

Submission to the United Arab Emirates Just Transition Work Programme

Call for inputs: just transition
mechanism

April 2026

The Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment was established in 2008 at the London School of Economics and Political Science. The Institute brings together international expertise on economics, as well as finance, geography, the environment, international development and political economy to establish a world-leading centre for policy-relevant research, teaching and training in climate change and the environment. It is hosted by the Global School of Sustainability at LSE and is funded by the Grantham Foundation for the Protection of the Environment. www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute

The Just Transition Finance Lab is part of the Grantham Research Institute and was launched in February 2024 with the goal of being a centre for experimentation and excellence in the financial solutions needed for a just transition. The Lab is grateful for the core support of its Founding Funders: Antin Infrastructure Partners, Barclays, HSBC and Laudes Foundation. www.justtransitionfinance.org

The Green Skills Lab was established in 2025 as part of the Global School of Sustainability at the London School of Economics and Political Science. The Lab develops interdisciplinary research combining economics, data science and sociology to close the evidence gap on green jobs and skills.

CETEx – the Centre for Economic Transition Expertise – was established in 2024 at the London School of Economics and Political Science as a specialised research and policy centre to support the ambitious reforms required to deliver sustainable, inclusive and resilient economies and financial systems across Europe. The Centre is hosted by the Global School of Sustainability and has founding funding from the Sequoia Climate Foundation, ClimateWorks Foundation, Children’s Investment Fund Foundation, Sunrise Project and European Climate Foundation. www.cetex.org

About this submission

This submission to the United Arab Emirates Just Transition Work Programme responds to a call for the views of Parties and non-Party stakeholders on the process for operationalisation of a just transition mechanism, as set out in FCCC/PA/CMA/2025/L.14 paragraphs 25 and 26. The submission draws on work produced by the Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment, including the Just Transition Finance Lab and the Law & Governance research unit; the Green Skills Lab; the Centre for Economic Transition Expertise (CETEx); and the TPI Global Climate Transition Centre.

The version presented has been lightly edited since submission to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change portal in March 2026.

About the authors

Anisa Indah Pratiwi is a Policy Analyst at the Just Transition Finance Lab at the Grantham Research Institute.

Ben Crawford is a Research Officer at the Green Skills Lab and the Grantham Research Institute.

Isabel Lara Miranda is a Policy Fellow at CETEx.

Jameela Joy Reyes is a Policy Officer at the Grantham Research Institute

Liam Orme is a Policy Fellow at the Just Transition Finance Lab.

Tiffanie Chan is a Policy Analyst at the Grantham Research Institute.

Acknowledgements

The authors (listed alphabetically above) thank Kate Higham, Joe Feyertag, Rowan Conway and Sharan Burrow for their review comments. The authors are also grateful to Setenay Hizliok, Giorgia Monsignorini and Antonina Scheer from the TPI Global Climate Transition Centre, as well as Jodi-Ann Wang for their inputs to this submission.

The views expressed in this submission represent those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the host institutions or funders. The authors declare no conflict of interest in the preparation of this report.

This paper was first published in April 2026 by the Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment.

© The authors, 2026.

Licensed under [CC BY-NC 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/). Commercial permissions requests should be directed to gri@lse.ac.uk.

Suggested citation: Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment (2026) *Submission to the United Arab Emirates Just Transition Work Programme. Call for inputs: just transition mechanism*. London: Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment, London School of Economics and Political Science.

Contents

Summary	4
1. Introduction and context	6
2. Process for developing a just transition mechanism	7
3. Functions and structure of a just transition mechanism	10
References	21
Appendix 1. Mapping JTM complementarities with ILO programmes and initiatives	24
Appendix 2. Existing UNFCCC mechanisms and frameworks	26

Summary

This submission responds to the call for inputs under the United Arab Emirates (UAE) Just Transition Work Programme (JTWP). It responds directly to paragraphs 25 and 26 of the UAE JTWP CMA.7 decision agreed at the 30th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP30) which invite views on the process for operationalising a just transition mechanism (JTM) under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Our recommendations address both the process for developing the JTM and the functions and corresponding institutional structures the JTM should adopt.

