

**LMDC Statement on ADP Process**  
**ADP 2.6 Plenary**  
25 October 2014, Bonn

Ecuador is delivering this statement on behalf of the Like-Minded Developing Countries.

Co-Chairs, we are strongly dissatisfied about the process of this Contact Group so far. Instead of undertaking direct negotiations among the Parties on drafting text, we have lost valuable negotiating time this week with more open-ended discussions. This leaves us very concerned about how you plan to organize our work in Lima.

We must be clear. At Lima, we expect the process to change from the very first day. We expect to see the Contact Group start direct negotiations among the Parties. We want to see draft texts from Parties on screen, on paper, being directly negotiated by the Parties with each other, in order to narrow differences, find convergence, and achieve consensus.

We support what the BASIC countries and the African Group have called for, that the Contact Group set up focused open-ended groups of Parties to work on drafting and concluding texts. These focused groups must have clear mandates, co-facilitated in a balanced way by developed and developing country colleagues selected by the Parties themselves, and focused on addressing issues identified and raised by Parties and which need to be settled among themselves. Draft texts can come only from Parties and have legal standing as a negotiating basis when they are submitted as CRPs. The COP's rules of procedure as applied to the ADP do not allow the co-Chairs to exercise the rights of Parties and table texts, as you are both well aware.

We know that you will adhere to the Party-driven process. We want to help you with that. This is why we expect a shift in the mode of our work in the Contact Group to a formal and direct negotiating mode among the Parties through elements-focused drafting groups from Day 1 in Lima. We do not want to lose more time.

We said before that convergence and consensus cannot simply be declared into being, these have to be negotiated. As a Party-driven process, it is up to Parties to discover and decide through direct negotiations where areas of convergence exist and consensus can be achieved. As Co-Chairs, we look to you to facilitate the negotiations by accurately reflecting all Parties' views rather than exercising your own judgment on where convergence and consensus may lie.

Co-Chairs, we can live with something that we have collectively worked on and negotiated together with other Parties, but not with something that has simply been handed down to us without the benefit of actual intergovernmental negotiations. Such negotiations must take place, to ensure that Lima and Paris will achieve balanced, comprehensive and consensus-based outcomes. Under the Convention, Parties have to actively make a decision by consensus, rather than assume that a decision is adopted unless Parties have a consensus to reject it.

The urgency of climate change and the long-term impacts of the decisions that we are to take in this process on our economies and societies demand that we negotiate in good faith, with full knowledge, transparency, and inclusiveness.

We represent sovereign States. We wish to negotiate with our partners with dignity and respect in order to achieve consensus. We will not accept being made, due to a mismanaged process, to press around each other in an undemocratic, non-inclusive, and non-transparent "huddle" at the last hours and minutes of the COP just to finalize a decision. We will not accept a situation in which we are forced to consider on a take it or leave it basis an outcome text that we have not negotiated upon, whether in Lima or Paris. This is our responsibility as the representatives of our peoples.

Our CRPs are on the table. We are ready to negotiate.

Thank you, Co-Chairs.