

Submission by Norway on the 2024 work plan for the New Collective Quantified Goal (NCQG) on climate finance

19 February 2024

Norway hereby shares its views in accordance with Paragraph 13 of the decision entitled “New collective quantified goal on climate finance” adopted under agenda item 10(e) of CMA 5. Our submission is structured according to the questions in the message (19/1 2024) from the co-chairs of the ad hoc work programme on the NCQG.

How should the technical expert dialogues (TED) and the meetings under the ad hoc work programme (MAHWP) 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?

This first meeting of the TED/MAHWP in 2024 could be organised in similar ways as the previous TEDs, where parties and non-party stakeholders interact in an open discussion. We would recommend that there is written input and/or guiding questions from the Co-chairs to structure the discussion. External speakers could be invited, but their interventions or inputs should be targeted to the specific questions or input produced by the co-chairs.

The aim of the first TED/MAHWP in 2024 should be to provide a framework for the discussions in 2024. It should be focused on in-depth technical discussions on the elements of the NCQG. We see merit in building on the options identified in 2023, by streamlining and refining these options and identify gaps. To do this, structuring our discussion around clusters of issues could be helpful. We believe that: i) scope, ii) structure and iii) quantum are key issue-clusters to sort our discussion. The first meeting could start fleshing out the elements and options that fall under each of these clusters/headings. As an illustration, elements under the “scope” of the goal could be the relationship between article 2.1c and article 9, and sources and channels. “Structure” could encompass discussions on timeframe, transparency and possible sub-goals or principles. “Quantum” could include discussions on contributors and how the goal should be informed by needs, priorities and science. Clustering elements like this could help us identify how issues are interlinked and eventually develop different packages for the goal.

In terms of time-balance between the TED and the MAHWP, we see the first TED to be longer than the MAHWP, where the latter takes stock of the deliberations and gives directions for future work. The 2nd and 3rd MAHWP would naturally be longer than the TEDS as more time will be needed for negotiations.

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?

There should be substantive outcomes from each meeting. The substantive framework for a draft negotiating text is the vehicle to capture progress along the way. We would, however, like to give the freedom to the co-chairs to capture the outcomes from each meeting in the way they deem to be best. Potential options could include a co-chairs note that capture parties’ views, papers on specific issues, annexes that presents different options for the goal etc.

Capturing progress is an iterative process through 2024, where text get streamlined and options clarified through the meetings. TEDs should pick up the outcomes of the previous MAHWP and allow for further in-depth technical discussions. The MAHWG should be informed by the TEDs and bring the discussions forward. Inputs from non-party stakeholders will continue to be important in both the TED and the MAHWG.

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?

Norway sees value in having the HLMD well before the CMA6. It is important that the HLMD allows for broad participation and is inclusive. Organising them back-to-back with other meetings, such as UNGA or PreCOP could be an option. We are also in favour of a setting where ministers can engage directly and in an interactive manner to deal with difficult issues. This could be in the form of break-out groups. We are also in favour of engaging ministries beyond the HLMD. This could be done by Presidency outreach or by ministerial co-facilitators. We do however see merit in building on the first and second TED/MAHWP before ministerial engagement gets more formalised.