**December 5 2011**

**AWG LCA Open plenary discussion**

2nd issue of amalgamation will be issued on Wed.

**Argentina (G77):** G77 asked that discussions on informal consultations are reflected there. CRP text is not considered as basis for negotiation. It is a useful input, but needs to be amended to include all parties’ views. What would be the text handed to Ministers?

**Japan**: There are shortcomings in the text. For moving forward, text need to become more compact and readable/shorter to be considered the basis of decision. Need to take decisions this year.

**Switzerland:** Useful document, progress has taken place. Some areas are a draft decisions, but others need lots of work on the conceptual basis. Ready to take it as a basis for this week’s work. There are areas where we should be able to reach agreement. There are certainly issues that need to be agreed here, like peaking, and others that can be postponed.

**China:** About the process, don’t want an ‘acclamation document’. CRP does not reflect discussions. Are we going back to informals to discuss the substantive issues? Will negotiate on the big issues on the informal informals? Need to continue the substantive discussions on the informal informals**.**

**Ecuador:** REDD+ tiene que ser parte del paquete de deciones con el mecanismo financiero definido. Los recursos financieros se requieren ahora.

**EU:** Some sections are not ambitious enough. Clear options are needed for ministers. Text too long. More progress: Ambition gap (developed countries and collective global gap), common accounting rules, clarifying pledges, transparency. Section on market mechanism remains too long. 2nd KP period requires a new market mechanism. Need more progress.

**Colombia:** Options were deleted and altered. In some critical issues like REDD+, the text does not reflect views from a large number of parties resulting in a very mediocre outcome: a technical paper and yet another workshop.

**India:** Cannot discuss the how without properly identifying the what. On the legal form, discussion need to focus on the mandate. Balance between two tracks is important. On GCF, not inf favor to reopen the text, need to established the GCF here in Durban. IAG and IAR, need to be brief and concise, elaboration and further guidance can be done as part of further work.

**CO-Chair:** GCF is not taken by this body, but by the COP Presidency,

**Russian Federation:** Problem areas in several parts of the text, but need to understand that text is the result of the work of the delegations. Need to focus on the core of the issues, prepared to work with Chair to reach agreement.

**Pakistan:** Undue focus on mitigation. Issues essential for developing countries, poorly reflected like long term finance with only partial solutions. Like to see completion of the BAP in Durban in all aspects.

**Bolivia:** Have analyzed the doc in detail. Doc does not reflect and responds to the issues at sake in Durban, like commitment from A1 parties that will not ratify KP’s 2nd commitment period. A rigorous system for compliance for these parties need to be part of this, there is no system of control, accounting, compliance, comparability. Developed countries in this agreement need to effectively reduce their emissions are provided with a lot of flexibility. Principle of common but differentiated responsibility not reflected. New alternative mechanism for forests proposed by Bolivia is not included in the document and there is not will among parties to discuss this mechanism.

**Co-Chair:** Would like to clarify, that Bolivia’s proposed alternative joint-mitigation and adaptation mechanism is included on Page 31, paragraph 2 of the amalgamation text.

**New Zealand:** Much work needs to be done on core mitigation issues. Work on clarifying mitigation actions and targets needs to be finalized in Durban to show that parties are committed to achieve mitigation goals. Need a positive outcome on market approaches.

**Nigeria:** Imperative that draft decision is party-driven. Too much emphasis on markets for climate change financing. Public funds should be the core of financing.

**Gambia:** Mandate for the legal form needed.

**US:** Text is useful. Have mentioned the concerns before. On the process: Some sections need to be streamlined, progress is possible and needs to be made in all areas of the process.

**Argentina:** In relation Ch2 response measures, deep concern that there is only a title on the issue.

**Grenada.** Need a new protocol. Legal form is key, the 4 options reflect the discussions, option 1 has had active engagement by all parties regarding timeline, content and forum for adopting a new protocol. Mitigation ambition remains very low, need more ambition, and this needs to be done in Durban.

**Fiji:** Importance of 2 specific issues: scope of the review (it cannot be redefined), the body needs to be appropriate to the task. Committed to see a positive outcome from this session.

**Iraq:** Food securtity.

**Trinidad and Tobago:** Support to the process by the Chair of legal option. Recognizes the usefulness of the text.

**Nauru:** Scope of the review clearly expressed in 1 CP-16. View of extending it to 1.5 degrees.

**Co-Chair:** We are in Durban not in Dublin, we are working on an amalgamation text not an acclamation text. Text came from parties, parties need to negotiate on the real issues before us. It is intended to issue a 2nd amalgamation text reflecting the discussions on the informal. Continuing discussions on the legal group: 4 options, 1st. We can finalize most of the work. On issues that cannot be concluded need to result on clear political options that can be negotiating. Presidency has urged to finalize most issues as possible. COP will hold an informal plenary where the Chair needs to report. Hopes to inform that most issues have been resolved.