

Principles of a registry mechanism

1. Thank you co-facilitator. First, I'd like to thank others for the views they have expressed on the purpose and function of a registry. It is clear that there are many policy issues still to be resolved. There are many perspectives, many interpretations – I would like to outline our preliminary views. In the interests of time, I'll keep this short.
2. New Zealand sees the registry as a tool that developing country Parties and providers of support can **voluntarily** use, to record proposed mitigation actions and support available. Paragraph 53 of 1/CP16 states that the registry will 'facilitate matching'.

In our view the Registry would not have the power to determine, but rather to facilitate 'matching'. Like Brazil, we think the registry is where information comes together.

The registry does not have decision-making authority over the sources of support that will be listed in it. So it cannot allocate support to NAMAs, nor can it make 'matches' or guarantee funding for proposed actions listed in it.

3. New Zealand would also like to clarify that voluntary recording of actions in a registry is not a substitute for reporting through national communications, be they biennial update reports or full national communications. The registry is a voluntary mechanism, so it cannot serve as a comprehensive reporting vehicle.

As agreed in the Cancun outcome, national communications and biennial reports will be the primary tools for reporting Parties' mitigation actions.

4. New Zealand agrees that a registry can provide a channel for recording and recognising NAMAs. However, the voluntary 'recording' of actions in the registry should not replace the need for Parties to inscribe their mitigation actions - the appropriate place for such inscription of these actions is in a schedule or annex.

Thank you, co-facilitator.