126/10) (RC.DEL/86/10), Romedia Foundation, Croatia (RC.DEL/93/10), International Institute of Regional Researches “Open Society”, Greece (RC.DEL/87/10), European Roma Rights Centre, Serbia, France (RC.DEL/125/10/Corr.1), Romania (RC.DEL/88/10), Ternype International Roma Youth Network (RC.NGO/98/10), Public Fund “Consent of the People”, Council of Europe (RC.IO/27/10), Azerbaijan (RC.DEL/102/10), Ms. A. Crickley (United Nations), Commission of Human Rights of Kazakhstan, “Centre Roma” (Bulgaria)

Right of reply: Cyprus (RC.DEL/128/10), Kazakhstan, Germany, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (RC.DEL/96/10), Croatia, Greece, Italy

4. Next session:

Wednesday, 6 October 2010, at 3 p.m., in the plenary hall

Review sessions

Session 8

1. Date: Wednesday, 6 October 2010

Opened: 3.10 p.m.

Closed: 6.15 p.m.

2. Chairperson: Ambassador-at-Large M. Jarbussynova (Kazakhstan)

3. Subjects discussed – Statements:

Agenda item 6: WORKING SESSIONS FOR REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF OSCE PRINCIPLES AND COMMITMENTS, INCLUDING A FOCUS ON RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTION AND GREATER CO-OPERATION AMONG PARTICIPATING STATES

(a) REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ALL OSCE PRINCIPLES AND COMMITMENTS IN THE HUMAN DIMENSION (HDR) (continued)

– TOLERANCE AND NON-DISCRIMINATION II, INCLUDING:

- PROMOTION OF GENDER BALANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OSCE ACTION PLAN AND RELEVANT COMMITMENTS
- PREVENTION AND RESPONSE TO HATE CRIMES IN THE OSCE AREA
- COMBATING INTOLERANCE AND DISCRIMINATION

Chairperson, Mr. M. Walecki (ODIHR) (Moderator), OSCE Chairmanship's Personal Representative on Gender Issues (Introducer), Ms. A. Crickley (United Nations) (Introducer), OSCE Senior Adviser on Gender Issues (RC.GAL/9/10), International Network against Cyber Hate (RC.NGO/118/10), Estonia (also on behalf of the European Union (with the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland and Turkey; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; the European Free Trade Association countries Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area; as well as Andorra, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, San Marino and Ukraine, in alignment))

(RC.DEL/110/10), Council for Global Equality
(RC.NGO/102/10), B'nai B'rith International
(RC.NGO/114/10), Amulet (RC.NGO/135/10),
United Kingdom (RC.DEL/81/10), Russian Federation
(RC.DEL/79/10), European Raelian Movement
(RC.NGO/101/10), Associazione “Giuseppe Dossetti: I Valori”
(Cultural Association Giuseppe Dossetti: i Valori) –
Observatory for Religious Tolerance and Freedom
(RC.NGO/96/10) (RC.NGO/97/10), United States of America
(RC.DEL/108/10), Human Rights First, Sova Centre for
Information and Analysis (RC.NGO/112/10), Public Movement
“Multinational Georgia”, Women’s Forum Russia (Tajikistan),
Open Society Institute Assistance Foundation in Tajikistan,
Women-Entrepreneurial’s Union (RC.NGO/136/10), Algeria
(Partner for Co-operation) (RC.DEL/90/10), Holy See
(RC.DEL/83/10) (RC.DEL/84/10), Tajikistan (RC.DEL/80/10),
European Jewish Congress (RC.NGO/111/10),
United Kingdom (also on behalf of the European Union (with
the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic
of Macedonia, Iceland and Turkey; the countries of the
Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate
countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and
Serbia; the European Free Trade Association countries
Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European
Economic Area; as well as Andorra, Armenia, Georgia,
Moldova, San Marino and Ukraine, in alignment))
(RC.DEL/111/10), Union of European Turkish Democrats –
Brussels (RC.NGO/103/10), Croatia (RC.DEL/98/10),
“Bakubat” Public Association, Human Rights Commission,
Feminist League, Georgia (RC.DEL/117/10), Kazakhstan
(RC.DEL/97/10) (RC.DEL/121/10), Zharia, Uzbekistan, Office
of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
(RC.IO/25/10), Constantinopolitan Society, Centre for
Research on Anti-Semitism, Association of Religious
Organizations of Kazakhstan, Council of Europe (RC.IO/18/10)
(RC.IO/19/10), Canada (RC.DEL/113/10) (RC.DEL/114/10),
Federation of Western Thrace Turks in Europe
(RC.NGO/71/10), Union of Crisis Centres in Kazakhstan
(RC.NGO/144/10), Informational Fund on Religious Questions,
Redeemed Lives, Inc. (RC.NGO/117/10), Human Rights
Educational Centre (RC.NGO/134/10), Western Thrace
Minority University Graduates Association Greece
(RC.NGO/116/10), Observatory on Intolerance and
Discrimination against Christians (RC.NGO/107/10), Centre of
Development and Adaption “Phoenix”,
Avrupa Demokrasi Vakfi e.V. (European Democracy
Foundation), Moscow Bureau for Human Rights, Public Fund
“Consent of the People”, Agency of Social Technologies
“Epicentre” (RC.NGO/132/10), Finnish-Russian Civic Forum,
Muslim Committee on Human Rights in Central Asia

(RC.NGO/141/10), Serbia, Armenia (RC.DEL/118/10),
Chernivtsy Regional NGO “Human Rights” (RC.NGO/138/10),
Women’s Information Centre, Independent Expert (Ukraine)
(RC.FR/1/10/Rev.1), Moldova (RC.DEL/131/10)

Right of reply: Tajikistan, Russian Federation, Belgium,
Kazakhstan, Greece, United States of America, Ukraine

4. Next session:

Thursday, 7 October 2010, at 10 a.m., in the plenary hall

Review sessions

Plenary session (open)

1. Date: Thursday, 7 October 2010

Opened: 10.05 a.m.

Closed: 11.50 a.m.

2. Chairperson: Mr. J. Lenarčič, Director of the ODIHR (Moderator)

3. Subjects discussed – Statements:

Agenda item 7: REPORTS BY THE RAPPORTEURS AND THE
CHAIRPERSON'S SUMMARY

Rapporteur of session 1 (Romania) (Annex 4), Rapporteur of session 2 (Portugal) (Annex 5), Rapporteur of session 3 (Poland) (Annex 6), Rapporteur of session 4 (Serbia) (Annex 7), Rapporteur of session 5 (United Kingdom) (Annex 8), Rapporteur of session 6 (Canada) (Annex 9), Rapporteur of session 7 (Finland) (Annex 10), Rapporteur of session 8 (United States of America) (Annex 11), Belgium-European Union (with the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Iceland; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; the European Free Trade Association country Norway, member of the European Economic Area; as well as Andorra, Georgia, Moldova and San Marino, in alignment) (RC.DEL/174/10), United States of America (RC.DEL/134/10), Canada (RC.DEL/136/10), Russian Federation (RC.DEL/127/10), Ambassador-at-Large M. Jarbussynova (Kazakhstan) (Annex 12), Chairperson (RC.GAL/11/10)

Agenda item 8: FORMAL CLOSURE

The meeting was formally closed.

4. Next session:

Thursday, 7 October 2010, at 3 p.m., in the plenary hall

Forward-looking discussions

Session 1

1. Date: Thursday, 7 October 2010

Opened: 3.10 p.m.

Closed: 5.50 p.m.

