



AT A GLANCE:

Submissions on views of Parties and non-Party stakeholders on the process for operationalisation of a just transition mechanism to inform SB 64 negotiations

A total of fifty-eight (58) submissions were made on the “Views of Parties and non-Party stakeholders on the process for operationalisation of a just transition mechanism”. The contributions were provided by Parties, including four negotiating groups, agencies from the UN Nations system, and admitted NGOs, which represent the majority of contributions. Each contribution addressed relevant elements to render the just transition mechanism effective. In this context, stakeholders presented important considerations on the purpose and expected ambition of the structure (**Scope**), its institutional configuration and relation to the JTWP (**Governance**), the functions it will execute, and the timeline under which it will operate (**Mandate**), its means of implementations (**Mol**) and some particular concerns on thematic priorities and crosscutting issues, such as human rights (**Special Considerations**). For practical reasons, a summarised, streamlined version of the key elements described in submissions is presented below in two umbrella categories: Party and Non-Party Stakeholders, the latter with three further subdivisions being: (i) UN Agencies; (ii) academia and (iii) Civil Society.

Party Stakeholders

AILAC:

JTM as a way to support integration of just transition into national climate and development strategies and to address gaps in turning principles into action. It offers a clear timeline proposal, including two dialogues, each tied to the next sessions of the SBs, and adoption of a final resolution at CMA8. On governance, the group highlights that the JTM must be the central pillar of work for 2026, with JTWP modalities supporting a broader mechanism development process, but ultimately converging and being replaced by the JTM as single negotiation, technical and facilitation space in relation to just transition. They advocate for the consideration of an expansive list of elements, including the CBDR-RC principle, human rights, care economy, gender responsiveness, Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), biodiversity integrity and 1.5°C alignment. ([Panama, AILAC, 2026](#)).

EIG:

JTM has the potential to provide practical support for the operationalization of just transition pathways at the national level and enhance international cooperation. To this end, the group recognises the mechanism could advance mitigation, adaptation and resilience in line with the CBDR-RC principle. It proposes a relatively light mandate, the creation of an expert cooperation forum, facilitation of support channels, and coordination among relevant bodies. Looking forward, the group strongly emphasises the Secretariat mapping exercise and synthesis report as the foundation for design choices, repeatedly stressing coherence, complementarity and non-duplication with the JTWP and other workstreams ([Switzerland, EIG, 2026](#)).

EU:

The group frames the JTM as a tool to strengthen 1.5°C-aligned climate policies while addressing social and economic dimensions of the transition. With regards to mandate, it sees the mechanism as supporting integration of just transition into NDCs, NAPs and LT-LEDS, and enhancing knowledge-sharing, international cooperation, technical assistance and capacity-building. The group stresses meaningful participation and social dialogue with all social partners as an essential element for effective governance, and favours a cross-cutting rights-based approach, including labour rights, Indigenous rights, the right to a healthy environment, gender equality and intergenerational equity. ([Cyprus, EU, 2026](#)).

LDC Group:

The group favours an implementation-focused mechanism responsive to structural constraints, debt, poverty, limited fiscal space and resilience needs in LDCs. It calls for practical support across national, subnational and community levels, including tools, methodologies, planning support, sectoral assistance, green supply chains and formalisation of the informal sector. On Mol, the group pushes for a dedicated financial pillar, grants, concessional finance, debt-sensitive support, and even debt-for-transition type solutions. On governance, it favours a board with a technical arm, dedicated LDC representation, regular reporting to the CMA, continuation of the JTWP, having COP31 as a deadline for adoption ([Timor Leste, LDC Group, 2026](#)).



UN Agencies

ILO:

Pushes for a mechanism anchored in the [ILO Just Transition Guidelines](#) and the [Decent Work Agenda](#). In the same vein, it supports the active and substantive participation for workers' and employers' organisations. On mandate, it favours knowledge-sharing, capacity development and assistance to governments and social partners activities, proposing a policy helpdesk at the heart of the JTM.

UNICEF:

Calls for the integration of children's rights, intergenerational equity and child participation across policy, finance, participation, and accountability. Also, it demands that fossil fuel phase-out is part of the structure of the mechanism. Highlights that locally led adaptation and loss and damage because of children's disproportionate exposure to the negative effects of climate change.