Development of the JTM

The JTM should learn from the institutional trajectory of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage (WIM). The WIM's evolution over 13 years reveals recurring challenges – fragmentation between its constituted bodies, delayed operationalisation of key functions, and gaps in accessibility and outreach that the JTM can avoid by design. We recommend that any constituted bodies established under the JTM should, from the outset, have clear and complementary mandates, be required to coordinate with each other and with relevant bodies within and outside the UNFCCC, and produce knowledge products accessible in multiple languages and inclusive of Indigenous peoples, local communities, youth and displaced populations.

The process of developing the JTM must embody the principles of meaningful participation that the COP30 decision text affirms. Under International Labour Organization (ILO) jurisprudence, “meaningful and effective” social dialogue implies structured engagement, early involvement, information sharing and the ability to influence outcomes. Trade unions, employers’ organisations and civil society coalitions – including the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC), the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC) and sectoral unions such as the International Transport Workers’ Federation (ITF) and IndustriALL – have been central to advancing just transition principles within the UNFCCC. We recommend that these organisations be granted an advisory role in the JTM development process, in anticipation of a formalised governance role within the mechanism. Approaches that marginalise social partners in institutional design would be inconsistent with the principles agreed in the decision text.

Functions of the JTM

Paragraph 25 of the COP30 decision text identifies four purposes of the JTM: enhancing international cooperation, capacity-building, technical assistance and knowledge-sharing. Our recommendations focus on three of the functions.

Capacity-building

- The JTM should help countries develop employment-focused sectoral transition strategies aligned with their nationally determined contributions, through sustained processes of social dialogue. This requires building the capacity of governments and non-state actors to engage meaningfully in transition planning, and in integrated economic planning for affected communities and regions.
- As the cases of Spain and Scotland illustrate, institutional capacity for social dialogue varies substantially between countries and sectors. Where dialogue is thoroughly institutionalised, it generates political trust and policy learning that spills over to new sectors. Where it is weak, maintaining momentum in the just transition and social dialogue depends more heavily on the political coordination and public mobilisation capacities of stakeholders.
- The JTM's capacity-building function should, therefore, operate at two levels: high-level coordination across existing UN programmes and initiatives, and direct operational support for social partners at the country and sector levels, including through independent analytical capabilities, network development and training. This dual approach builds on the existing

delivery modes of ILO programmes while addressing a key gap: the limited direct support currently available for social partners in the largest green transition programmes.

Technical assistance (particularly in mobilising finance for just transitions)

- As a provider of technical assistance, the JTM can help parties navigate systemic headwinds, strengthen national coordination capacities in line with country-owned transition pathways, and support institutional learning so that emerging practice in one context can inform adaptation in others.
- Lessons from Just Energy Transition Partnerships (JETPs) highlight several design weaknesses in grant funding. Grant allocations have tended to reflect donor interests rather than domestic priorities; only a small share has reached community- and worker-focused initiatives, and front-loaded grant funding creates 'cliff effects' (abrupt stoppages) at the end of the funding cycle.
- JTM technical advice should adopt a strong definition of country ownership and help create accountability structures that incorporate milestone- and target-based disbursements and transparency. Any financing modalities supported through the JTM should include a defined minimum grant share for the least developed countries (LDCs) and high-vulnerability emerging market and developing economies (EMDEs), safeguards to limit debt burdens, and support for countries with more limited capacity. JTM technical assistance should also respond to existing and emerging bilateral and multilateral initiatives, including JETPs and country platforms.

Knowledge-sharing

- The JTM should establish a permanent observatory to consolidate and categorise resources across existing platforms, consulting all UNFCCC constituencies. Under the UNFCCC, the JTM is in a unique position to foster knowledge-sharing that accounts for the cross-border implications of transition policies, and that acts as a basis for international cooperation.
- Evidence from deliberative processes – including climate assemblies – demonstrates that structured learning phases can shift participants' views and build consensus on contentious issues. Institutionalising such a learning phase within the JTM would create an opportunity to move towards a shared understanding of the risks of failing to phase out fossil fuels, and of the opportunities presented by the green transition.
- The knowledge-sharing function should adhere to the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and support the regionalisation of resources where necessary, including the development of contextualised sectoral pathways and benchmarks for EMDEs. It should also improve awareness of and access to weather and climate information in vulnerable countries.