2. Chairperson: Ambassador-at-Large M. Jarbussynova (Kazakhstan)

3. Subjects discussed – Statements:

Agenda item 6: WORKING SESSIONS FOR REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF OSCE PRINCIPLES AND COMMITMENTS, INCLUDING A FOCUS ON RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTION AND GREATER CO-OPERATION AMONG PARTICIPATING STATES

(b) FORWARD-LOOKING DISCUSSION OF THE THREE TOPICS SPECIFICALLY SELECTED BY PC.DEC/933 (HDF)

– FREEDOM OF MEDIA

Chairperson, OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media (Introducer), Germany (also on behalf of the European Union (with the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Iceland; the country of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate country Bosnia and Herzegovina; as well as Andorra and San Marino, in alignment)) (RC.DEL/148/10), Turkmenistan Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights, Finnish-Russian Civic Forum, Chief Editor's Club (RC.NGO/147/10), Uzbekistan (RC.DEL/129/10), Swedish-OSCE Network, National Association of Independent Media of Tajikistan, Ukraine, Human Rights Commission, Norway (RC.DEL/167/10), Switzerland (RC.DEL/177/10), Media Council of Tajikistan, Western Thrace Minority University Graduates Association (RC.NGO/155/10), Media Alliance Tajikistan (RC.NGO/187/10), United States of America (RC.DEL/135/10), Canada (RC.DEL/137/10), Bureau of Human Rights and Rule of Law (RC.NGO/148/10), France (RC.DEL/145/10), United Citizens Fund (RC.NGO/146/10), Kazakhstan (RC.DEL/130/10), Russian Federation (RC.DEL/132/10), First Caucasian Independent Magazine "Dosh-Word", Human Rights House Foundation, Human Rights Educational Centre (RC.NGO/164/10), Public Foundation "Journalists in Trouble"

(RC.NGO/163/10), Civic Engagement Foundation, Newspaper “Almaty Info” (RC.NGO/159/10) (RC.NGO/169/10), Media Law Institute, People’s Party “Alga!”, Newspaper “Golos Respubliki” (RC.NGO/158/10), “Gazeta Liter” LLC, Internet Association of Kazakhstan, Observatory on Intolerance and Discrimination against Christians in Europe (RC.NGO/142/10) (RC.NGO/143/10), Information and Consultative Group “Perspective”, Georgia (RC.DEL/172/10), Armenia (RC.DEL/158/10), International Foundation for Protection of Freedom of Speech “Adil Soz”, Youth Media Union of Kazakhstan (RC.NGO/181/10), “Happy Family”, Belarusian Association of Journalists, Albania, Azerbaijan (RC.DEL/151/10), Civil Society Fund (Kazakhstan), Public Foundation “Local Self-Government Centre”, Social Forum Russia, Council of Europe

Right of reply: Turkey, Tajikistan (RC.DEL/152/10), Russian Federation, Kazakhstan, Greece, Azerbaijan

4. Next session:

Friday, 8 October 2010, at 10 a.m., in the plenary hall

Forward-looking discussions

Session 2

1. Date: Friday, 8 October 2010

Opened: 10.10 a.m.
Closed: 12.15 p.m.

2. Chairperson: Ambassador-at-Large M. Jarbussynova (Kazakhstan)

3. Subjects discussed Statements:

Agenda item 6: WORKING SESSIONS FOR REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF OSCE PRINCIPLES AND COMMITMENTS, INCLUDING A FOCUS ON RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTION AND GREATER CO-OPERATION AMONG PARTICIPATING STATES

(b) FORWARD-LOOKING DISCUSSION OF THE THREE TOPICS SPECIFICALLY SELECTED BY PC.DEC/933 (HDF) (continued)

– INTOLERANCE AGAINST MIGRANTS

Chairperson, Ms. D. Petrova (Equal Rights Trust) (Introducer), Mr. S. Stavros (European Commission against Racism and Intolerance) (Moderator), Greece (also on behalf of the European Union (with the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland and Turkey; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; the European Free Trade Association country Norway, member of the European Economic Area; as well as Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, San Marino and Ukraine, in alignment)) (RC.DEL/153/10/Corr.1), Congress of National Minorities of Ukraine (RC.NGO/177/10), National Association of Muslim Police (RC.NGO/156/10), Tajikistan (RC.DEL/147/10), Council of Europe, Perspektiva, DeuKische Generation e.V. (RC.NGO/167/10/Rev.1), Ami-Austrian Muslim Initiative, Croatia (RC.DEL/156/10), Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (RC.IO/24/10), Turkish Community in Germany (RC.NGO/168/10), United States of America (RC.DEL/163/10), Avrupa Demokrasi Vakfi e.V. (European Democracy Foundation), Human Rights First (RC.NGO/174/10), COJEP International (RC.NGO/172/10), Human Rights Commission, International Organization for Migration, Public Fund “Consent of the

People”, Justice-Paix-Liberté Monde (RC.NGO/173/10), Kazakhstan (RC.DEL/154/10), Turkey (RC.DEL/155/10), Centre for Social and Political Research, International Association of Independent Democrats against Authoritarian Regimes, Russian Federation (RC.DEL/149/10), Information and Consultative Group “Perspective”, Centre for Support of Migrants (RC.NGO/193/10)

Right of reply: Germany, Italy, United States of America

4. Next session:

Friday, 8 October 2010, at 3 p.m., in the plenary hall

Forward-looking discussions

Session 3

1. Date: Friday, 8 October 2010 (afternoon)

Opened: 3.10 p.m.
Closed: 5.40 p.m.

2. Chairperson: Ambassador-at-Large M. Jarbussynova (Kazakhstan)

3. Subjects discussed – Statements:

Agenda item 6: WORKING SESSIONS FOR REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF OSCE PRINCIPLES AND COMMITMENTS, INCLUDING A FOCUS ON RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTION AND GREATER CO-OPERATION AMONG PARTICIPATING STATES

(b) FORWARD-LOOKING DISCUSSION OF THE THREE TOPICS SPECIFICALLY SELECTED BY PC.DEC/933 (HDF) (continued)

– COMBATING TRAFFICKING IN HUMAN BEINGS, WITH A PARTICULAR FOCUS ON TRAFFICKING IN CHILDREN

Chairperson, OSCE Special Representative and Co-ordinator for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings (Moderator), Ms. S. Jacomy-Vité (United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund) (Introducer), Hungary (also on behalf of the European Union (with the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland and Turkey; the country of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; the European Free Trade Association countries Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area; as well as Andorra, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, San Marino and Ukraine, in alignment)) (RC.DEL/164/10), European Roma Rights Centre, United States of America (RC.DEL/160/10), Kazakhstan (RC.DEL/165/10), Uzbekistan, Anti-Slavery International, Council of Europe (RC.IO/21/10), ISENIM, Human Rights Commission, Russian Federation (RC.DEL/150/10), Tajikistan (RC.DEL/161/10), Centre for Children’s Rights (RC.NGO/191/10), Canada (RC.DEL/171/10), Moldova, National Centre for Child Abuse Prevention, International Organization for Migration (RC.IO/29/10), ECPAT (RC.NGO/188/10), International Labour Organization

(RC.IO/31/10) (RC.IO/32/10), Poland, Union of Crisis Centres in Kazakhstan (RC.NGO/176/10), Centre of Development and Adaption “Phoenix”, Georgia (RC.DEL/169/10), Muslim Committee on Human Rights in Central Asia, FEMIDA, International Trade Union Confederation, Azerbaijan (RC.DEL/170/10), Tajikistan

Right of reply: Kazakhstan

4. Next session:

Monday, 18 October 2010, at 3 p.m., in Vienna



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Review Conference
Warsaw**

RC(10).JOUR/1
30 September–8 October 2010
Annex 1

Original: ENGLISH

4th Day of the 2010 Review Conference
RC(10) Journal No. 1, Point 2

**STATEMENT BY
THE DELEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

Madam Chairperson,

My government would like to join the European Union and Canada in raising the point of order under Section VI, paragraph 2(e) of the OSCE Rules of Procedure (MC.DOC/1/06).

We are concerned that the OSCE rule on NGO participation is not being implemented properly for this Review Conference. According to the provisions of Chapter IV, paragraphs 15 and 16 of the Helsinki Document 1992, participation can only be denied to “persons or organizations which resort to the use of violence or publicly condone terrorism or the use of violence.” This rule is clearly referred to in PC.DEC/952, which lays out the modalities for the present Review Conference.

Two NGO representatives have not yet been allowed to register this year, apparently on the basis of an objection by the Government of Turkmenistan. While these individuals have been the subject of proceedings in Turkmenistan, both reside legally in EU countries, and the charges against them have not been recognized outside of Turkmenistan. We also note that our host, the Government of Poland, clearly had no reason for the exclusion of either from entry into this country, or they would not be standing in this hotel, separated from these discussions only by not having been registered for this meeting. Turkmenistan objected to these same two NGO representatives in previous years, and each time its objections were denied. Indeed, one of the two individuals has attended six previous OSCE meetings; the other has attended seven previous OSCE meetings. No new information has been presented to suggest any reason to reconsider Turkmenistan’s request. Indeed, Turkmenistan is not even here to press its own claims.

Madam Chairperson,

The United States believes, in the strongest possible terms, that it is unacceptable that one government have the ability to unilaterally deny NGO representation on any basis other than that upon which we as an organization have previously agreed. Such action is injurious to the OSCE as an organization and as a community of values. We request that, before moving to the next agenda item, representatives of both the Secretary General and the Chairmanship-in-Office explain to this working session why the NGOs in question have not

yet been seated. We further request that, if a decision to seat these NGOs has not been reached by noon, we be provided with a written statement by both the OSCE Secretary General's office and the Kazakh Chairmanship-in-Office giving reasons for their effective exclusion.

