

Submission by the Republic of Zambia on behalf of the African Group of Negotiators (AGN)
on
the New Collective Quantified Goal on Finance

1. The African Group welcomes the CMA-5 decision to transition the NCQG discussions towards a text-based negotiating process with a view of preparing a comprehensive negotiating text for consideration and adoption at CMA.6. We urge Parties not to move away from the agreement at COP28 to shift to a negotiated text as the focus of our work and that the first draft of a negotiated text should be primarily based on party submissions and the elements contained in the NCQG Co-Chairs report to COP28.
2. We recall decision 9/CMA, paragraph 3 and note that the purpose of the new goal is to contribute to the accelerated delivery of ambitious actions and pledges of developing countries' mitigation, adaptation, addressing loss and damage as well as other climate-related strategies and programmes that should be implemented and delivered within the principles of the Convention and Paris Agreement, particularly equity and CBDR as stipulated under Article 2.2 and in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication as clearly reflected in Article 2.1 of the Paris Agreement
3. Overall, obligations and principles as stipulated in Article 4 of the Convention and Articles 2.2, 9.1 and 9.3 of the Paris Agreement, respectively, form the basis of engagement in setting the new goal. While the new goal primarily entails a mobilization goal, the setting of the goal must also consider the obligation of support as the catalytic basis for mobilization.
4. Setting the new finance goal must recognize that implementation of Articles 4 of the UNFCCC, 4.5 7, 8, 10 and 11 of the Paris Agreement is premised on the full fulfilment of financial obligations keeping to the principles of the Convention and Paris Agreement and that the new goal is premised on the continuation of developed countries existing obligations under the Convention. In addition, Article 13 of the Paris Agreement presents the framework that facilitates effective implementation within clear and transparent terms.
5. As agreed, the new goal would be based on the annual 100 billion USD goal, learning from its lessons in relation to delivery, lack of accountability, and instruments, and it should be based on the same principles in relation to responsibility to provide.
6. The two years of deliberations under the NCQG work programme provided Parties the space to engage on the nature (quantitative, qualitative), thematic focus, delivery, and timelines. In the first three meetings of the NCQG programme in 2024 we need to discuss elements of a negotiation text regarding the nature of the goal – quantitative, qualitative elements and thematic focus, public and other innovative sources and transparency arrangements such as methodologies for accounting and reporting, reaching a text that could be presented and discussed in the fourth meeting in 2024.
7. While this package of elements is crucial to consider if an ambitious and responsive goal, considering the needs and priorities of developing countries, is to be set, the African Group, recalling decision 1/CP21 paragraphs 53 and 14 CMA, holds the view that further progress towards an outcome at COP

29 should be based on ratcheted efforts in unpacking the quantum of resources required to achieve the ambitious conditional targets set by developing countries as contained in their NDCs, and the NAPs and also respond to the calls to enhance collective climate ambition, with developed countries taking the lead, up to 2030 as per the Glasgow, Sharm el Sheikh, and Dubai outcomes. Other important elements, as outlined above, should be discussed in the context of the quantum informed by findings of the IPCC and lessons learned from the USD 100B per year goal, and additional outcomes of COP28 related to scaling up new and additional grant-based, highly concessional finance and non-debt instruments to support scaling up of implementation.

8. The African Group highlights the following elements as providing clear guidance for our work under the NCQG:
 - a) The NCQG is the next phase of the fast start finance and the 100 billion USD annual goal thus it follows the same clear responsibility of developed countries to provide and mobilize a quantified sum of finance on an annual basis;
 - b) Article 9 provides us with the needed elements to formulate and quantify the NCQG, including on the increase (progression);
 - c) The NCQG must provide the clarity and predictability for further ambition and action by developing countries, in particular on the international financial support (provision and mobilization) for the current and incoming conditional NDCs.
 - d) The new goal should be a clear quantification of finance that is based on the expected actions to be taken by developing countries in line with their NDCs, this would clearly build on the scientific finding and be reflective of inclusive just transition pathways, in line with Parties individual socio-economic development priorities.
 - e) The NCQG considers the required provision and mobilization of climate finance, taking into account the exigent need to support implementation in developing countries, increase and accelerate ambition;
 - f) The new goal should deliver the resources needed to implement current NDCs, including NAPs, increase ambition and accelerate action toward the achievement of Article 2 of the Paris Agreement, taking into account the evolving needs of developing country Parties, as per 14 CMA 1, 9/CMA 3, and the GST outcome decision in COP28;
 - g) Provision, mobilization, and delivery of the quantum should be done within clearly defined qualitative aspects building on lessons of the USD 100B goal as well as lessons from Article 4 of the UNFCCC implementation when it comes to climate finance supports from developed for developing countries, and clear timeline that ensures predictability of resources availability and accessibility.
 - h) The NCQG is not a static process but rather a dynamic recurring process that reflects the updated science and the ambition cycle we have under the Paris Agreement and the evolving needs of developing countries;
 - i) There should be clear criteria for burden-sharing between developed countries, which allows predictability, transparency, and accountability, such burden-sharing would enhance the delivery of Articles 4.5, 9.5, and 13; and
 - j) The fulfilment of the annual goal needs to be captured through the UNFCCC transparency and accountability regime and the SCF.

