

EIG Submission related to the 2024 work plan of the ad hoc work program on the new collective quantified goal (NCQG)

The Environmental Integrity Group (EIG) comprising Georgia, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Monaco, the Republic of Korea and Switzerland hereby would like to share its views in accordance with the decision mentioned in FCCC/PA/CMA/2023/L.10.

How should the technical expert dialogues and the meetings under the ad hoc work programme be organized to bring together the elements of the NCQG and the options identified under each element, taking into account the linkages across each element and progress made in the previous meetings?

Organization of the TEDs and meetings: We believe the TEDs / meetings should progress over time, leaving in the beginning more space for technical discussions and input. In our view the first TED of this year could focus in particular on the interlinkages and the clustering of issues, making interdependencies between the options on the table transparent.

In our view the first TED of this year could be longer than the back-to-back 1st meeting, but then the 2nd TED and the 3rd TED could become shorter and shorter leaving more time for the back-to-back 2nd and 3rd meetings to discuss and negotiate the input provided by the co-chairs e.g. in the form of discussion papers or options of decision text.

The 2nd meeting, which in our view will be held in parallel with the SBs, could be organized in various discussion / negotiation slots. These could be spread out e.g. over 2-3 non-consecutive days during the period of the SBs, allowing for an evolving discussion of a written input by the co-chairs to progress and move Parties closer together on various issues over the period of the 2nd meeting, ideally allowing for the issuance of a draft text with options by the end of the 2nd meeting by the co-chairs.

Co-Chair's input to TEDs/meetings: We believe it would be useful if the co-chairs would prepare a written input ahead of each TED/meeting allowing Parties to prepare for the discussions building on the work of the ad-hoc work programme and written submissions in accordance with the CMA5 decision. This input should at least be guiding questions for the first TED/meeting, but would ideally evolve over time from guiding questions to issue papers to a substantive framework for a draft negotiating text. In our view this framework should contain one text with options for the difficult issues.

Inclusiveness: It will be critical that a **broad representation of all interested Parties from all regions** is ensured in particular during the meetings to ensure that the discussions lead to an outcome with broad support moving us towards common ground. In accordance with last year's CMA decision, it is also really important for the EIG that the **TEDs remain inclusive for non-state actors** and allow for their equal participation and input in particular from private sector, civil society representatives, academia and indigenous peoples and local communities. Recalling the CMA5 decision that the meetings of the ad-hoc work program will be open to observers, we request that the co-chairs schedule sufficient time so observers will be able to speak during the meetings.

How should progress be captured between the technical expert dialogues and the meetings under the ad hoc work programme and from one meeting to the next with a view to developing the substantive framework for a draft negotiating text by CMA 6?

We would like to **leave as much freedom to the co-chairs as necessary in capturing the progress from one TED/meeting to the next**. We expect a report / written outcome after each TED/meeting capturing the progress, but we don't expect a report / written outcome after each TED as an input for the back-to-back following meeting. The report could after the first or second meeting be in the form of

potential issue papers or another narrative format. This report / issue papers could take the elements and options from last year's co-chair report, structure them further and identify potential resolutions of issues and / or bridging proposals to bring Parties closer together.

The report of one TED/meeting should always be basis of the input for the next TED/meeting and the content should in our view continuously progress, moving us stepwise from e.g. issue papers or another narrative format to options of decision text for the various issues to one substantive framework for a draft negotiating text by CMA6 to be captured / annexed to the annual report of the co-chairs. We would like to leave it up to the co-chairs to decide when to move from one step to the other and which format to chose to capture progress in the report after each TED/meeting.

How can the high-level ministerial dialogue be best used to facilitate reaching an agreement on the NCQG at CMA 6, when it should be convened and in what format?

The **high-level ministerial dialogue** should be conducted in an interactive manner, ideally with smaller break-out sessions allowing ministers to really engage with each other moving us forward on the most political issues such as the contributor base. We expect the dialogues and any ministerial engagement beyond the dialogue to be as inclusive as possible, allowing for a broad geographic participation of all interested Parties and ensuring a balanced representation of all negotiation groups. The standard format with a large square table and ministers reading out pre-drafted statements will not be conducive to finding a solution, therefore smaller break-out and discussion groups are in our view necessary allowing for a true engagement and solution orientation between political decision makers. The expected outcomes from the technical work and the ministerial level have to be well defined, to clarify the purpose, expectation and objective of each of the processes.

The dialogue should be organized back-to-back / during other important high-level events during the second half of the year, such as the UN GA High-Level Segment, the pre-COP or the World Bank Annual Meetings. It is important that the ministerial dialogue is as inclusive as possible to allow for a broad participation from ministers from all regions of the world.

We still believe it would be helpful to have a clearly defined **ministerial engagement throughout the year beyond the mandated high-level ministerial dialogue**, in particular in the form of bilateral outreach by the Presidency itself or two co-facilitators appointed by the Presidency focused on the most difficult political issues bringing Parties closer together. The discussion and resolution of highly political issues should not be kept to the last hours of the next CMA session.