Finally, we note that failure to resolve this issue will cast a shadow on the Astana Summit. All of us want the Astana Summit to be a success.

We ask that this statement be attached to the journal of the day.

Thank you, Madam Chairperson.



Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Review Conference
Warsaw

RC(10).JOUR/1
30 September–8 October 2010
Annex 2

Original: ENGLISH

4th Day of the 2010 Review Conference
RC(10) Journal No. 1, Point 2

STATEMENT BY THE DELEGATION OF KAZAKHSTAN

Firstly, the Chairmanship reminds all participants of this meeting that this is the OSCE Review Conference and not the OSCE's annual Human Dimension Implementation Meeting. The conduct of this Review Conference is governed by the modalities set out in Permanent Council Decision No. 952, which was adopted by a consensus decision of all participating States and cannot be overruled either by the Chairmanship or by any other participating State, and definitely not by the OSCE Secretary General or by the ODIHR.

Secondly, PC Decision No. 952 clearly stipulates that any decision on the attendance of any NGO or individual whose participation has been questioned should be in conformity with Chapter IV, paragraph (16) of the 1992 Helsinki Document and be based on the views of the interested participating States. Therefore, the Chairmanship has no right to decide on this matter. Furthermore, Kazakhstan has not declared itself an "interested participating State" the views of which should be taken into account in deciding on this matter. This is only natural and is in full accordance with the mandate of any Chairmanship, as prescribed in Porto Ministerial Council Decision No. 8 on the role of the OSCE Chairmanship-in-Office. According to this mandate, the Chairmanship should ensure that its actions are not inconsistent with positions agreed by all the participating States and that the whole spectrum of opinions of participating States is taken into account, thereby ensuring neutrality and objectivity. In other words, the Chairmanship has to respect the opinion of every single participating State.

Thirdly, the Chairmanship wishes to highlight the difference between the modalities of the ongoing Review Conference and the annual Human Dimension Implementation Meeting (HDIM) on this particular matter: the participation of NGOs at HDIMs is governed by the above-mentioned paragraph of the 1992 Helsinki Document, and no formally agreed procedure for ensuring such compliance has been established by the participating States for HDIMs. With regard to the Review Conferences, compliance with that paragraph is ensured by consultations held by the Secretary General and by the requirement that the views of all interested participating States should serve as a basis for any decision on the matter.

The fourth matter concerns the situation with these particular individuals under discussion. They registered for the Review Conference, and their attendance was questioned by an interested participating State. Some other interested participating States expressed different views. Therefore, in full accordance with PC Decision No. 952, the Secretary General is conducting consultations with all interested participating States. No

decision was taken on this matter, due to diverging views among the interested participating States.

Finally, the Chairmanship urges all interested participating States, including those which support and those which do not support the attendance of the Conference by these individuals, to take serious efforts towards converging their views and enabling a constructive resolution of this matter.

This statement will be attached to the journal of this meeting.



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Review Conference
Warsaw**

RC(10).JOUR/1
30 September–8 October 2010
Annex 3

Original: ENGLISH

4th Day of the 2010 Review Conference
RC(10) Journal No. 1, Point 2

STATEMENT BY THE EUROPEAN UNION

Thank you, Madam Chairperson,

On behalf of the EU, Belgium would again like to make a point of order in accordance with the OSCE Rules of Procedure, Chapter VI, Section A, paragraph 2(e), on the participation of NGOs in the human dimension part of the Review Conference.

As interested participating States NGO participation in the Review Conference, the EU member States would like to call on the Kazakh Chairmanship also to present itself as just such an interested participating State. We consider this to be inherent in their role as holder of the OSCE Chairmanship.

We urge the Kazakh OSCE Chairmanship to give a strong recommendation to the OSCE Secretary General to allow the two Turkmen NGO members to participate in the Review Conference.

The EU reiterates that it remains strongly committed to the open and free participation of non-governmental organizations in OSCE human dimension meetings, as is set out in our commitments.

We would like to recall that when a decision is taken on the participation of NGOs in OSCE events, there can only be one criterion of consideration, namely, that, in accordance with Chapter IV, paragraph 16 of the Helsinki Document 1992, persons or organization may only be denied participation in OSCE events if they “resort to the use of violence or publicly condone terrorism or the use of violence.”

The EU strongly demands that in accordance with the OSCE commitments the Turkmen NGO members Mr. Nurmukhammed Khanamov and Mr. Annadurdy Khadzhiev be admitted to participate in this year’s OSCE Review Conference.

I ask that this statement be attached to the journal of the day.



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Review Conference
Warsaw**

RC(10).JOUR/1
30 September–8 October 2010
Annex 4

Original: ENGLISH

6th Day of the 2010 Review Conference
RC(10) Journal No. 1, Agenda item 7

SESSION 1: DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

Report by the rapporteur

The session underlined the importance of democratic institutions for the development of democracies. Democratic elections were recognized as being central to this endeavour. States reaffirmed their election-related commitments, making specific reference to the Copenhagen Document, and the necessity to implement them.

The ODIHR presented its approach to election observation before, during and after elections, taking into consideration, *inter alia*, mass-media during election campaigns and pointed out that the election observation methodology is set out in the Election Observation Handbook. The ODIHR encouraged the participating States to implement the Istanbul Summit commitment to carry out prompt follow-up to recommendations contained in election observation reports. The OSCE Parliamentary Assembly highlighted the commitment of parliamentarians, as elected officials, to clear standards and impartiality in election observation. Both institutions referred to the observation of elections as a common endeavour of the ODIHR and the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly in accordance with the Copenhagen Agreement of 1997. Several States mentioned improvement of electoral frameworks as part of their governmental agenda and enumerated measures taken to this end in co-operation with the ODIHR.

The following were some of the elements mentioned as being important for the safeguarding of democracy and democratic processes, including the conduct of democratic elections: respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, political pluralism, an independent judiciary, a vibrant civil society, rule of law and separation of powers in the State, freedom of expression, pluralistic and independent mass media, and freedom of assembly. Several participants mentioned the importance of democracy at the local level for the overall state of democracy in any given country.

Mention was made of challenges in the following more specifically election-related fields, and of the necessity to address them: the right to stand for elections and be elected; a level playing field for all election candidates, notably with respect to equal access to mass media; accuracy of the lists of voters; equality and secrecy of the vote; the correct counting and tabulation of votes; effective mechanisms for election disputes that ensure remedies to complaints, and provisions designed to enable both domestic and international observers to monitor elections.

The majority of speakers commended the ODIHR's election observation methodology, including its long-term observation and monitoring of the mass media. One State suggested the adoption by the participating States of a joint document regulating the work of international observers.

Many States referred to the need for better follow-up to election report recommendations, notably for the purpose of better peer review of the implementation of commitments. They made concrete suggestions to this end.

Recommendations

1. Enhance efforts to fully implement OSCE election-related commitments;
2. Call on participating States to issue invitations for election-monitoring without restrictions;
3. Carry out concrete follow-up to election observation reports, with participating States presenting their endeavours to the PC and/or the Human Dimension Committee;
4. Education for young voters on the importance and conduct of democratic elections;
5. Continue co-operation between the ODIHR and the Parliamentary Assembly in election observation in accordance with the 1997 Copenhagen Agreement and Ministerial Council Decision No. 19/06;
6. Ensure sufficient resources for the ODIHR to carry out its election observation activities;
7. Continue to develop the capacity of national observers to monitor domestic electoral processes;
8. Consider the possibility of adopting new election-related commitments to reflect the development of new technologies, notably in the mass media.



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Review Conference
Warsaw**

RC(10).JOUR/1
30 September–8 October 2010
Annex 5

Original: ENGLISH

6th Day of the 2010 Review Conference
RC(10) Journal No. 1, Agenda item 7

SESSION 2: FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS I

Report by the rapporteur

The first introducer, Prof. Malcom Evans, underlined that the most profound change over the previous ten years concerning the enjoyment of the freedom of religion or belief had been the heightened importance of the role that belief, whether religious or non-religious, plays in the public and political life of communities. The manner in which these issues were addressed had become a matter of critical political importance both domestically and internationally; furthermore, it tended to give rise to clashes and controversy, rather than compromise, causing the issues in question to become invested with a significance beyond their true importance.

