

JOINT OPENING STATEMENT ON THE OPENING PLENARY OF THE AWG-KP  
Delivered by the Philippines, Bangkok, 30 August 2012

Madame Chair,

I have the honour to deliver this statement on behalf of Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, India, Iran, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mali, Nicaragua, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, and Venezuela.

The above Parties fully associate themselves with the statement made by Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77 and China.

Madame Chair,

The Kyoto Protocol is the only legally binding, rules-based instrument with quantitative emissions reduction targets for Annex I Parties. It must be preserved.

As you know, obtaining a substantial and effective second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol is a key element in the global community's efforts to address climate change and its adverse effects under the Convention. Without the Kyoto Protocol's second commitment period that reflects sufficient mitigation ambition on the part of the Parties to it, global climate change mitigation efforts will be severely hampered with resultant increased adverse impacts on developing countries.

A meaningful second commitment period is the centerpiece and should be the focus of our work towards Doha. Doha is the last opportunity before the end of the first commitment period on December 31, 2012 to adopt the amendments to Annex B of the KP. Therefore, we stress that KP should be the central deliverable at Doha and we are of the firm view that Doha should be the KP2 COP. A meaningful second commitment period and the preservation of KP is the key element of the Durban balanced package. A satisfactory resolution and completion of work of the AWGKP at COP 18/CMP8 without any further conditions is necessary. Failure to do so would gravely affect the full scope of negotiations and implementation under the climate regime.

We note that the Heads of State of all member States of the United Nations in the outcome document of the Rio+20 conference urged "parties to the Kyoto Protocol to fully implement their commitments, as well as decisions adopted under those agreements." As such, Parties to the Kyoto Protocol are committed to an approach that results in a science-based aggregate commitment for Annex I Parties that ensures an equitable and adequate contribution by Annex I Parties to the objective of the Convention in accordance with Article 4.2 of the Convention.

Madame Chair,

It seems that some Parties intend to depart from the decisions made under the Kyoto Protocol that Parties should determine an aggregate amount of emission reductions under the Kyoto Protocol, and based on this, the individual contributions to this aggregate. Instead of this they are

pursuing a pledge-based approach, in which weak individual pledges are aggregated "bottom up" into an aggregate target.

However, mitigation commitments of Annex I Parties must be established as QELROs through a multilaterally agreed methodology to ensure common accounting and comparability of efforts within the Kyoto Protocol and to ensure all Annex I Parties offer an equitable and adequate contribution. An ad-hoc approach to defining QELROs in which each Annex I country defines and communicates their own QELRO cannot assure the delivery of real and ambitious emission reductions. QELROs should not be treated as merely a political arrangement, or an "empty shell". Endless discussion regarding assumptions and conditions of numbers need to come to an end. An ambitious aggregate emission reduction targets for Annex I collectively in accordance with their historical responsibilities must be achieved together with high quality QELROs by Annex I Parties.

All loopholes must be closed including, but not limited to, those relating to surplus allowances, to ensure the integrity of Annex I emission reductions. It is of concern that the low pledges of Annex I Parties may be further undermined by loopholes, potentially resulting in Annex I Parties making no net contribution to the global mitigation effort.

The issue of the provisional application of the second commitment period before the entry into force of the amendment to Annex B of the Kyoto Protocol remains unresolved. In order to ensure that there is no gap between the first and second periods, such provisional application is necessary, and there are numerous precedents that can be cited to show that such can in fact be legally done by Annex I Parties.

Madame Chair,

We regret and are gravely concerned that one Annex I Party withdrew from the Kyoto Protocol and that some other Annex I Parties continue to insist on their refusal to join the second commitment period of Kyoto Protocol. This together with the lack of certainty, clarity and consistency behind the "numbers" presented under the AWG-LCA process by Annex I Parties "alongside" the KP second commitment period, constitute betrayal of the Durban package.

These issues relating to the current state of the Kyoto Protocol negotiations, particularly the prospect that there might not be a second commitment period under the Protocol or, at best, a second commitment period with weak targets from Annex I Parties, create the potential for unraveling the Durban package, and could therefore endanger any progress that we might make on other parts of such package, such as with respect to the work under the Durban Platform.

Madame Chair,

Departing from one's commitments under the Kyoto Protocol must have consequences because it shows a clear lack of commitment to helping solve the global climate change problem. In this regard, Annex I Parties who are not Parties to the Kyoto Protocol or are not going to commit to a second commitment period thereunder should not be allowed to use the Kyoto Protocol's flexibility mechanisms. Neither should any new market mechanisms be further developed or

concluded under the AWG-LCA for the use of Annex I Parties. Solid KP commitments from Annex I Parties provide not only political assurance on the use of the flexible mechanisms but are also indispensable preconditions for their continued availability and use.

We have all agreed in Durban that the second commitment period shall commence on 1 January 2013. At the same time, we believe there is important work to continue in the AWG-KP including negotiations on raising the ambition of Annex I Parties contributions to levels consistent with science and equity.

Considering that there are so many issues that still need to be resolved with respect to the AWG-KP, we therefore face the prospect that we might need to extend the life of the AWG-KP in order for us to have a second commitment period that is commensurate to the challenge that faces us and which reflects the strong and firm commitment of Annex I Parties to the Kyoto Protocol take the lead in undertaking mitigation targets that reflect their historical responsibility for cumulative global GHG emissions.

Madame Chair,

In Durban, we strongly proclaimed that Africa will not be the graveyard of KP. In Doha, neither will we allow KP to be buried in the sands of Asia.

Thank you, Madame Chair.