

SUBMISSION ON THE AD-HOC WORKING GROUP ON THE DURBAN PLATFORM

Please below the text of the statement delivered by Argentina on behalf of Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ghana, India, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mali, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Venezuela, Yemen, delivered during the opening plenary of the Ad-Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform on 17 May 2012, in Bonn, Germany.

The Delegation of Argentina hereby submits the statement as an official submission on behalf of the above countries in relation to the mandate and work of the Ad-Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform.

JOINT STATEMENT

Madame President:

I have the honour to speak on behalf of Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ghana, India, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mali, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Venezuela, Yemen.

The decision establishing the Durban Platform was part of a delicate overall package in Durban that includes a meaningful second commitment period of Kyoto Protocol, and the understanding that developed countries will undertake commitments for deep emission reductions taking into account the comparability of efforts, including up to 2020. Therefore the negotiations and progress on the Durban Platform are intrinsically connected to the developments and conclusion of the KP and the LCA tracks.

Madame President,

We are concerned that this decade could become a lost decade, a decade where the prevailing philosophy would seem to be “do what you want, when you want and how you want”, a decade of “voluntary” irresponsibility”, a decade of lost trust.

We left Durban with the firm commitment that developed country Parties would ratify their emission reduction commitments but we continue to wait. We now have motives to be concerned.

In this sense, we are convinced that the outcome of the Durban Platform can be an effective instrument in the struggle to overcome climate change, through the strengthening of the multilateral regime under the Convention. In this sense, we must not forget that the democratic nature of multilateralism is due to the fact that all States have equal rights. There must be mutual trust, that can only grow strong roots when no one takes advantage of the others and when commitments are fulfilled and everyone respects the established principles and rights.

It is our firm belief that the term “under the Convention” means that the outcome, whatever the form it takes, must be in accordance with and consistent with the Convention. The nature of the outcome of the AWGDP process cannot therefore be a replacement of or a reinterpretation of the Convention, which remains the overarching framework for the climate change regime. We are of the firm view that this outcome must be in accordance with the principles and provisions of the Convention, including the principles of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities, and must recognize the historical responsibilities of developed countries in their contribution to climate change. Therefore, we must ensure that any outcome ensures the enhancement of the full, effective and sustained implementation of the Convention.

We also believe that the term “applicable to all Parties” refers to the fact that the outcome of the Durban Platform process will apply to all Parties, similar to how the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol is applicable to all Parties which enter into these treaties. This term does not mean that the outcome must be such that all Parties undertake uniform or similar types and levels of obligations.

Universality of application, Madam President, is not uniformity of application.

As mentioned clearly in paragraph 5 of the decision on AWG-DP, the scope of work, and the outcome, under the Durban Platform and the AWG-DP will include all relevant and interlinked issues, notably the building blocks of mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology and capacity building. There is no legal doubt in the Convention that the mitigation efforts of developing countries are linked to receiving support in terms of finance, technology and capacity building, in accordance with Article 4.7 of the Convention. We shall together ensure a proper balance among these issues, in particular as to mitigation; adaptation; and means of implementation, that is, finance and technology for enabling and supporting the voluntary mitigation and adaptation nationally appropriate actions of developing countries.

Madame President,

We would like to clearly underline that the design of the work-plan on enhancing mitigation ambition shall recognise the differentiation of the nature and level of obligations of developed and developing countries, and of Annex I and non-Annex I countries, in accordance with the principles of equity and CBDR and with relevant provisions of the Convention. Allow me to reiterate once again that the voluntary mitigation efforts by developing countries are related to the extent of obtaining of finance, technology transfer and capacity building, what has been long recognised in the history of the Convention and remains valid and relevant.

In this sense, we welcome the celebration of the workshop on equitable access to sustainable

development in this session in Bonn. The deliberations in this AWG should be informed of the inputs of that workshop, being that equity must be the centerpiece and underpin any possible outcome of the DP. We must reaffirm the developing countries' right to development in the framework of harmony and balance with nature, which effectively permits ecosystems to adapt naturally to climate change building on a society with more justice, equity and solidarity.

Regarding the legal form of the outcome, the choice of the legal form should not be decided on up-front, nor should discussions on this be an immediate priority, but such discussion should be phased in at an appropriate time, when the negotiations on substantive issues evolve and mature.

Regarding the plan of work of the AWG-DP, it is our firm view that the scoping of our work including an agreement on the guiding principles of the AWG should precede more substantive discussions on the outcomes.

Thank you, Madame President.