Prof. Evans identified some major areas of difficulties: firstly, legitimate security concerns that should not be used to justify improper restrictions upon the enjoyment of freedom of religion or belief; secondly, the misuse of laws relating to the recognition of religious organizations to limit, restrict or even prohibit the free exercise of religion or belief; and finally, the relationship between freedom of religion and freedom of expression, the latter being hampered by such things as increased legislative activity seeking to restrict the wearing or display of religious clothing and symbols. The introducer emphasized that it was through the idea of “respect” that these issues could best be addressed; furthermore, participating States should ensure that all forms of religion or belief be able to secure their proper space in public life, and that the belief communities be allowed a place in public and political debate.

Many participating States and NGOs underlined that freedom to express and to change one’s religion or belief was an integral part of this freedom, and that the failure to protect the rights of members of religious communities contributed to the erosion of the right not only to religious freedom but also to free assembly and expression, and other human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Several statements voiced concern that in an increasing number of participating States the level of freedom of religion or belief had worsened, while worrying new tendencies were undermining the rights of individuals and communities to profess and practise their religion or belief freely. They pointed out that security concerns, though often legitimate, were utilized to restrict this freedom, in particular with respect to minority or non-traditional religious groups.

In this connection, several participating States and NGOs noted the tendency of introducing restrictive policies and laws imposing difficult registration requirements and placing severe restrictions on religious education, proselytizing, religious publications, and property or building permits for places of worship.

Strong views were expressed on the question of the legal measures seeking to restrict the wearing or display of religious clothing and symbols.

Some NGOs mentioned the existence in some participating States of “anti-sect” policies not in line with OSCE commitments. In reply to this criticism, representatives of several participating States gave explanations regarding the exact nature of such policies.

Some NGOs also referred to the right to conscientious objection; one of them defended the view that it should not be limited to the military services.

Finally, many participating States and NGOs commended the work carried out in close collaboration with other international organizations by the OSCE and ODIHR in protecting freedom of religion or belief.

The recommendations from the discussion can be summarized as follows:

- Participating States should adhere more closely to OSCE commitments on freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief;
- Participating States should respect and protect people who belong to any religious community – and indeed those who prefer a secular approach – and investigate and prosecute cases of bias-motivated violence against individuals and property associated with religious communities;
- The recommendations of participating States and representatives of civil society gathered at the upcoming Supplementary Human Dimension Meeting on freedom of religion or belief should be taken into account in the work of the OSCE;
- The ODIHR’s panel of experts on freedom of religion was encouraged to draw up an independent report on the laws on extremism and their implementation;
- The OSCE’s institutions and field operations were encouraged to mainstream freedom of religion or belief in human dimension work.

The second introducer, Ambassador Douglas Wake, First Deputy Director of the ODIHR, presented some observations about ODIHR activities, underlining that over the previous 11 years the ODIHR and its activities had gone through important changes. Notably, the expansion of its mandate and structures had further developed its capacity to monitor and report on matters within its mandate and to assist participating States in implementing their commitments. The ODIHR was currently carrying out its mandate through programmes on elections, democratization, human rights, tolerance and non-discrimination, and through a Contact Point for Roma and Sinti issues. It constantly sought to ensure that its work was closely linked with the engagement of host governmental institutions, civil society, other OSCE structures, and international community partners. Ambassador Wake also stressed that

the ODIHR's activities were carried out in an increasingly wide range of participating States and were not limited to any geographical region or subregion within the OSCE area.

A large group of participating States suggested that the forthcoming OSCE Summit provided an important opportunity to revitalize the organization and stressed that the Summit should have a substantial agenda, with the Corfu Process being central to discussions. Along with this, speakers underlined the autonomy and expertise of OSCE institutions in helping participating States to implement their commitments and their support for the ODIHR's observation methodology. In addition concerns were raised regarding the situation of human rights defenders, attacks against journalists, negative developments in media freedom, notably in connection with Internet-based media, trafficking in human beings, and violence against minorities. Finally, there was praise for the efforts of the relevant OSCE human rights bodies and OSCE missions in this field.

Two other participating States raised concerns about some of the activities of the ODIHR and OSCE field missions, recalling that OSCE field operations could work only with the consent of the host participating State and were to co-operate closely with governmental activities with the aim of transferring the mission task to the local authorities. They also emphasized that the field missions could not function as observatory bodies. They argued that some OSCE commitments had been granted more attention than others, generating an imbalance both in the baskets and the commitments.

Specific recommendations on this topic:

- The OSCE Summit should set out a mandate for revitalizing the Organization and its future work, which should include the strengthening of the autonomy and integrity of the Organization's institutions;
- Participating States should explore ways to enhance support for the implementation of human dimension commitments, notably through peer, thematic and national review, or through human dimension events. It was also suggested that certain commitments should be adapted and reinforced in specific areas of the human dimension, including freedom of the media, freedom of assembly and the protection of those who promote human rights;
- Participating States should be more systematic in carrying out the recommendations of ODIHR election observation reports;
- Co-operation with international organizations should be enhanced, in particular with the UN and the Council of Europe;
- Participating States should give assistance to projects and programmes in the human dimension field, whether through facilitating project implementation on the ground or through making appropriate material contributions;
- The extrabudgetary funding of projects should be more transparent and accountable, with reporting to the receiving participating States;

- The ODIHR should pursue greater geographical and topical balance in its activities;
- A unified body of rules should be implemented to promote transparency, balanced approaches and co-operation amongst the participating States and OSCE institutions.



SESSION 3: FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS II

Report by the rapporteur

The session was moderated by Ms. Hanna Machinska, Director of the Information Office of the Council of Europe, who pointed out that while the freedom of association and assembly was a recognized pillar of democracy, practice was in many cases not in conformity with commitments. She also noted that while national human rights institutions played an important role in processing complaints, pursuing a critical approach on human rights protection and promoting human rights education, these institutions were often endangered by the criticism they expressed. Speaking about freedom of movement, she pointed to international and national standards and to many OSCE documents that protect the right to leave and return to one's country and stated that restrictions on travelling within and between countries should be the exception.

The session was introduced by Mr. Serghei Ostaf, Resource Centre for Human Rights, Moldova. Referring to freedom of assembly and association, Mr. Ostaf listed a number of points that should be considered, including:

- Exchange of good practices;
- The extent to which spontaneous assemblies are allowed;
- Restrictions on freedom of assembly (proportionality, experiences, limits);
- Role of courts in upholding rights related to the freedom of association and assembly;
- Restrictions on associations (number, registration, citizenship, administrative hurdles, role of the courts);
- Functioning of civil society organizations;
- Environment necessary for fostering the flourishing of civil society.

Speaking about national human rights institutions, Mr. Ostaf highlighted the fact that although most participating States have established them, they are very often still poorly developed and subject to financial and political pressures and limitations. He stated that at the

core of their functioning was the ability to establish a successful dialogue with State authorities.

Introducing the subject of freedom of movement, Mr. Ostaf recalled the Vienna and Copenhagen Documents and posed the question as to whether the commitments in this field are realized in practice, especially with regard to migrants.

The session provided a fine opportunity for discussion, which was used to the full. There were numerous interventions, both by the participating States and by representatives of civil society from different parts of the OSCE area. While participating States tended to focus on how they strive for better implementation of commitments, the representatives of civil society pointed to the continued existence of shortcomings and to violations, calling for further action aimed at full compliance with commitments. The majority of the interventions related to the questions of freedom of assembly and association and of national human rights institutions and the role of civil society in the protection of human rights. There were also a number of statements on freedom of movement.

A number of recommendations were made during this working session, with the addressees being urged:

- To fully observe the freedoms of expression, assembly and association, and to take concrete action to enable individuals to effectively exercise their rights to peaceful assembly and association, freedom of expression and freedom of movement;
- To ensure the promotion and protection of human rights and all fundamental freedoms;
- To make use of the OSCE and the ODIHR, notably of their expertise in the areas of freedom of association, expression, and movement;
- The ODIHR and the field operations were called upon to assist the participating States in reviewing legislation and practice with regard to international and regional human rights, to continue to engage with national human rights institutions and defenders across the OSCE area, and to strengthen their own capacity to promote, protect, monitor and report on respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms;
- To allow freedom to join or not to join trade unions or professional associations and to establish religious associations;
- To make human rights education mandatory in all educational institutions;
- To protect human rights defenders throughout the OSCE area; to create a special representative on human rights defenders within the ODIHR; to develop rapid response mechanisms for cases in which human rights defenders need assistance;
- To strive to make the OSCE area a single freedom and security area;

- To ensure that visa regimes do not prevent travelling in the OSCE area, and to mandate the ODIHR to constantly monitor how the participating States fulfil their commitments relating to freedom of movement;
- To stop intimidation and prosecution of human rights activists;
- To refrain from using anti-terrorism measures to stifle civil activism and to target associations;
- To streamline NGO participation in OSCE events;
- To provide better information about national human rights institutions and their work, to foster their activities with financial support, and to promote contacts between national human rights institutions and representatives of civil society;
- To foster better co-operation with civil society at the State level in order to solve problems without it becoming necessary to bring them to international forums;
- To create a standing forum for national human rights institutions;
- To boost regional co-operation and national education on human rights;
- The HCNM and the ODIHR were called upon to monitor the situation of internally displaced persons and refugees with regard to freedom of movement and to help the OSCE engage in solving the problem;
- To allow national human rights institutions true independence;
- To continue co-operation between participating States on freedom of movement, also including the OSCE Partners for Co-operation;
- To improve the implementation of existing commitments.



