

Pedro Luis Pedrosa

**LMDC Opening Statement  
ADP, 2 December 2014, Lima**

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

1. We fully associate with the statement made by Bolivia on behalf of the Group of 77 and China.
2. Co-Chairs, both the process in the ADP and the substance of what we produce at this session are going to be crucial in shaping what the final outcome will be in Paris.
3. We are deeply concerned about the process within the ADP. Direct negotiations among the Parties did not take place at the October session, and your scenario note indicates that that will also not be the case at this session. We are highly concerned that this process will not move us forward in a Party-driven, transparent and inclusive manner.
4. We expect the mode of work to change from the very first day. We expect to see the Contact Group start direct and interactive 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 through focused negotiating groups around specific points under the six core elements in order to narrow differences, find convergence, and achieve consensus. Various views from Parties should be reflected in a balanced, objective, neutral and comprehensive manner. Any streamlining of the options should be based on the collectively constructed consensus among Parties rather than reflecting Parties' views in a selective manner
5. We do not want to lose more time. We expect, at the close of this session, to see the elements for a draft negotiating text to have been elaborated by the ADP. This is our mandate and must be fulfilled.
6. We want to see a solid and robust international outcome implementing the UNFCCC's provisions, principles, and structure. This will enable all countries to solve the climate crisis together in an equitable manner. This international cooperation should see developed countries doing substantially more than what they are doing or planning to do in cutting their emissions. We should also see developed countries fulfill their commitments under the UNFCCC and cooperate more with developing countries, through providing more financial resources, improving access to climate knowledge and technology, helping build skills and capacity, and addressing the adverse social and economics consequences of their response measures, so that developing countries would be able to do more in terms of adaptation, mitigation, and sustainable development as their respective contributions to addressing climate change in a manner that benefits all countries and peoples equitably.
7. The ADP decision in Lima should address balance in the core elements mandated by Durban and focus on the three agreed tasks from Warsaw, i.e., elaboration of the elements, identification of the information and acceleration of the pre-2020 implementation.
8. We emphasize our grave concern over those developed country Parties that are not Parties to the Kyoto Protocol, withdrew from the Kyoto Protocol, or do not participate in the 2<sup>nd</sup> commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol. We believe that any attempts by developed country Parties to

casually set aside their existing legal commitments while calling for increasing pre-2020 ambition or a new legal agreement seriously questions their sincerity in combating climate change.

8. Unfortunately, your draft ADP decision text falls far short in terms of being balanced and comprehensive. The bottom-up approach based on self-differentiation for all Parties, as proposed by the developed country Parties will not reflect the principle of CBDR, would fail to achieve ambitious and urgent commitments, and represents a clear backsliding on their existing commitments under the Convention. It prioritizes mitigation over all the other elements such as adaptation, finance, technology transfer, and capacity-building. It paves the way to an outcome that will in essence rewrite and reinterpret the Convention, particularly the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and will eliminate the differentiation between developed and developing country Parties. It downplays the high importance that developing countries attach to seeing adaptation, finance, technology transfer, and capacity building be on an equal footing as mitigation and as the basis for their enhanced actions in the 2015 outcome. The same approach can be seen in your non-paper on the elements.
9. This approach will lead to an outcome marked by low ambition and low levels of action. It will be inequitable, unbalanced, and will not bring us closer to solving the climate crisis in a fair manner.
10. For your papers to be considered as among the bases for our negotiations, balance must be first brought into them. This would include, among other things: 1. treating all elements in a balanced manner and with the equal footing, rather than prioritizing mitigation over the others; 2. ensuring that the principle of CBDR as seen in the Convention is fully reflected rather than reinterpreted or rewritten through using the terms 'evolving'; 3. the bottom-up approach can not be the new approach for undertaking commitments by developed country Parties but should be so for the enhanced actions to be undertaken by developing countries; 4. developed countries must substantially ramp up their emission reductions ambition; and 5. the linkage between the provision by developed countries of the finance, technology and capacity building support to developing countries and what developing countries can do in terms of enhanced actions must be made clear.
11. We want to reach an outcome here in Lima and then in Paris that will be equitable and allows us all to work together to solve the climate crisis. We can only do that if the process is open and transparent, inclusive, Party-driven and built on consensus if the substantive content is balanced. As representatives of 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 3.5 billion peoples.

Thank you.