

PC.DEL/1310/14  
7 November 2014

ENGLISH  
Original: RUSSIAN

Delegation of the Russian Federation

**STATEMENT BY MR. ANDREY KELIN,  
PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION,  
AT THE 1024th MEETING OF THE  
OSCE PERMANENT COUNCIL**

6 November 2014

**On the situation in Ukraine and non-implementation by the central  
authorities of the Minsk agreements**

Mr. Chairperson,

Full and careful implementation of the Minsk agreements by the parties to the conflict remains the key condition for a peaceful resolution of the crisis in Ukraine.

To date, we note that the implementation of the Minsk agreements of 5 and 19 September is proceeding in an unsatisfactory manner. The ceasefire is not being implemented in full. Today, Ukrainian National Guard tanks attacked Yasynuvata in the suburbs of Donetsk. A battle is raging there. Residential areas and industrial facilities in Donbas continue to be shelled, and civilians are being killed. Yesterday, 12 civilians were killed near Luhansk as a result of shelling by the Ukrainian security forces, and many were wounded. Yesterday, a mortar shell fired by the Ukrainian security forces near Donetsk airport hit a football pitch at a Donetsk sports school: two boys were killed and three injured. This tragedy needs to be investigated. The Investigative Committee would deal with this in our country.

The line of separation has still not been agreed upon. Agreements on the withdrawal of heavy armaments and equipment are not being implemented. The process of releasing all hostages and illegally detained persons is being dragged out.

We are not denying that both parties to the conflict are responsible for the existing situation. However, we should like to draw the attention of our colleagues who so harshly criticize the militias to the fact that quite a number of provisions of the Minsk Protocol are not being implemented by the leaders in Kyiv.

In particular, paragraph 6 of the Minsk Protocol provides for the adoption of a law on preventing the prosecution and punishment of persons in connection with the events that have taken place in the Donetsk and Luhansk regions. Not only has the amnesty law failed to enter into force, but, judging by the reports coming in, the Chairman of the Verkhovna Rada,

Oleksandr Turchynov, has registered a draft decree which proposes cancelling the law altogether.

Paragraph 8 proposes the adoption of measures to improve the humanitarian situation in Donbas. The central authorities are not taking any such measures in this regard. On the contrary, they have completely deprived the population of Donbas of their pensions, salaries and social security benefits. We have to help by sending humanitarian convoys.

The decision adopted by President Poroshenko repealing the law on special status actually undermines the Minsk agreements, especially as this is done under the highly dubious pretext of the alleged illegality of the elections held in Donbas.

On the contrary, the whole story with the elections has shown that the adoption of the version of the law on special status that was signed by the President (and entered into force) on 16 October did not fully meet the requirements of the Minsk agreements. The date of 7 December that appeared in the law was not discussed or agreed upon with the representatives of Donetsk and Luhansk.

If the information reported in the media is true, then perhaps, instead of the repealed law, a new draft law on the special status of Donbas will be considered, in which, as expected, the borders of the districts with special arrangements for local self-government will be set out and in all likelihood a new date for the holding of local elections set. It is crucial for the new version of this law to provide for real decentralization of power, as stipulated in paragraph 3 of the Minsk Protocol. It stands to reason that the text of this law, which concerns the inhabitants of large regions of Ukraine, should be discussed with their representatives. Then there will not be the variant readings that undermined confidence in the law of 16 October. And it is completely unacceptable to adopt a new law with what are known to be impossible conditions.

Unfortunately, instead of the Minsk agreements being implemented in good faith – not in words but in deeds – fears are once again being heightened and rumours spread about imaginary Russian military trucks in Ukraine and a regular army of Russian forces, of a “threatening concentration”, on the border.

As for the Geneva agreements, the implementation of which the Permanent Representative of the United States of America has mentioned here, I should like to recall that at the meeting in Geneva on 17 April 2014 the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Russia, the United States of America and Ukraine and the European Union High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy agreed on a joint statement in which initial concrete steps to de-escalate tensions and restore security for all citizens were set out. Among other things, it was underscored that in Ukraine “the announced constitutional process will be inclusive, transparent and accountable. It will include the immediate establishment of a broad national dialogue, with outreach to all of Ukraine’s regions and political constituencies, and allow for the consideration of public comments and proposed amendments”.

It is now clear that all these agreements have been blatantly flouted by the Ukrainian authorities. Instead of de-escalation, military activities involving the use of heavy equipment have been stepped up by Kyiv in south-eastern Ukraine, resulting in thousands of human casualties and large-scale destruction. Instead of real constitutional reform and the

establishment of dialogue with their own people, there have been some incomprehensible manoeuvres behind the scenes, which have so far resulted in nothing but empty promises.

Mr. Chairperson,

I should like to stress that Russia recognized the choice of those citizens of Ukraine who gave their vote on 26 October, and it expressed its willingness to co-operate with both the new Parliament and the new Government.

On 2 November the inhabitants of the Donetsk and Luhansk regions also expressed their will. We heard this and respect that it needs to be taken into account. In the same way, for example, we respect the democratic choice of the majority of Scots to remain part of the United Kingdom. The main thing is not what our colleagues call this expression of will and how many quotation marks they place around the word “elections”. The main thing is that the people had their say and did so democratically and without the aid of stones and Molotov cocktails.

Let me repeat: the voting on 2 November is not harmful to the peace process, as some claim, but, on the contrary, contributes to it. I draw our colleagues’ attention to the fact that representatives of the Donetsk People’s Republic and Luhansk People’s Republic have already said that they are ready to continue dialogue with Kyiv, restore full ties with the regions of Ukraine, conclude agreements with the Ukrainian Government, enterprises and organizations and engage in broad economic, commercial, financial and cultural co-operation. The elections will, we hope, lead to sound political solutions for removing the differences that have accumulated.

I remember earlier the representatives of the central authorities referred to the absence of an “opposing side” for mutually respectful and equal dialogue. This also explained the failure of the spring round tables. Public figures, political leaders and activists from Donbas were branded “terrorists” by the officials in Kyiv, with whom dialogue was impossible. Now there are partners for negotiations.

In summing up, I would urge our colleagues not to try to reduce the entire situation regarding the implementation of the Minsk agreements exclusively to the holding of elections in Donbas on Ukrainian legislation or Ukrainian border control.

Priority should be given to ensuring a sustainable ceasefire regime and preventing further casualties and destruction. Direct and mutually respectful dialogue between all of the parties involved in the conflict is required to this end. A refusal to engage in dialogue may lead to a continuation of the conflict.

Thank you for your attention.