The JTM's value lies in linking these functions within a framework for multilateral dialogue.

International cooperation forms the connective tissue between the mutually reinforcing functions discussed above. Capacity-building enables the social dialogue that makes technical assistance effective. Knowledge-sharing provides the evidence base on which capacity-building and technical assistance depend.

Institutional structure of the JTM

We recommend a dual-arm structure comprising **a policy arm and an operational arm with an embedded funding coordination hub** as the model best suited to performing the functions summarised above. The policy arm should provide analysis, develop frameworks and toolkits, and coordinate with existing UNFCCC bodies. The operational arm should deliver demand-driven technical assistance, capacity-building and knowledge brokerage, hosted by or networked through existing UN agencies. Financing coordinated through the JTM should adhere to the principles agreed in paragraph 12 of the JTWP COP30 decision text. This structure mirrors existing models within the UNFCCC – notably, the Technology Mechanism. Parallel initiatives offer important insights into how to mitigate the risk of fragmentation between bodies (e.g. WIM) and the financing arrangement of the Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT).

1. Introduction and context

This submission responds to the call for inputs under the United Arab Emirates Just Transition Work Programme (JTWP). It responds directly to paragraphs 25 and 26 of FCCC/PA/CMA/2025/L.14 (UNFCCC, 2025a), which was agreed at the 30th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP30) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC):

25. Decides to develop a just transition mechanism, the purpose of which will be to enhance international cooperation, technical assistance, capacity-building and knowledge-sharing, and enable equitable, inclusive just transitions, noting that the mechanism is to be implemented in a manner that builds on and complements relevant workstreams under the Convention and the Paris Agreement, including the work programme, and requests the subsidiary bodies at their sixty-fourth sessions (June 2026) to recommend a draft decision on the process for its operationalization for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement at its eighth session (November 2026);

*26. Invites, in the spirit of mutirão, Parties and non-Party stakeholders to submit via the submission portal views **on the process referred to** in paragraph 25 above by 15 March 2026;*

This submission on the development of a just transition mechanism (JTM) represents a collaborative effort across several teams hosted at the Global School of Sustainability at LSE. It follows a series of submissions made by the Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment to the JTWP (Leiter et al., 2025; GRI, 2024; Wang and Chan, 2024; Wang and Robins, 2024).

Our recommendations for the JTM aim to:

- 1. Build on recent progress.** Important principles for the just transition have been agreed within the UNFCCC decision text; these should be further protected by – and embedded within – the JTM (see paragraph 12 of the CMA.7 JTWP decision text).
- 2. Value emergent initiatives and partnerships.** The mechanism should not impede bilateral or multilateral actions to advance just transitions responding to specific local, regional, national or international needs and opportunities. The mechanism should not impose or prescribe specific actions but should respond to requests for support.
- 3. Be pragmatic.** Recommendations recognise the consensus-driven nature of the UNFCCC process. Any JTM will reflect the existence of a range of definitions of just transitions and priorities among Parties.

Structure of this submission

Section 2 provides recommendations on the process for developing the JTM, derived from analysis of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage (WIM), and emerging best practices for social dialogue.

Section 3 provides recommendations on the capacity-building, technical assistance and knowledge-sharing functions of the JTM. It concludes by outlining options and a recommendation for an institutional model that could fulfil these functions.

2. Process for developing a just transition mechanism

This section provides recommendations on the process for developing the JTM, drawing on specific lessons from the evolution of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage (WIM) and emerging best practices for social dialogue. It also reviews briefly the role of the Just Transition Work Programme (JTWP) by reflecting on CMA.7 paragraphs 27 and 28.

