

PC.DEL/1459/15
30 October 2015

ENGLISH
Original: RUSSIAN

Delegation of the Russian Federation

**STATEMENT BY
MR. ALEXANDER LUKASHEVICH, PERMANENT
REPRESENTATIVE OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, AT THE
1073rd MEETING OF THE OSCE PERMANENT COUNCIL**

29 October 2015

**On the report by the Director of the Office for Democratic Institutions and
Human Rights on the Human Dimension Implementation Meeting**

Mr. Chairperson,

We take note of the report on the outcome of the 19th Warsaw Human Dimension Implementation Meeting presented by Mr. Michael Link.

We are forced to note with regret that this event has ceased to serve as a forum for constructive dialogue and has turned into a platform for settling political accounts.

The radicalized position of a number of States, particularly with respect to Russia, has led to inappropriate confrontation and calls into question the expediency of continuing discussions in this tone and format. One clear example of this is the undignified behaviour of a number of government delegations, who attempted to disrupt the statement by the representative of the Russian Community in Crimea, Mr. Dimitry Polonskiy. The attitude of saying “no” without even hearing what an opponent has to say bears little resemblance to the principles proclaimed in the OSCE, in particular freedom of speech and pluralism of opinions, not to mention the various unseemly acts of provocation.

Russia has consistently opposed the artificial politicization of the topics discussed in the OSCE. As the recent meeting has shown, however, some of our colleagues are more interested in political shows than in real dialogue.

Unfortunately, the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), which is called upon according to its mandate to foster constructive discussions, actively plays along, on the contrary, with these destructive tendencies.

The ODIHR is continuing its practice of filling the annotated agenda of the Warsaw review conference with items that do not by any means enjoy consensus. At the same time, a number of important issues, such as economic, social and cultural rights, are still left out in the cold.

The presentation together with the High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM) of its one-sided and biased report on Crimea was the latest confirmation of the ODIHR's politically motivated position. Its elaboration without the corresponding instruction to do so by the OSCE participating States was a direct violation by these executive structures of their mandates and also of the Organization's norms and working principles. The fact that it was financed from extrabudgetary resources does not give the ODIHR or the HCNM the right to act on their own accord or on the direct instructions of sponsors. All this looks more like a paid commission than so-called independent investigation, not to mention the fact that the use in the report of the non-consensus terms "occupation" and "annexation" with reference to Crimea is completely unacceptable.

It can only be concluded from all this that the ODIHR and the HCNM, contrary to their declared neutrality and impartiality, are wholeheartedly on the side of the well-known anti-Russian group of countries.

As for the organization of the Warsaw meeting, the ODIHR is partly to blame for the fact that not all participants were able to attend the event or were considerably delayed in doing so. Reference is made here in particular to members of the Russian government delegation and also representatives of Russian media and society, including the Crimean Tatar people. We understand that the Polish authorities provided considerable assistance in screening "undesirable" participants by refusing without reason to issue visas or dragging out the formalities involved. We consider this a gross violation of Poland's obligations to ensure that international organizations can operate on its territory, which casts doubt on the expediency of having the ODIHR and the review meeting in Warsaw.

There are many other gripes about the ODIHR's activities at the meeting. In the first place, there is the question of the ODIHR's attempt to introduce its own form of censorship both in the registration of speakers from civil society and during their statements.

This confrontational approach is detrimental to the authority of the ODIHR and other OSCE executive structures and undermines confidence in them. It is clear that the practice and method of working of these institutions that have become established clearly call for a serious reconsideration of their mandates.

We cannot ignore the above-mentioned factors in the discussion that has begun on the budget for the OSCE executive structures for 2016. We consider that a reduction in the length of the review meeting to one week would be one way of making substantial savings for the Organization.

Thank you for your attention.