9. In our assessment, the core problem in the determination of the quantum/NCQG process is that existing finance and development targets are voluntary input-based, i.e., namely based only on what developed countries are prepared to provide and mobilize rather than focus on the need and impact/output that achieves transformational change. Input-based are essentially committed figures with no anticipated results. Input-based pledges/ goals have generally led to limited returns (0.7% GDP and USD100b) as they do not address the transformation and structural changes needed to address climate, development, and poverty eradication. As such, there is the risk that the NCQG repeats previous experience in goal setting. This will not lead to integrated and indivisible goals that balance the three dimensions of sustainable development: the economic, social, and environmental spheres.
10. The NCQG process in 2024 must demonstrate how the multilateral climate system can use evidence and needs-based approaches to determine output-based global goals, particularly for finance. Firstly, the demonstration of change would focus on ensuring that the needs and priorities of developing countries form the basis of setting the NCQG by ensuring that qualitative discussions focus on how best to support country-driven strategies and ownership, including strengthening institutional capacities in the context of climate finance and responding to the whole spectrum of mitigation, adaptation, addressing loss and damage, and just transition needs of African countries, by building on lessons learned from the failure of input-based goals such as the USD 100B. Secondly, we need the NCQG process to demonstrate how the range of global climate outputs (as agreed in Glasgow, Sharm el-Sheikh, and Dubai) can be informed by data and science, with a view of the goal designed with clear targets and deliverables to address the needed investment pathways and finance gaps in critical sectors. Ideally, the climate finance outcomes in 2024 should include a set of anticipated outcomes/impacts that the goal should achieve in a bid to deliver Article 2 of the Agreement.
11. The African Group has continually expressed the need for the NCQG to be an outcome-based goal. Ideally, the NCQG should be a financial goal with defined outputs and outcomes based on the needs and priorities of developing countries to be achieved within a certain temporal scope between 2025 to 2030.
12. The NCQG-focused discussion should not renegotiate provisions of the Paris Agreement, including established and agreed principles or scientific evidence.
13. NCQG deliberations and outcomes should also be very clearly in line with Articles 2.1, 2.2, 3, 4.5 and 9 of the Paris Agreement; it should be guided by COP outcomes, including ministerial roundtables, as inputs to its work in formulating decision outcomes.

Additional elements to the abovementioned and reflecting on the questions are as follows:

a- 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;

- The documents to be prepared by the co-chairs should provide an initial outline of the outcome document in terms of principles, references, structure of the goal, qualitative and quantitative elements, transparency arrangements, and timeframes.
- It should provide options based on inputs by parties.
- The technical expert dialogues should focus on discussing the options.
- The focus of the technical expert dialogues should also be on the quantitative aspect of the goal, as this is the main focus of the mandate as per the name of it. The TEDs need to consider various outputs/outcomes that the new goal should contribute to and unpack quantum options based on these expected outcomes that are drawn from the needs of developing countries.
- The meetings under the ad hoc work programme should be organized in a manner that allows the development of a draft negotiating text that builds upon elements of the substantive framework for a draft negotiating text.

b- 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;

- Co-chairs should plan the two meetings in a manner that the TEDs inform the meetings of the work programme, with a Co-Chairs note to be presented after the TED to the Work Program.
- The focus of both should be clearly focused on the mandate, which is the quantified goal, through a focus on the needed deliverables as indicated by science, or UN reports or COP decisions including the GST outcome and the GGA, including the recognition of public finance.

c- 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.

- Two ministerial meetings are to be considered, one as per the COP28 decision, that could be held on the margins of the GA, under both COP28 and COP29 presidencies similar to the loss and damage ministerial organized before COP28.
- The second ministerial should be the one at the beginning of the COP29, which allows for final refinement of the elements of the expected outcome.
- Both ministerial meetings should provide, as needed, any political guidance to allow for the delivery of the mandate to agree on the NCQG at COP29.