

**21st Meeting of the Working Group to the Aarhus Convention
(Geneva, 4-6 April 2017)
Agenda item 8(c): Financial arrangements**

Norway

Norway supports the draft decision on financial arrangements prepared by the Bureau with the eminent support from the secretariat as always.

As you know from previous discussions at the last MOP and subsequent meetings of the Working Group, Norway prefers a mandatory financial scheme based on adjusted UN scale of assessed contributions. We believe this would be the best solution based on the principles of an equitable sharing of the burden, stable and predictable sources of funding, accountability and sound financial management.

Judging from these previous discussions and the intervention made by the EU, the prospect of changes in the position of those opposed to the introduction of a mandatory scheme during the few months left before the upcoming sixth Meeting of the Parties is bleak. If we had thought that there was a even a faint possibility of convincing those opposed through discussions at the Meeting of the Parties, we would have insisted on keeping the two options at the table. We have however come to the conclusion that this is not the case, and we therefore no longer insist on keeping the option of a mandatory contribution scheme based on an adjusted UN scale of assessments.

However, we are not giving up on our aim to secure more predictable, stable and equitably shared funding of the activities under the Convention. That is why we would like to keep paragraph 1 *litra* (b) on the minimum amount of contribution in the original wording proposed by the Bureau, without the changes proposed by the EU. For the same reason we would also like to emphasize the importance of keeping paragraph 14, which mandates the Bureau and the Working Group to explore in the next intersessional period options for more predictable, stable and equitably shared funding. We do not believe this to be a cumbersome or futile task. We are simply asking for it to be explored, without dictating how it should be done and how much effort should be put into it.

Since we do not consider that the existing interim scheme meets the needs and alleviate the concerns expressed in the fourth and fifth preamble paragraphs of the draft decision, we oppose the proposal made by the EU to delete the sixth and last preambular paragraph. It does not make sense to us to express the needs and concerns and then jump right to the conclusion to keep the current interim

scheme with its shortcomings, without first also expressing the belief that alternative options for a better scheme will be explored in the future.

Thank you Chair