SESSION 4: RULE OF LAW I

Report by the rapporteur

The majority of participating States and NGO representatives stressed the importance of the rule of law as a fundamental element for the development of democratic society and respect for human rights. For this reason, the State was responsible for providing its citizens and residents with a stable, predictable and ordered environment.

Several participants stated that in order for this goal to be achieved, appropriate action must be taken by all three branches of government – the judiciary, the legislature, and the executive – to guarantee separation of power between the branches and the existence of mutual checks and balances.

It was emphasized by the majority of participants that the judiciary should preserve its independence by introducing several safeguards against any kind of influence, particularly political. Those measures should include transparent terms of appointment, guaranteed tenure, specialization of judges, fair and independent disciplinary proceedings, and the provision of respective working conditions, resources and salaries. In the case of one State, lack of transparency in recruitment and appointment procedures was used as an example of possible hidden manipulation. Ensuring the highest standards in the above-mentioned procedures could also contribute to the eradication of corruption among judges.

Several participants repeatedly emphasized that everyone was subject to the law and no one above the law. This principle of the rule of law should promote the strengthening of ordinary citizens' trust and faith in the judicial system.

A number of participants in the discussion referred to the practice, recommendations and standards of the Council of Europe and the European Court of Human Rights. Some participating States reported on recent judicial reforms and new procedures in their national legislation. One NGO stressed necessity to bring the norms of juvenile legislation in conformity with international standards.

Some participants, particularly representatives of NGOs, expressed concern about the situation in their and other countries with respect to: non-transparency of judicial proceedings; lack of timely delivery and enforcement of court decisions; violation of defendants' rights; corruption of judges and, on the other side of the same coin, intimidation

of judges. In particular, considerable attention was devoted to violations in the form of lack of evidence, prevention of defendants from having access to a lawyer, and forced confessions, with particular reference to such practices as unlawful arrests and maltreatment in custody, the latter in some cases leading to fatalities. A number of participants expressed concern regarding the protection of witnesses in general, and in particular of those involved in war-crime trials.

As a matter of urgency, some States were called upon to resolve cases involving human rights defenders and journalists, and to do so in accordance with national law and international legal standards. In responding they advanced the argument that interventions of this kind could be regarded as interference in internal judicial procedures prior to a judgment being passed. A few participants stated that double standards were being applied within the OSCE.

There was a call from a number of NGOs for the above-mentioned violations to be made the subject of international monitoring, with special responsibilities being borne by the OSCE and by the Chairperson-in-Office in particular

A group of States addressed the subject of legislative transparency. They recalled the commitments of participating States to ensure public procedure in the process of drafting and adopting legislation. Particular emphasis was laid on the inclusion of NGOs and other civil society actors in the law-making process. As the relevant texts should be published and accessible to everybody, several NGOs proposed that their dissemination should be improved, with consideration being given to making them available free of charge.

Recommendations from the discussion:

- Participating States should make the principle of judicial independence an effective reality by introducing and applying objective criteria and transparent procedures for selecting and appointing judges;
- Participating States should establish efficient systems for the publication of judicial decisions and ensure that the latter are accessible to the public;
- Participating States should build and maintain respect and trust in the judicial system through the timely and efficient enforcement of judgments;
- Participating States should provide adequate resources to enable the judiciary to perform its functions properly;
- Participating States should ensure fair, timely and effective judicial proceedings, guaranteeing that witnesses are protected and the rights of defendants respected;
- Participating States should consider enhancing and strengthening the institution of official legal aid;
- Participating States should ensure transparent and inclusive legislative processes that reflect the will of the people;

- The OSCE should assist participating States in exchanging information on good practices in the area of the rule of law;
- The OSCE should continue to assist participating States in capacity-building in the judicial field and facilitate the exchange of practices and contacts between their judiciaries;
- The OSCE should provide civil society with regularly updated information on international legal standards and with materials relating to rule-of-law issues.



SESSION 5: RULE OF LAW II

Report by the rapporteur

Abolition of the death penalty

It was noted that the previous decade had seen a gradual phasing out of the death penalty in the OSCE area. Only six States still retained the death penalty. Of these, only two still carried out executions. The two States in question pointed out that they used the death penalty sparingly and only in exceptional circumstances, and that its use did not contravene OSCE commitments. Four States had retained the death penalty for cases of terrorism leading to loss of life and other most serious crimes, but had not in fact imposed the death penalty for some years.

It was also noted that this positive trend had continued despite an increase in terrorist activity in the OSCE area over this period. States had resisted the temptation to reintroduce the death penalty, possibly taking the view that it might fuel extremism and radicalization. Many States expressed their opposition to capital punishment in all cases and under all circumstances, and called for a global moratorium as a first step towards its abolition. Some States pointed out that popular support for the retention or reintroduction of capital punishment remained strong. The ODIHR's annual background paper entitled *The Death Penalty in the OSCE Area* was commended.

Recommendations:

- Some States and NGOs urged the OSCE to examine alternatives to the death penalty, in particular the imposition of life sentences;
- Specifically, there was a call for the OSCE to facilitate exchange of information on sentencing arrangements and on the handling of those condemned to life in prison;
- Some NGOs called for increased public awareness of the broader human rights implications of the death penalty.

Preventing torture

The prevention of torture and ill-treatment of citizens by State bodies was seen as being crucial to the maintenance of public confidence in the rule of law. However, a number of NGOs quoted instances of torture and ill-treatment by police and prison officers in their own countries, some claiming that torture was commonplace and even encouraged by the authorities as a means of extracting confessions. The perpetrators of torture were able to carry out these violations with impunity.

Some States accepted that torture had not been completely eliminated, but insisted that it was not used on a systematic basis. The adoption of national preventative mechanisms and the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture were important steps in preventing torture. It was acknowledged that the OSCE had played a central role in helping States move forward on both.

Recommendations:

- Systematic monitoring of detention facilities by international organizations and/or NGOs;
- Professionalization of the police and prison services, including human rights education and training for officers;
- Introduction of effective and transparent complaints procedures, including independent investigations into serious allegations, and appropriate punishments for those convicted of serious violations;
- Introduction of a set of basic minimum standards for detention facilities.

Protection of human rights and the fight against terrorism

Many States acknowledged that the fight against terrorism posed a challenge concerning respect for human rights, though it was also noted that according to the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy effective counter-terrorism measures and the protection of human rights were not conflicting goals but complementary and mutually reinforcing ones.

Some States argued that certain human rights, such as freedom from torture, were absolute, but that within strict limitations established by international law other rights could be relaxed in the pursuit of effective counter-measures. Some States warned against the misuse of vaguely worded counter-terrorism legislation to suppress critical opinion or to promote religious discrimination. Some NGOs alleged that organizations that posed no threat to national security were indeed being silenced by State authorities misusing counter-terrorism legislation to label them as extremist bodies.

Recommendations:

- In developing counter-terrorism measures, States should ensure that any limitations on human rights are in full conformity with their international legal obligations;

- NGOs should play an increasing role in combating extremism and terrorism through, for example, educational and awareness-raising campaigns;
- The OSCE should facilitate an ongoing exchange of experience and best practices to maximize the value of the expertise available on the development of counter-terrorism measures that do not violate human rights commitments.



6th Day of the 2010 Review Conference
RC(10) Journal No. 1, Agenda item 7

SESSION 6: HUMANITARIAN ISSUES AND OTHER COMMITMENTS

Report by the rapporteur

The session was opened by the Chairperson, a representative of Kazakhstan.

Before the introduction of the session, a point of order was raised by a majority of participating States expressing concern at the exclusion of certain NGOs. The participating States requested a swift decision accepting the excluded NGOs in question (from Turkmenistan) at the Review Conference. The Chairperson recalled Permanent Council Decision No. 952 and pointed out that consultations on this matter were in progress.