OHCHR:

Calls for inclusion, transparency, meaningful participation, public participation and a human-rights-based approach to energy transition, including FPIC of Indigenous Peoples. Ultimately, the agency views the JTM as a means to operationalise the COP30 rights outcomes in practice, putting human rights at the centre of its structure.

FAO:

Pushes for the inclusion of agrifood systems under the work of the mechanism, as one of the main pillars of just transition. To this end, they propose a dedicated workstream or expert taskforce inside the structure, favouring a mandate that includes policy guidance, capacity-building, technical support, peer learning, and technology transfer for inclusive and resilient agrifood transformation.

UNRISD:

The agency does not support narrow sectoral or formal-employment framings and pushes for recognition of unpaid and paid care work. In this sense, it proposes that operationalisation should embed care across planning, finance and participation. Connects care to gender inequality, informality, and wellbeing as special considerations.

Academia | Grantham Research Institute:

Recommends learning from the WIM, especially to avoid fragmentation, delayed operationalisation and weak accessibility. It calls for meaningful participation and advisory roles for trade unions, employers' organisations and civil society in the design phase. On mandate, the Institute submits capacity-building, technical assistance and knowledge-sharing activities, working under a dual-arm architecture (governing and technical), with funding coordination hub, drawing analogies with the Technology Mechanism and stressing country ownership and accountability in finance.

Civil Society | Women and Gender (WGC):

Considers the JTM should be a constituted body under CMA, proposing a detailed three-arm structure: (i) coordination and policy coherence, (ii) knowledge-building and (iii) action and support for implementation. It pushes for full membership of rightsholder constituencies under the UN climate regime. It promotes equity, the CBDR-RC principle and a broad set of human rights, including women, gender-diverse people, Indigenous Peoples, afro descendants and persons with disabilities.

Business Sector (ICC/BINGO):

Supports a holistic, non-prescriptive, nationally driven mechanism explicitly recognising the private sector as a key implementation partner. To this end, it proposes a facilitative platform focused on international cooperation, practical learning, technical assistance, capacity-building and investment mobilisation activities. Pushes for SMEs, micro-entrepreneurs, smallholders, public-private collaboration, investable pipelines and resilient supply chains to be included on the list of elements of work of the JTM. Also flags critical minerals as a cross-cutting topic. Lastly, it favours light-configuration, phased operationalisation, with modalities that are coherent with existing processes.

Trade Unions (ITUC/TUNGO):

Supports a mechanism that is rooted in the ILO Guidelines and centred on workers and trade unions. It pushes for the JTM to be a coordinating body, liaising between the UNFCCC and ILO to support just transition in national policies, preventing work duplication. Calls for more climate finance linked to labour rights, social protection, decent jobs, reskilling and public finance that does not worsen debt in the Global South, and demands a governance role and seat at the table for trade unions.

Indigenous Peoples (IIPFCC):

Calls for dedicated Indigenous seats in governance, with representatives chosen through Indigenous Peoples' own procedures. Supports a three-arm structure focused on technical assistance, capacity-building, knowledge-sharing and international cooperation, as well as direct and simplified access to finance for Indigenous-led initiatives and flags risks from critical minerals, renewable energy infrastructure, carbon markets, bioenergy and geoeconomics. It pushes the JTM to be a rights-based mechanism.

Local Governments (C40/LGMA):

Calls for all constituencies, including LGMA, to have an equal seat in governance, plus a single-window interface/focal point for subnational participation. It views the JTM as a platform to facilitate dialogue, coordination, knowledge sharing, technical advice, and support for multilevel implementation.

Youth (YOUNGO):

Sees the JTM as part of a broader UNFCCC shift from rule-setting to implementation architecture. It supports the same three broad functions proposed by WGC, highlighting the need for a more structured institutional solution rather than a loose platform.

Supported by



This document is part of a project that is supported by the International Climate Initiative (IKI) of the Federal Government of Germany. Within the Federal Government, the IKI is anchored in the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Climate Action, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMUKN).



Legal Response International
c/o Simmons & Simmons, CityPoint,
One Ropemaker St, London EC2Y 9SS, UK
enquiries@legalresponse.org - www.legalresponse.org
Registered in England and Wales,
company no. 07385563, charity no. 1147043