

Government of Japan

Submission on the 2024 Work Plan of the Ad Hoc Work Programme  
on the New Collective Quantified Goal

February 2024.

1. Introduction

Japan appreciates the opportunity to submit its views on the 2024 work plan of the New Collective Quantified Goal (NCQG) on climate finance. 2024 is one of the most important years for climate finance, since the New Collective Quantified Goal would be decided at CMA.6. Standing at the significant turning point from the USD 100 billion goal to NCQG, now is the time to move away from the binary opposition between developed and developing countries. Japan believes that NCQG should be the polar star which tells the right and clear direction for every stakeholder involved in climate change, and mobilize a wide range of finance, not only public but also private, broadening contributor base such as emerging countries with a capacity to do so.

Although there is less than one year before NCQG decision, the Parties have not yet reached consensus on any substantial part of NCQG. To use the limited time effectively, co-chairs should consider the work plan well, and the whole process should be proceeded based on the work plan.

Japan welcomes the continuation of co-chairs of Ad Hoc Work Programme, both Mr. Zaheer Fakir, and Ms. Fiona Gilbert, and expects the smooth facilitation by co-chairs.

2. Japan's view on Issues proposed by co-chairs

Japan's views on the issues proposed by co-chairs are as follows.

- (i) How should the technical expert dialogues (TED) and the meetings under the ad hoc work programme (the meetings) be organized to bring together the elements of NCQG and the options identified under each element, taking into account the linkages across each element and progress made in the previous meetings?
  - As has been discussed, when it comes to deciding on NCQG, it is essential to decide on the options of each element. Through these two years, Parties have been extracting possible options of each element. It is important to consider every possible option without excluding any of them, however, at the same time, under the circumstance that there is less than one year left until the deadline of NCQG decision, we should proceed the discussion to decide the concurred option of each element urgently.
  - Some of these elements are deeply related to each other, such as funding sources and time frame etc., therefore, it would be effective to recognize the linkages of these elements and move the discussion forward by prioritizing these elements.
- (ii) 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?
  - The purpose of “the meetings” is to make the framework of draft decision text at CMA.6. As a first step, Parties should try to pursue the language that all parties can approve as much as possible, and if some options remain, the discussion should be focused on narrowing down the number of options.
  - In order to make discussions smoothly, Japan believes that the role of the TED would be to examine the ideas that have been raised so far and narrow it down to concrete options to help “the meetings” to discuss easily.
  - In addition, in terms of sharing information between TED and “the meetings”, Japan requests co-chairs to prepare the summary of each TED more swiftly than before, so that countries can refer the summary as input for the next meeting.
- (iii) How can the high-level ministerial dialogue be best used to facilitate reaching a decision on NCQG at CMA.6, when it should be convened and in what format?
  - The current High-Level Ministerial Dialogue (HLMD) tends to be less interactive, as its

format is only to deliver the statement from each country and there is no interactive discussion. It was pointed out by several Parties at CMA.5.

- High-level ministerial involvement in the decision-making process of NCQG itself is useful to some extent, but as mentioned above, the current HLMD is not sufficient in terms of involvement. Therefore, it would be useful to set up small group sessions to provoke more interactive communication.
- In terms of the timing of HLMD, in order to operationalize HLMD effectively for the decision making at CMA.6, as mentioned in the decision text of CMA.5, it should be organized well before the CMA.6. On the other hand, gathering high-level ministers physically only for NCQG HLMD is not practical. It is more appropriate to organize along with existing meetings such as SB or using online meetings.

### 3. Japan's view on other matters

Japan expresses the following views on topics other than those proposed by co-chairs

#### (i) Article 2, paragraph 1, (c)

- It is necessary to maximize the scale of NCQG in order to provide sufficient support to truly vulnerable countries. To this end, Japan believes it is important to expand the contributor base and achieve Article 2, paragraph 1, (c), of the Paris Agreement.
- For example, it would be constructive to consider how to include elements to promote mobilization of private finance in NCQG, such as public-private partnership, blended finance, preparation for investment environment. In addition, Japan emphasizes the importance of setting NCQG to include supports from emerging countries with capacity to do so, such as triangular cooperation and expects to reach a common understanding on contributor base.

#### (ii) Mandate of co-chairs

- Japan concerns that if co-chairs try to collect all ideas suggested, the draft would be redundant, and it would be impossible to reach consensus on NCQG. Hence, Japan suggests that sufficient mandate should be given to co-chairs to reflect their consideration of the options for inclusion / deletion when preparing the draft. And depending on the circumstances of the negotiation, co-chairs should also have mandates to change the work plan.

#### (iii) Relationship between G7 and G20

- Attention to climate finance in G7 and G20 is increasing, and climate finance will be one of the main topics and will be discussed in these fora this year. Hence, NCQG could also be discussed outside of UNFCCC, it is important to cooperate with other fora not to diverge the discussion