The debate at this session was very rich, as was reflected in the large number of interventions by NGOs and participating States. The statements and comments were of high quality and fascinating in substance.

Participants were reminded of the vast number of displaced persons in the OSCE area in previous years. While mention was made of certain specific States, attention was focused on two larger regions, the Balkans and the Caucasus. A large number of participating States took the occasion to provide an update on their respective national legislative frameworks and initiatives.

The themes of this session were introduced by a representative of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. His introduction focused on the following points:

- The issue of displacement is becoming more complex. The nature of conflict has changed, with the lines between civilians and the military and between military operations and humanitarian action often becoming blurred;
- One out of four refugees in the world is from Afghanistan, an OSCE Partner for Co-operation;
- Statelessness remains a major challenge, and the absence of solutions for refugees in protracted displacement continues to pose major challenges;

- There is an intrinsic link between conflict and displacement, and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the OSCE engage in close co-operation on the ground;
- Emphasis was laid on the basic principles of humanitarian action, notably neutrality and impartiality;
- Widespread sexual and gender-based violence remains a defining feature of many conflicts in the OSCE, including cruelty against children;
- *Refoulement* often occurs out of the public eye, disguised as voluntary return;
- There is a considerable commitments implementation deficit in the OSCE;
- The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees welcomes the adoption of anti-trafficking measures and laws adopted by a number of OSCE participating States;
- The number of child refugees, mostly from Afghanistan, has increased dramatically, presenting serious challenges;
- An encouraging regional dynamic has been observed in Central Asia, with much-needed follow-up actions now being in progress;
- Resettlement is a key protection tool and responsibility-sharing mechanism, though local integration is often the preferable solution;
- Too often there is a glaring gap between States' obligations and commitments and their implementation in practice.

During the debate that followed, a great number of points were raised and debated. A group of States insisted that a global and balanced approach was necessary, with a focus on prevention-based policies. Some participants insisted on the direct link between protection of refugees and the task of establishing peace and security in regions in post-conflict situations.

Some participating States pointed out that the issue of refugees had been exacerbated by the global economic crisis. It was also stated that Roma and Sinti should not be returned without sufficient safeguards.

Concerns were expressed about politicians contributing to xenophobia by using minorities as scapegoats in order to pursue their own political ends.

It was suggested that education was at the heart of the promoting human rights. Co-operation between the OSCE and other relevant institutions should be increased in this field.

Attention was drawn to persisting problems related to freedom of movement and return, access to property and tenancy rights, compensation for damage suffered, and possibilities for integration. A number of recommendations were made for consideration and

follow-up. Emphasis was laid on the importance of learning by sharing experience and best practices.

Some participants called for increased co-operation between the OSCE and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and other relevant institutions on the ground. The importance of national human rights commissions was noted. A number of participants pointed out that the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities could play a useful role in this context.

Respect for human dignity and rights should be at the heart of national policies, because the reality behind the figures and statistics was that of human beings.

Participants reiterated the usefulness of NGOs in the development of civil society in OSCE participating States. NGOs played an important part in stimulating human rights education, which was crucial in promoting this issue amongst the wider population and contributing to better understanding. Participants often noted the clear and direct link between peace and security and human rights education, in the promotion of which the OSCE human dimension and environment and security dimension both had an important role to play.

Constant changes in the security architecture made it important to reconcile human security and State security. Most participants recommended the incorporation of the UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement into national legislation and policies.



Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Review Conference
Warsaw

RC(10).JOUR/1
30 September–8 October 2010
Annex 10

Original: ENGLISH

6th Day of the 2010 Review Conference
RC(10) Journal No. 1, Agenda item 7

SESSION 7: TOLERANCE AND NON-DISCRIMINATION I

Report by the rapporteur

Working session 7 addressed questions relating to the implementation of the OSCE Action Plan on Roma and Sinti, national minorities and the prevention of aggressive nationalism, racism and chauvinism. The clear focus of the session was the situation of the Roma, grave concern being expressed at anti-Roma rhetoric having moved from the extreme to the mainstream of political discourse and at the dangerous deterioration in the situation of Roma in Europe. The introducer also pointed out that there had been an increase in hate crime attacks on Roma in some participating States and stated that there was a link to the fact of right-wing politics being on the rise generally.

A great number of participants made comments in the subsequent discussion. Several statements highlighted the huge gap between the reality of Roma communities and the existing legal frameworks and political commitments. Delegates presented a number of national measures designed to address the situation of Roma, including the use of advisory boards featuring Roma participation at the national, regional and municipal levels. Attention was also drawn to the fact that over 30 per cent of Roma are under 40 years of age, and that failure to invest in Roma will create whole new generations of socially excluded persons. The participating States were called upon to make Roma children and youth a priority and to establish channels of communication with young Roma.

The point was made that many Roma were leaving their country of origin because of extreme poverty and lack of opportunities; discrimination and segregation in education, for instance, were widespread. While a lot of attention was devoted to the plight of Roma migrants within the European Union, it was also emphasized that the majority of Roma live in their home countries and that the primary responsibility for the protection of rights and wellbeing of all citizens lay with the national governments. It was stressed that governments should take a more active role and find the political will to make Roma issues a priority. It was also stressed that education, and most particularly early education, was a crucial tool for improving the situation of Roma and Sinti. In addition, it was also important to educate the majority population, because their attitudes also needed to be changed.

Many statements proposed that additional international measures should be employed. For instance, more intensive international co-operation could be attained by a European Union policy on Roma and by full use being made of the forthcoming Council of Europe

ministerial meeting on Roma in October. The upcoming OSCE Summit in Astana also offered a chance to draw attention to Roma and Sinti issues and to discuss how to better implement the comprehensive OSCE Action Plan.

Recommendations from the discussion included the following:

- Participating States should fulfil their commitments and obligations under various international agreements for the protection of the human rights of Roma;
- Participating States should show serious commitment by transposing commitments into policies and practice at national and local level, and by refraining from measures and statements that discriminate against Roma;
- Participating States should provide the necessary administrative and financial resources for implementing policies for Roma integration;
- Participating States should increase efforts to combat discrimination, in particular educational and residential segregation, at all levels and to engage in partnership with Roma civil society and the Roma communities;
- The European Union should increase its support for capacity-building and empowerment of Roma civil society and organizations, increase its efforts related to Romani youth development and education, and design programmes aimed at increasing the civic and public participation of Roma communities;
- The European Union should further monitor the fundamental rights situation of Roma within its area, and take action as appropriate;
- The EU was urged to monitor progress and failures with respect to the use of EU funding and ensure that such funds are spent to best effect with a view to the integration of Roma;
- The EU was also recommended to ensure consultation and dialogue with Roma and the participation of Roma and their representatives in the processes that shape policies affecting them;
- The OSCE was recommended to upgrade the profile and strengthen the status of the ODIHR Contact Point for Roma and Sinti Issues and to support the establishment of a panel of Roma and Sinti advisers and experts to work on a regular basis with the Contact Point;
- The OSCE should review the implementation of the OSCE Action Plan on Roma and Sinti on a regular basis;
- Co-operation between the OSCE, the Council of Europe, the EU and Roma organizations was encouraged.

The discussion was not restricted to the situation of Roma and Sinti but also extended to cover aggressive nationalism, racism and chauvinism as exemplified by neo-Nazism. It

was recalled that hate crimes were manifestations of racism and chauvinism and that action against them should be made a priority. Threatened communities were often distinguished by such characteristics as religion, ethnic background or sexual orientation. It was recommended that participating States should create comprehensive policies against hate crimes encompassing all aspects of intolerance, and support initiatives addressing the social challenges faced by minority groups and helping them participate in public and political life.

Attention was also paid to general questions related to minorities. In this context, several participating States proposed raising the Bolzano/Bozen Recommendations on National Minorities in Inter-State Relations to the political level. A specific recommendation was made to the OSCE and other relevant institutions to monitor closely the minority situation in Kyrgyzstan, especially in Osh and its surroundings.



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Review Conference
Warsaw**

RC(10).JOUR/1
30 September–8 October 2010
Annex 11

Original: ENGLISH

6th Day of the 2010 Review Conference
RC(10) Journal No. 1, Agenda item 7

SESSION 8: TOLERANCE AND NON-DISCRIMINATION II

Report by the rapporteur

The session focused on two main areas: the promotion of gender balance, including the implementation of the OSCE 2004 Action Plan and other relevant commitments; and the prevention of and response to hate crimes in the context of combating intolerance and discrimination in the OSCE area. The session was moderated by Marcin Walecki, Chief of the ODIHR Democratic Governance and Participation Unit. It attracted an impressive list of 58 interventions and seven rights of reply.

