



## Australian Government

### **Submission: views on issues to be addressed as part of the 2024 workplan for the ad hoc work programme on the new collective quantified goal on climate finance**

Australia welcomes the opportunity to submit views on the issues to be addressed as part of the 2024 workplan for the ad hoc work programme (AHWP)<sup>1</sup> and thanks the co-chairs for the additional guidance provided on 19 January 2024, including the specific questions which Parties were encouraged to focus on as part of these submissions.<sup>2</sup> This submission responds to the questions posed by the co-chairs in their 19 January communication.

Recognising that deliberations on setting the new collective quantified goal on climate finance will conclude in 2024, Australia welcomes the decision at CMA.5 to transition the ad hoc work programme on the new collective quantified goal on climate finance to a mode of work which will enable deliberations among Parties that are conducive to the development of a draft negotiating text for consideration at CMA.6.

**Question 1. 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?**

#### *Organisation of the technical expert dialogues (TEDs) and meetings under the ad hoc work programme*

Noting the decision made at CMA.5 to convene (for the first time) meetings under the AHWP back-to-back with the TEDs in 2024, the co-chairs' workplan should provide Parties with initial guidance on the relationship between the two meetings, informed by Party views, to ensure that the TEDs *inform* and *complement* the meetings under the AHWP as mandated.

Australia sees the TEDs as an ongoing tool for advancing towards a common technical understanding of different options for elements of the goal, particularly around issues which still require expert-level mapping, with the meetings under the AHWP being informed by and building upon, but not duplicating these discussions. Australia encourages the co-chairs to continue to hold the TEDs in an informal setting conducive to constructive expert discussions, providing opportunities for deep consideration of issues in small groups across different technical elements of the new goal and enabling ongoing participation and input from a wide range of relevant stakeholders.

As TEDs and meetings under the AHWP are to be held back-to-back, it would be useful for there to be a transition in the physical format of the two meetings, to help symbolise and support the transition between expert dialogue and more formal deliberations in 'negotiation style' format.

It will be important for co-chairs to have the flexibility to organise the TEDs and the meetings under the AHWP in a manner which supports a mode of work that enables *'conducive to the development of a draft*

---

<sup>1</sup> [CMA5 AUV CMA agenda 11 \(unfccc.int\)](#), Paragraph 13.

<sup>2</sup> [Notification from 2023 NCQG Co-chairs \(unfccc.int\)](#), 19 January 2024.

*negotiating text*’ and will support the co-chairs in fulfilling their mandate of developing ‘*a substantive framework for a draft negotiating text capturing progress made*’ no later than four weeks prior to CMA.6. This includes flexibility to allocate relative time to each meeting based on the content to be covered and the format most appropriate for advancing progress on these topics (eg: TED 9 may be 3 days and the first meeting under the AHWP may be 2 days, but TED 10 may only be 2 days with 3 days allocated to the second meeting under the AHWP).

The exact nature of this ‘mode of work’ will need to be tailored to suit the needs of Parties, and the progress of deliberations over this year. As a result, the workplan should accommodate flexibility and avoid being overly restrictive in setting out the exact structure, organisation or format for either the TEDs or the meetings under the AHWP.

Other processes, such as the Transitional Committee on Loss and Damage, have demonstrated that it can be valuable for co-chairs to have the flexibility to determine, sometimes in real time, if there is need to adapt the mode or format of working to best accommodate and enable constructive deliberation.

#### *Issues requiring further discussion by technical experts in 2024 [focus on TED 9]*

The AHWP in 2024 should build upon the work already undertaken in 2022 and 2023, including the options contained in the annual report of the co-chairs of the AHWP in 2023.<sup>3</sup> In assessing the options contained in the 2023 annual report, Australia suggests that there are some elements which have not received adequate expert deliberation and for which options need to be mapped in order to progress, on a holistic basis, towards discussions on how these options come together into possible packages.

At TED 9 Australia would welcome further expert-level technical dialogue on:

- Options for how Article 2.1C could be integrated into the new goal.
- Options for how the new goal will reflect the global effort as set out in Article 9, and the current economic realities which should inform the contributor base for different layers of the new goal, reflecting the evolving capacities of countries to contribute to the provision and mobilisation of finance.
- Options for structuring the goal to support it to unlock, draw upon and mobilise the widest possible range of sources, inputs, instruments and finance flows – so as to maximise scale and impact.

Further, to assist parties in moving forward from siloed discussions on ‘options’ for different elements of the NCQG towards a cohesive consideration of possible ‘packages’, TED 9 should dedicate time to discuss ‘**interlinkages**’ between the elements of the new goal.

Australia recommends that a dedicated focus on **interlinkages** is necessary to ensure that parties can identify practical synergies and trade-offs between elements of the new goal, and to approach the construction of possible packages in a manner which avoids inconsistencies within and between different elements. Technical discussions could be further complemented by a call for submissions – to enable Parties to submit formal views on how these interlinkages work for different technical components of the goal.

#### **Question 2. 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?**

Given the large number of outstanding elements and multiple directions which deliberations could take, Australia reiterates the need for flexibility and adaptability in how the co-chairs are empowered to capture

---

<sup>3</sup> [cma2023\\_11.pdf \(unfccc.int\)](#)

progress between the technical expert dialogues and the meetings under the ad hoc work programme from one meeting to the next, with a view to developing the substantive framework for a draft negotiating text by CMA.6, to ensure responsiveness to the pace, focus and manner of evolving deliberations and discussions between parties.

The form in which co-chairs decide to capture progress between meetings, as well as the products developed as *inputs to* and *outputs from* meetings should be 'fit for purpose' and determined by co-chairs on an as-needed basis, with the object of ensuring transparency of the process and with the goal of advancing deliberations between parties on a substantive framework for a draft negotiating text. Co-chairs should also be informed by the views of Parties in determining which products to produce and when, and to strive to provide as much advanced notice as possible to Parties on the types of products which will be produced, and the status of those products.

**Question 3. 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?**

Australia encourages co-chairs to work with the COP28 and COP29 Presidency teams to ensure that the high-level ministerial on the NCQG in 2024 is conducted in a more interactive format than previous ministerial dialogues, with a view to maximising interactive discussion between Ministers on priority political questions for consideration and decision which cannot be resolved at the expert level, and in a manner which complements work being undertaken under the AHWP and reflects progress made by Parties in their deliberations.

The high-level ministerial dialogue in 2024 should also involve a broader range of stakeholders, particularly those from the private sector and broader multilateral financial architecture for whom the structure and form of the new goal will have significant consequence, to allow Ministers to hear from and engage with these stakeholders directly.

The high-level ministerial dialogue (HLMD) should be convened in a manner which will ensure maximum participation from Ministers from different geographic regions. The HLMD should take place after the June Intersessional meetings, but well in advance of CMA.6, to provide enough time for experts to advance work under the AHWP and undertake at least two of the mandated TEDs and meetings under the AHWP, so as to support constructive Ministerial engagement on key political issues, but to also accommodate time for Ministerial discussions to inform deliberations and preparation of a substantive framework for a draft negotiating text capturing progress made, which will set Parties up to successfully conclude deliberations on the new goal at COP29.