2.1. Learning from the WIM

The WIM was established in 2013 at the 19th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP19) in Poland to enhance knowledge, strengthen dialogue and increase action and support to address climate-related loss and damage (UNFCCC, 2013). Like the JTM, the WIM was initiated out of a work programme at the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP16). This strong mandate produced some early successes, such as the establishment of several technical working groups and the Fiji Clearinghouse for Risk Transfer, which aggregated information on risk transfer options (Byrnes and Surminski, 2019). Yet major gaps have persisted in the 13 years since the WIM's establishment. Among the most significant criticisms is the need to improve the timeliness, relevance, delivery and usefulness of its products and outputs (The Loss and Damage Collaboration, 2025). There have been three reviews of the WIM, each offering lessons for the design of the JTM.

Incorporating recommendations from these reviews, particularly on coherence, complementarity and accountability, from the outset can strengthen the JTM's effectiveness.

The first two WIM reviews identified gaps in coordination. The 2016 review recommended that countries establish loss and damage contact points to strengthen implementation at the national level. The 2019 review acknowledged the need to enhance the WIM's knowledge function, leading to the establishment of the [Santiago Network](#), which has since become pivotal in connecting developing countries and communities with technical assistance on loss and damage.

The third review, conducted at COP30 in 2025, recalled recommendations from the first two reviews (particularly on the need for national contact points) and identified three further areas for improvement (UNFCCC, 2025b):

- Increasing the effectiveness of the WIM's implementation function
- Enhancing complementarity and coordination across the WIM Executive Committee, the Santiago Network, and the Board of the Fund for Responding to Loss and Damage
- Improving accessibility, outreach, finance and other support.

The COP30 decision requested the Executive Committee of the WIM to update its terms of reference, enhance work on non-economic losses, and develop knowledge products on managing compound risks and methodologies for assessing economic and non-economic loss and damage. On accountability and outreach, the decision welcomed efforts under the WIM to make knowledge products available in languages other than English and encouraged this to continue. It also determined that Parties must provide regular multi-year reports synthesising lessons learned and providing best practices and policy advice on loss and damage "in an accessible and user-friendly manner" (ibid.).

The WIM also offers lessons for how the JTM can anchor just transition within formal COP processes.

Loss and damage appears in COP agenda items in relation to the work of the WIM. In 2014, a year after its establishment, the WIM was already part of the formal programme of the COP. The WIM reinforces momentum for loss and damage conversations to be part of the agenda, via Article 8 of the Paris Agreement, the creation of the Santiago Network, the conduct of the Glasgow Dialogues, and the establishment of the Fund Responding to Loss and Damage. The creation of the WIM was therefore a crucial, though not the sole factor, in formalising loss and damage discussions as part of the COP agenda. Its establishment anchored loss and damage within the formal processes and introduced reporting and governance arrangements that helped sustain political attention on the issue. Similarly, the JTM (alongside the JTWP dialogues) can be a way by which just transition discussions can be integrated into COP agendas and processes. To achieve this, the JTM should have its own decision text, similar to [Decision 2/CP.19](#) for the WIM, to anchor it within formal UNFCCC governance and sustain momentum for just transition on the COP agenda.

2.2. Meaningful participation of social partners

The decision to establish a JTM reflects sustained advocacy by civil society and stakeholder organisations for embedding just transition principles in the UNFCCC framework. Their expertise should inform the JTM development process to ensure it is effective, inclusive and legitimate.

Key contributors include the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) and European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC), as well as sectoral global union federations such as IndustriALL Global Union, the International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco (IUF) and Allied Workers' Associations, which bring deep knowledge of worker priorities and sector-specific challenges.

Under ILO jurisprudence and practice, meaningful and effective social dialogue implies structured engagement, early involvement and information sharing with social partners, as well as giving them the ability to influence outcomes (ILO, 2021). The ILO has extensive knowledge competencies for designing, implementing and strengthening social dialogue mechanisms to ensure alignment with the realisation of fundamental rights to freedom of association and collective bargaining (see ILO, 2015).

