



Statement by the Delegation of the Republic of Azerbaijan

1076th Meeting of the Permanent Council,

12 November 2015

in response to the Delegation of Armenia

Thank you Mr. Chairman,

I was tempted to respond to the previous statement made by the distinguished Ambassador of Armenia. But I did not and thought that it would not be correct or could be seen as non constructive, which we try to avoid in the PC. I did not want to expose the allegations of the Ambassador of Armenia to the criticism. I do not understand why in all his responses the Distinguished Ambassador of Armenia blamed Azerbaijan, while the United Nations Security Council on behalf of the entire international community defined the situation differently.

The distinguished Ambassador of Armenia tried to blame Azerbaijan for every act related to the conflict, but that is only the product of his imagination. Independence of Nagorno Karabakh does not exist. In fact even Armenia has not officially recognized it. In reality, the independence of Armenia is at stake due to this conflict. I encourage you to look at the issues more pragmatically.

The second point - the UN SC Resolutions that were adopted 20 years ago. No matter when they were adopted they still constitute the mandate of these three co-chairmen. They have to be guided by this mandate. If you wish them to work on the basis of something else, then we have to reconsider the whole peace process entirely. Azerbaijan is ready to consider and to discuss every element of the UNSC Resolutions, including lifting of restrictions on communications, humanitarian access and the rest. But we do not see the same extend of readiness and willingness on the Armenian side, perhaps due to the fact that you were not pressured to do so for the last 20 years. Our distinguished mediators did not push Armenia to consider those elements.

Last point – refugees and IDPs of Armenian origin. We regret that this happened. There were cases when the provocations were instigated by some outside forces, including events in Sumgayit and in some other cities of Azerbaijan. Therefore, we suggest you to look at those cases once again if you wish to do so. We would like to hold accountable those provocateurs, who instigated the acts against the citizens of Azerbaijan, which triggered the conflict. If your

government is willing to do that, please, join us in joint investigation of the incidents which took place back then. I think our Government will be ready to demonstrate such openness.

If I can have a floor just for few minutes more, I wanted to touch upon the comments in the previous statement of the Ambassador of Armenia, in particular on the issue of *use heavy weapons leading to the civilian casualties*. Civilian are mainly living on the territory of Azerbaijan along the line of contact. We do not know any civilians of Armenian origin who lived in the occupied territories of Azerbaijan before the conflict. If they appear there, then that is the violation of the Geneva Conventions of 1949. If Armenia keeps them as a shield this is a violation committed by Armenia.

Mechanism of investigation as CBM. We have repeatedly inferred to this CMB as a non effective initiative. Because this mechanism could function if there is a willingness to withdraw the Armenian troops. If Armenia does not want to withdraw those troops there are more than hundred violations on a daily basis happening along the line of contact. I wonder how the mechanism would function and try to identify where this violation are coming from.

Downgrading of the PR CiO Office. That is absolute false. The distinguished Ambassador Kasprzyk is here and his wording, by the way, for the program outline as a fund manager was accepted by Azerbaijan. It was the Delegation of Armenia that did not want to accept it.

Permanent presence. Ambassador Kasprzyk has no mandate for permanent presence. In fact if he wished to reflect that in draft budget proposal, which happened before, then he could face the problem that OSCE auditors questioned that mandate, because there was no relevant decision of the PC to establish a permanent presence of PR CiO. Therefore, PR CiO is present on the ground but not on a permanent basis.

Considerations by other international organizations of the issues related to the conflict. For your information, Azerbaijan and Armenia, as members of the Council of Europe, have a commitment, an obligation to resolve the conflict peacefully and there is a monitoring committee in the Council of Europe, which oversees the implementation of that commitment. How we could escape discussing that commitment and putting forward resolutions in that organization, if you want us not to do anything related to that. That is not reasonable at least.

Missing persons. We do not want to politicize it, in fact we want it to be resolved and we have already provided ICRC with every data held on our side. The mere fact that Ambassador of Armenia referred to the so-called “commission of de-facto authorities” is the indicator of politicization. The Presidents of Azerbaijan and Armenia joined President F. Hollande in France and adopted this commitment. Therefore, these two sides are responsible for the implementation of it. There was no reference to the so-called commission existing in the occupied territories of Azerbaijan. If you wish to create and to present it as an interested party, we have a similar community of expelled Azerbaijanis of the Nagorno Karabakh region who might be a corresponding partner for them.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.