



## **United States Mission to the OSCE**

# **Statement on the Interim Report on the Corfu Process**

As delivered by Ambassador Ian Kelly  
to the joint FSC/Permanent Council, Vienna  
July 5, 2010

We welcome the final publication of this interim report on the Corfu Process and we appreciate the chance to comment upon it ahead of the OSCE Informal Ministerial in Almaty in just over ten days.

We are grateful to the Chairmanship for its perseverance and flexibility in guiding the report to this stage. Mr. Chairman, you asked us in the interim report to use this joint FSC/PC as an opportunity to address four critical questions about how to proceed. These strike us as the right questions, ones that will help us focus both on our vision as well as on specifics of what we need to consider as next steps.

While we all continue to agree on the basis for our work here, which is the indivisible and comprehensive concept of security in the OSCE region as reflected in our body of commitments, our Corfu discussions have revealed some significant differences in how those terms are defined and what their implications are. So part of the substantive way forward here must involve a recommitment to the fundamental principles that form the basis of the OSCE.

In our view, strengthening our toolbox on conflict prevention and resolution is a first-order priority. We have had some difficult but useful discussions on the topic during our Corfu deliberations, yet as the report makes clear we are still some distance apart on an agreed way forward. We have also noted time and again the essential role of the human dimension as an integral element of comprehensive security – and we have seen a particular lack of fulfillment of commitments in this dimension. Without a firm sense of the outstanding problems our region still faces on human rights and fundamental freedoms – and the determination to solve them – we will never be able to realize our vision of a more secure and confident Europe and Eurasia.

The report also highlights some serious divergences over what would constitute a more effective OSCE. Many of the specific ideas expressed are really, unfortunately, just tinkering around the margins, but the fundamentally different views are a cause for greater concern. Effectiveness is not just about greater efficiency or streamlining, it is also about having the right tools to make an impact where it is needed most, and the will to use them to ensure implementation of OSCE commitments.

This report has been a useful framing exercise, setting out in full view the nature of the problems we face and some ideas for solutions. A natural and logical result would be a stronger and more effective OSCE – with better implementation of our common commitments – that would enable us to address outstanding questions and confront threats and challenges. Proceeding on that basis, therefore, means that we as participating States must be willing to take on the difficult issues, discussed over the past year, that undermine our shared sense of security. What is needed now is sufficient political will to overcome our differences and agree on a way forward.

That view goes to the heart of the remaining three questions the chairmanship has posed:

- on methodology, I think most of us have agreed to a hybrid approach embodied by the Action Plan put forth by our colleague, the Ambassador from France, and seconded by the Kazakh Deputy Foreign Minister Zhigalov.
- on calendar and wider context, I think we need to convey to our Ministers that we have assembled some of the ingredients for our progress but we have not yet settled on a recipe. We agree with our EU colleagues that we need an outline of an integrated Action Plan at Almaty to provide us all with a vision of what is politically possible.

Again, we want to thank the Chairmanship for the many hours of hard work that have gone into making this report. We have a lot to do in front of us!

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.