Speaking on behalf of the chairmanship, Ambassador Jarbussinova introduced the session by highlighting the special emphases Kazakhstan has placed and is placing on tolerance and gender issues this year, as evidenced by the High-Level Conference on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination in Astana and the recent appointment of the Special Representative on Gender Issues, Ms. Wendy Patten. Ambassador Jarbussinova called on participating States to follow the recommendations of the Astana Declaration.

In her keynote address, Ms. Patten provided an overview of the 2004 OSCE Gender Action Plan, saying that while commitments were well delineated and a lot had been achieved on a normative level, much more needed to be done to create and sustain an environment where women could truly enjoy equality. As Special Representative, Ms. Patten said she envisaged her work as focusing on violence against women and the intersection of gender and migration. Furthermore she intended to adopt a strategic approach, conduct country visits, work with all stakeholders, hold roundtables, and participate in international forums to promote gender issues.

The second keynote speaker was Ms. Anastasia Crickley, member of the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. Ms. Crickley commended the OSCE for its work on defining hate crime and the collection of data from participating States. She raised the issue of certain recent hate crimes in which justification had been sought by blaming the behaviour of the victim, and recommended a victim-based approach. Hate crimes remained “underreported, under-recorded and under-prosecuted,” and data collection and monitoring of hate crimes were fundamental issues. Foremost of all, however, political will was required to implement existing decisions and instruments. Ms. Crickley made favourable mention of data collection systems in Finland, Sweden, the

United Kingdom and the United States of America, but also noted that the timing of the release of data created difficulties in including U.S. data in reports.

In discussing the issue of gender equality, many delegations took the floor to present their successful national programmes, while NGOs tended to focus on shortcomings in implementing commitments. Numerous speakers recognized gender equality as a fundamental right, emphasizing that sustainable and equitable society could only develop if women participated in all areas on an equal footing with men. Attention was paid to the problem of low representation of women in public and political processes, to the persistence of violence against women in the OSCE area, and to the economic deprivation that is often exacerbated by the high gender pay gap and the under-representation of women in the economic sphere. Many praised the work of the Secretariat and the ODIHR in the promotion of gender equality.

One NGO called for rapid action in areas of unresolved conflicts where women are particularly affected by violence. An NGO from Central Asia reported widespread violence against women, both in the domestic and the public sphere; furthermore, appropriate legislation to prosecute the perpetrators was still lacking, creating a situation that had led to an alarmingly high suicide rate among women in that country. Another NGO spoke of a range of serious problems including denial of education or employment opportunities, arranged marriages and abductions of women. A third NGO outlined persistent gender inequality in Central Asia, notwithstanding ongoing reforms.

Recommendations made to the participating States included the following:

- Develop and execute national action plans and other policy instruments for the promotion of gender equality;
- Adopt and implement legislation for combating gender-based discrimination;
- Fully implement UN resolution 1325 promoting the participation of women in conflict resolution and peace-building and the protection of women from gender-based violence;
- Ratify the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women;
- Make better use of the ODIHR and Secretariat's gender section resources;
- Call upon the media, public figures and civil society to assist in the elimination of long-standing gender stereotypes;
- Establish networks of women in economic and political leadership positions and provide funding for training of women who seek such positions;
- Nominate more qualified female candidates for high-level OSCE positions.

Recommendations to the OSCE included the following:

- Continue to compile, analyse and publish existing good practices and mechanisms used to promote gender equality;
- Focus on recruiting more women to leadership positions within the OSCE and include a gender perspective in all activities and operations across all three dimensions;
- Incorporate the principle of diversity in all recruitment efforts;
- Translate OSCE material on gender into other languages so as to facilitate an exchange of experiences;
- Send more women to peace-building operations.

The second topic encompassed the prevention of and response to hate crimes and the combating of intolerance and discrimination. The discussion was lively and revealed some deeply diverging views.

Again, attention was drawn to the serious gap between the adoption and actual implementation of commitments and legislation in the area of combating discrimination and hate crimes. A large number of participants spoke in support of the ODIHR's excellent work in the area of hate crime data collection and tolerance education. The work of the three personal representatives for tolerance was also noted.

Concern was expressed about the persistent high level of hate crimes occurring in the OSCE area, as evidenced by the ODIHR's report on the subject. One speaker commended the ODIHR for providing platforms for the discussion of the perceived rise of incitement to violence based on hate material on the Internet, while another delegation noted an increase in hate crimes related to extremist ideology and hateful speech in the media and suggested that governments monitor and prevent this phenomenon. Russia noted that it had identified 621 sources of inflammatory/extremist material. Other speakers noted escalating violence targeting the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) community and called on participating States to provide the ODIHR with a mandate to adequately address this issue.

A large number of delegations called for governments to move beyond diplomatic discourse and take a comprehensive, humanistic approach to seek remedies to racism, intolerance and discrimination and combat violent manifestations of intolerance against all individuals whether they belong to gender, ethnic, sexual or other minorities or majorities. The European Union, Canada and the United States also supported an explicit focus by the ODIHR on LGBT issues. Several Central Asian NGOs lamented the lack of adequate anti-discrimination legislation and the resulting impunity enjoyed by perpetrators, especially where it affected the LGBT community.

A representative of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees noted growing intolerance and xenophobia fuelled by extremist statements from political leaders as the greatest single challenge related to the protection of refugees and asylum-seekers at this time. One NGO presented European Union statistics documenting wide-ranging discrimination against migrants, particularly Roma, Africans and Turks, and called for rapid

action to effect the proper implementation of the relevant laws. Similar trends exist in which visible ethnic minorities have experienced heightened levels of discrimination. Notably, the United States of America called for an SHDM (Supplementary Human Dimension Meeting) on racist discrimination in 2011 under the Lithuanian Chairmanship.

Discrimination against and marginalization of Christians was mentioned by a number of participants who listed, *inter alia*, an increase in attacks on Christian symbols, persistent violation of education rights, and cases of reversed discrimination. One participant argued that Christian teaching on sexuality was often falsely labelled as intolerant.

The representative of a Mediterranean Partner for Co-operation noted the persistent equation of Islam with terrorism and the resulting increase in hostilities, and called on the OSCE to move beyond non-binding recommendations to adopt monitoring and reporting mechanisms modelled on first dimension approaches.

Kazakhstan repeatedly took the floor to emphasize, on the basis of recent surveys and statistics, the existence of interfaith and inter-ethnic harmony in Kazakhstan, while several Kazakh NGOs noted continued discrimination and a lack of implementation of hate crime legislation.

The recommendations to the participating States in this field included the following:

- Support and increase funding of the work of the ODIHR and of the three Personal Representatives of the Chairperson-in-Office on tolerance and non-discrimination;
- Enhance hate crime legislation to bring it into line with international standards;
- Provide more professional training for law enforcement personnel, publish guidelines on how to deal effectively with hate crimes, and engage in capacity-building;
- Clearly define hate crimes and improve data collection, notably through co-operation with NGOs;
- Implement specific measures to reduce under-reporting;
- Seek public-private partnership in the collection of hate crime data;
- Institute stricter penalties for perpetrators of hate crimes;
- Provide better assistance and access to justice for victims of hate crimes;
- Provide the ODIHR with a mandate to adequately address the issue of escalating violence targeting the LGBT community;
- Include the LGBT community as a protected group in hate crime legislation and decriminalize homosexuality in all participating States;
- Ensure public condemnation of biased motives and encourage positive role models among public figures;

- Reaffirm the Astana Declaration;
- Formally institutionalize and fund a non-discrimination programme as an integral part of the OSCE, and address the issue at the Astana Summit;
- Increase the sensitivity of authorities to new and subtle forms of discrimination and intolerance;
- Develop education and monitoring to combat increasing xenophobia;
- Improve co-operation on responding to incitement to violence through hateful material on the Internet;
- Make use of the ODIHR's expertise, technical assistance programmes and tool kits.

Recommendations for the OSCE included the following:

- Continue to assist participating States in legislation and implementation of tolerance education programmes;
- Continue the translation of the ODIHR's Holocaust and tolerance teaching materials into various languages for wider use;
- Include a focus on racial discrimination and hold an event dedicated to combating racism in 2011.