The JTM process should draw on the expertise of the ILO in enabling representation of social partners, including the practical capacity-building experience of the ILO's constituent-facing Bureau for Workers' Activities (ACTRAV) and Bureau for Employers' Activities (ACT/EMP). This can be implemented, for example, through creating JTM advisory roles for key ILO stakeholders.

Appendix 1 contains a mapping of ILO programmes that could complement the JTM and inform its development process. To manage the shift to a low-carbon economy, workers, employers and governments need to have conversations and work together – not just in the energy sector, but across many different industries.

Recommendations on the process for developing a mechanism:

- The development of the JTM should be coordinated with existing bodies within the UNFCCC process. Mandates should be clearly defined to avoid overlap and fragmentation of roles. This also makes the mechanism cost-effective, and the work coherent and complementary.
- Recognising the plurality of expertise in the context of just transition, the development of the JTM should also be informed by bodies outside the UNFCCC process, including those engaged in fossil phaseout, labour, education, and humanitarian and development systems.

- Accessibility and outreach should be enhanced by the creation of technical guides and knowledge products in languages other than English, meaningfully involve Indigenous peoples, local communities, youth and children, and displaced populations in the development of knowledge products, and enhance finance and support.
- The JTM development process should draw on the expertise of civil society and social partner organisations, including the ITUC, ETUC, and sectoral global union federations such as IndustriALL Global Union, the International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco (IUF) and Allied Workers' Associations.
- The JTM development process should proactively engage the ILO, drawing on its competencies in designing and strengthening social dialogue mechanisms and the practical capacity-building experience of ACTRAV and ACT/EMP. This could be implemented through dedicated JTM advisory roles for key ILO stakeholders.

3. Functions and structure of a just transition mechanism

This section presents a detailed vision of the functions of the JTM, responding to the purposes identified in paragraph 25 of the JTWP COP30 decision text, and discusses two institutional models that could fulfil these functions.

3.1. Capacity-building

The JTM can play a key role in supporting countries to: (a) develop capacity for employment-focused sectoral transition planning; (b) anticipate the labour market impacts of the transition; and (c) invest in reskilling and upskilling pathways aligned with sectoral decarbonisation strategies.

Employment-focused sectoral transition planning benefits from a whole-of-government approach as countries often require coordinated actions across social protection, regional development, land rehabilitation and sector-specific policy areas. It also benefits from meaningful inclusion of trade unions, employers and affected communities, potentially through a formalised stakeholder engagement framework for priority sectors.

Strengthening social dialogue institutions and the organisational capacities of social partners provides a foundational condition for effective just transition policy processes (ILO, 2015). Capacity-building can enhance political support, policy integration, economic coordination, institutional durability and the credibility of transition policy packages (Crawford et al., 2025; 2026a; 2026c).

As the case studies below demonstrate, institutional capacity for just transition social dialogue varies substantially between countries. The case of **Scotland** illustrates the challenges of developing broad, whole-of-economy just transition approaches where social dialogue mechanisms are weak or insufficiently integrated into the policy process (see **Box 2.1**). By contrast, **Spain's** institutionalisation of just transition dialogue through territorial Just Transition Agreements in coal and thermal energy has fostered policy learning and strengthened political trust between government and social partners – with lessons now transferring to other sectors, including, for example, the worker-led conversion plan for the SEAT Martorell plant (see **Box 2.2**). Given globally interconnected production systems, these cases illustrate the value of internationalised capacity-building efforts that the JTM could support.

Box 2.1. Case study on sectoral social dialogue: Scotland

Scotland's just transition framework provides three key lessons on the importance of institutionalising social dialogue into formal just transition policy processes.

First, fragmented governance and accountability can constrain implementation.

Established between 2019 and 2021, the Scottish Government's just transition framework supports economic development and workforce transition in regions and communities historically dependent on North Sea oil and gas. It provides multi-stakeholder policy advice through the independent, non-statutory Just Transition Commission, which issues reports and recommendations and supports the development and monitoring of transition plans. Sectoral and regional planning is guided by the 2021 National Just Transition Planning Framework. While initially motivated by Scotland's exposure to the North Sea transition, the approach has been adopted on a whole-of-economy basis.

