

YOUNGO's Submission for the 8th Technical Expert Dialogue under the Ad hoc Work Programme on the New Collective Quantified Goal on Climate Finance

We want to express our strong disappointment concerning the [GCF Replenishments](#) and the results of the [Adaptation Gap report](#). Recalling the decision [4/CP.26 paragraph 9](#), we urge parties to provide balanced Adaptation finance and contribute meaningfully to the Green Climate Fund.

These and further issues are the reason for the lack of trust in NCQG technical expert dialogues. To start we want to highlight our **4 main concerns** around the ongoing Technical Expert Dialogues on the NCQG:

- 1. A last-minute political decision - No progress by building up on certainties to address the intersectionality of the negotiation topics**
→ The topics of previous TEDs are highly interconnected. It is difficult for instance to agree on a quantum without setting the cornerstones for quality. Some groundbreaking decisions need to be made at COP28 to guide TED9-12 further. For example, parties should agree on having a public, grants-equivalent sub-goal and subgoals on Adaptation, Loss and Damage, and Mitigation. Building on a consensus on topics that are less controversial would simplify the task of TED9-12 to produce clear text options.
- 2. No addressing of the political dimension of the NCQG**
→ The NCQG is a highly political topic. In order to adopt a needs-based approach, for example, the scientific basis is decisively shaped by political parameters. It's unclear if the format of Technical Expert Dialogues can do credit to this political dimension and find solutions for major issues.
- 3. No will for real improvement - Repetition of the mistakes of the 100 billion**
→ YOUNGO is strongly concerned that countries do not have enough will not to repeat the mistakes of the 100 billion. It is unacceptable to once again have such large deficits in terms of quantity, quality, accountability, additionality, and transparency of climate finance.
- 4. Potential dilution of CBDR-RC and a lack of a common understanding of Art. 2.1c**
→ We are deeply concerned about the misuse of Art. 2.1c. and a dilution of CBDR-RC. Assuming that there will be no consensus on the scope of Art.2.1c in 2024, the risk is even higher that developed countries could use the Article to dilute their responsibilities under Art.9 of the Paris Agreement.

In addition to the importance of developing decision text options, we see a need for **further discussion on the following topics** which should be addressed in the TEDs 2024:

- 1. Transparency, Accountability, and Compliance**
→ We need to talk about how to ensure accountability and the continuous track of progress of the provision of support from developed countries; Integrating lessons learned from the past goal, assuring that compliance arrangements are put in place with the sources of finance, thus preventing the blame game for the NCQG. One option would be to define national climate financing goals, where each country gets assigned a share to contribute towards the overall goal
- 2. Quality**

→ The upcoming TEDs should develop indicators to monitor qualitative aspects, and should effectively address the following Guiding Questions:

- How to ensure that Climate Finance under the NCQG is new and additional?
- How to significantly increase grants-equivalent finance?
- How to immensely improve issues of accessibility in the context of insufficient community access?
- How could the commonalities in a climate finance definition build a crucial solid fundament of the climate finance objective? This definition must imperatively support the overall goal of the Paris Agreement and need to prevent double counting.
- How to improve the inclusion of children and youth - responsiveness and intergenerational equity, gender-responsiveness, human rights, and indigenous rights. Noting that Currently only [2.4 % of climate finance from 4 key funds supported projects considering child responsive interventions?](#)
- How to address the necessary inclusion of Loss and Damage Finance under the NCQG?

TED should intensify the discussion on these qualitative elements of the goal to develop principles backed up by indicators to monitor the quality.

3. Quantity

→ We highlight that there is a need to discuss the quanta of the goal further. Parties must negotiate about methodologies to assess a needs-based quantum/quanta. The quantum should not be a last-minute political decision.

4. Goal Structure

→ Parties need to discuss the structure of the goal further to provide clear decision text options. There is a need to clearly discuss sub-goals, principles, and indicators of the goal. Especially if the negotiations around the Loss and Damage Fund do not come to an agreement open questions should be included in the sub-goal around Loss and Damage as part of the NCQG.

Regarding the Format of the TEDs, we recommend taking the following considerations into account:

1. Need for real inclusion of observers

→ As the COP29 approaches, TEDs are going to become increasingly tense. This must not be synonymous with the exclusion of non-party stakeholders. On the contrary, civil society must be seen as an essential element of TEDs. Active observers must have access to funding (at least the travel, accommodation, and expense allowance costs) to ensure the presence of the civil society constituencies. We suggest that the submission report notes that civil society requests parties to require an extra-budgetary request to the Executive Secretariat of the UNFCCC to ensure civil society participation in this crucial negotiation workflow.

2. Structure of the TED - Innovative “Out of the box” methodologies

→ To promote an “out of the box” thinking approach we suggest that at TEDs we can have a change of roles methodology, similar to a debate exercise, where party and non-party stakeholders take a random position out of a box and have to defend it. We could make more use of moderation cards to ensure that not single countries dominate the discussions.

At the end of this submission, we want to address open questions. We wonder how the NCQG process will interrelate with other negotiation items. Some of these issues are highly relevant for COP28. We see interlinkages to the GGA negotiations, the GST, the L&D Fund, Just Transition Finance, and linkages with Biodiversity Finance.