Following the discussion, seven delegations used their right of reply. Most notably, Tajikistan said that their government was aware of widespread sexual harassment and domestic violence and was currently considering whether to ratify the Optional Protocol. The Russian Federation answered accusations of ethnic cleansing and eradication of Georgian cultural roots in occupied territories by maintaining that Abkhazia was an independent State. Belgium countered accusations of partisanship towards the majority religion combined with discrimination against clandestine religious communities by saying that in Belgium every individual had the right to profess a religion and enjoyed the same legal rights. The U.S. delegation responded to a statement by the Muslim Community on Human Rights in Central Asia by stating that the suggestion of any correlation between homosexuality on the one hand and paedophilia and necrophilia on the other was clearly irrational and offensive. Furthermore, unfounded and inflammatory allegations of that kind exemplified the kind of language that tended to promote hate crimes and certainly did nothing to promote understanding and co-operation. Finally, Ukraine responded to an NGO by saying that its national legislation stipulated that all citizens enjoyed equal rights, regardless of their race or national identity.



6th Day of the 2010 Review Conference
RC(10) Journal No. 1, Agenda item 7

STATEMENT BY THE DELEGATION OF KAZAKHSTAN

Ladies and gentlemen,
Distinguished participants of the Review Conference,

During the past few days several participating States have raised points of order on NGO access to the Review Conference, some doing so more than once, despite the exhaustive reply given by the Chairmanship in the morning of 5 October and distributed in writing as document RC.DEL/50/10. This is understandable, because it is an issue of great importance. The full participation of civil society at OSCE events is “a signature of this organization and at the very heart of its value added,” as the distinguished delegation of Canada eloquently put it. Kazakhstan could not agree more.

The latest statements by the distinguished delegations of the European Union and the United States of America suggest that there are still some open issues requiring further clarification, and I refer in particular to the US statements RC.DEL/54/10 and RC.DEL/105/10, as well as to the EU statements RC.DEL/53/10 and RC.DEL/63/10. Therefore, the Chairmanship considers it important not to leave these questions unanswered. Furthermore, the Chairmanship cannot leave unanswered the allegations about “inaccurate assertions” and the accusations about “drastic revision of agreed rules”, or the complete misinterpretation of unambiguous statements made by the Chairmanship. I will focus my intervention on two major groups of issues addressed by these delegations: interpretation of the rules and understanding of the role of the Chairmanship.

1. Firstly, what are the rules and procedures governing NGO access to OSCE meetings, in particular this Review Conference, and why do there seem to be different interpretations?

- (a) I am pleased to note that nobody contests the principle that there is only one rule or criterion for NGO participation in OSCE meetings, including both the Human Dimension Implementation Meeting (HDIM) and the Review Conference, namely, compliance with Chapter IV, paragraph (16) of the 1992 Helsinki Document. However, I regret to note that some delegations fail to recognize the difference between this single criterion and the procedure for ensuring compliance with that single criterion, in other words, the procedure for qualifying NGO representatives as “persons or organizations which resort to the use of violence or publicly condone terrorism or the use of violence.”

For the HDIMs, there is no formally agreed procedure for ensuring conformity with this Helsinki criterion. PC Decision No. 476 merely states, in Annex 3, paragraph 3, that “all non-governmental organizations having relevant experience in the field of the human dimension will be invited to participate, subject to the provisions contained in Chapter IV, paragraph (16) of the Helsinki Document 1992, following registration with the ODIHR.” Therefore, there is no formally established mechanism for HDIMs to determine whether an NGO passes the Helsinki criterion, except for registration with the ODIHR.

For the Review Conferences, including that of 1996 and 1999, the participating States established more elaborated procedures, as set out in the annex to PC Decision No. 952. The main element of the procedure, which significantly distinguishes it from the HDIM modalities, reads as follows: “Should questions arise concerning the application of Chapter IV, paragraph 16 of the Helsinki Document 1992, the Secretary General, assisted by the ODIHR, will undertake consultations to ensure that any decision on the matter is in conformity with the said provisions and is based on the views of the interested participating States.” This is the only provision existing in OSCE documents which provides a mechanism to ensure compliance with the Helsinki criterion. It is not ideal, but it is the only tool available in the OSCE, and it is applied only for the Review Conferences.

Therefore, the only rule, namely the Helsinki criterion, governing NGO participation in all OSCE meetings is enforced through different procedures at HDIMs and Review Conferences. For this reason, the Chairmanship does not accept any accusation that it has made inaccurate assertions or has implemented any drastic revision of agreed rules. We do not need to be reminded about our duty to properly implement OSCE decisions and rules.

- (b) There was also a question raised regarding interpretation of the annex to PC Decision No. 952. One delegation stated in document RC.DEL/105/10: “The Chairmanship’s statement this morning would suggest otherwise, i.e., that should any participating State object to an NGO for any reason whatsoever, the Chairmanship would not register that NGO.” The Chairmanship deeply regrets this attempt to distort its statements and ascribe to it a completely perverted interpretation. In no way did the Chairmanship suggest that there are other reasons for non-accession of NGOs than the one set out in the 1992 Helsinki Document and reiterated in PC Decision No. 952. Furthermore, the authors of this line fail to recognize that neither PC Decision No. 476 nor PC Decision No. 952 assign any role in the registration of NGOs to the Chairmanship.
- (c) There was also an assertion made by one delegation that PC Decision No. 952 “does not specifically vest the Secretary General with the authority – long held by the Chair-in-Office – to make this decision.” This assertion is questionable. While not explicitly stating who is the decision-maker, PC Decision No. 952 clearly vests the Secretary General with the authority to ensure that this decision meets certain requirements. Furthermore, the same authority was given to the Secretary General at the Review Conferences in 1996 and 1999.

2. Secondly, what should be the role of the Chairmanship in this matter? Should it act as an interested party and give strong recommendations to the Secretary General going against the views of at least one participating State?

The answer is “yes and no”. In our capacity as holders of the OSCE Chairmanship, we are deeply interested in everything going on in our Organization, and particularly in the success of this Review Conference. According to its mandate, any Chairmanship is responsible for co-ordination of and consultation on current OSCE business and for bridging gaps between different positions of participating States, and must ensure that the whole spectrum of opinions of participating States is taken into account in all the Chairmanship’s actions. Therefore, all issues related to the openness of OSCE meetings to civil society and NGOs are indeed of great interest to the Kazakh Chairmanship.

However, it cannot be expected that the Kazakh Chairmanship be an “interested participating State” in the context of the annex to PC Decision No. 952, and take sides in this specific dispute about access of certain NGOs. At the same time, the Kazakh Chairmanship is very much interested in resolving such matters in an impartial, transparent and open manner. Therefore, the Chairmanship will fully support any decision by the OSCE Secretary General on these matters, and has no doubt that it would be in full conformity with Chapter IV, paragraph (16) of the 1992 Helsinki Document and be based on the views of the interested participating States. We are very grateful to the Secretary General for undertaking transparent consultations with all interested participating States, and we do not see a need for sending strong recommendations to him.

In that regard, we regret that some delegations confuse the issue of the Chairmanship being an interested party in a particular dispute with the issue of being “an interested party in exercising the leadership ... in carrying out its duties of upholding previously agreed OSCE procedures.”

We categorically reject the assertion that the Chairmanship does not live up to its promise to stand for compliance with the fundamental principles of open NGO participation in OSCE events. The Kazakh Chairmanship has already demonstrated an exemplary approach towards civil society. Despite tremendous logistical and organizational difficulties caused by the preparation at very short notice of the Summit in Astana, we have demonstrated good will and supported the convening in Kazakhstan of the two additional events for NGOs before the end of this year – a regional seminar on co-operation between NGOs and governments, and the Civil Society Forum in Astana on 26 November 2010, right before the opening of the Astana part of this very Review Conference.

Last but not least, isn’t it sufficient evidence of the Kazakh Chairmanship’s openness to civil society that of the NGOs attending this Review Conference, the largest number come from Kazakhstan? All delegations have witnessed Kazakh NGOs being the most active participants of this forum, and the Government of Kazakhstan engaging with them in open and respectful dialogue. The statistics of the first four days of the Review Conference shows that the floor was given to 200 delegates, including 140 NGO representatives, of which 100 are representatives of Kazakh civil society.

It is really surprising that despite sincere and tireless efforts on the part of the Kazakh Chairmanship to ensure a successful year for the whole Organization in all areas of its work,

some delegations raise the issue of “leadership, responsibility and the effective stewardship of this body.” It is particularly regretful that for one reason or another some delegations unilaterally seek to cast a shadow on the Astana Summit. Let us not forget that the success or failure of the Summit will be equally shared by all 56 participating States of the Organization.

This statement will be attached to the journal of this meeting.