However, governance of the North Sea transition is distributed across multiple institutions operating at different levels. Energy policy is regulated by the UK Government, while the Scottish Government exercises devolved authority in areas central to the transition,

including skills policy, seabed leasing and aspects of industrial strategy. Industrial relations in offshore oil and gas differ from the wider UK context, with quasi-institutionalised sectoral bargaining through the multi-union Offshore Coordination Group and the voluntary Energy Services Agreement covering major firms. To date, transition governance has largely proceeded through industry-led voluntary commitments under the North Sea Transition Deal, overseen by the North Sea Transition Authority, alongside more recent measures under the North Sea Future Plan. The division of responsibilities across reserved and devolved competencies, and reliance on voluntary arrangements, has resulted in a multi-level governance framework that remains institutionally dispersed.

Second, sectoral social dialogue can advance workers' priorities, but without formal integration into the policy cycle, it tends to produce reactive rather than proactive planning. In Scotland, social dialogue has facilitated the progression of priorities into policy discussions, such as skills 'passporting' across offshore sectors and commitments to develop plans for at-risk sites, including the Mossmorran petrochemicals complex. However, links between Scotland's just transition policy process and oil and gas sectoral social dialogue mechanisms remain largely ad hoc and informal. The limited integration into formal policy planning has weakened stakeholder confidence in the practical delivery of a just transition. This contributes to a shift towards external political mobilisation rather than embedded policy co-production.

Third, in contexts with weak institutionalisation of social dialogue, capacity-building of unions and employer organisations to develop independent analysis and policy positions is essential. Delivering a just transition in these contexts relies on strong political coordination and public mobilisation capacities of stakeholders. In the North Sea context, collaboration initiatives such as the Just Transition Partnership (a non-governmental organisation-trade union forum supported by the Scottish Trades Union Congress) have enabled unions and environmental organisations to coordinate positions and generate public scrutiny of commitments, including the skills passport and Just Transition Planning Framework. Research by Friends of the Earth Scotland and Platform on oil and gas worker transition preferences fed into union and Scottish Trades Union Congress (STUC) policy processes, contributing to more adaptive and conditionally supportive responses to phaseout policy. Similarly, within Unite's petrochemicals sector, more proactive and conditional positions are linked to capacity-building through education and research sessions supported by the Global Labour Institute (Crawford et al., 2026b).

Box 2.2. Case study on sectoral social dialogue: Spain

Spain's just transition policy framework illustrates the benefits of multi-level social dialogue and the value of bottom-up sectoral planning.

First, territorial action plans provide a means to formalise multi-level social dialogue. In Spain, since 2018, 15 Just Transition Agreements (JTAs) covering all coal regions have provided a template for multi-stakeholder participation in transition planning. JTAs have extended social dialogue participation beyond traditional sectoral collective bargaining structures in coal and thermal power by including regional government, local authorities, non-governmental organisations and local communities. Spain's JTAs are anchored in [Law 7/2021](#) and the [2021 Just Transition Strategy](#) and overseen by the Just Transition Institute (ITJ). They provide tailored territorial action plans for regions affected by the closure of coal mines and coal-fired power plants, channelling funds from the EU Just Transition Fund, the Recovery and Resilience Facility, and national sources, alongside private capital, through the Just Transition Energy Tender programme. This funding supports economic activity and diversification, reskilling and upskilling workers, social, environmental and digital

infrastructure, land rehabilitation, and clean technology research and development, such as green hydrogen and energy storage.

Second, a bottom-up approach to sectoral transition planning can help reduce implementation frictions and support just distributional outcomes. For example, local knowledge on land productivity has informed effective allocation for solar, and stakeholder input into energy tenders has secured community co-benefits and investment in support of economic diversification (Just Transition Finance Lab, 2025). Territorial planning through the JTAs has strengthened the capacity of public bodies and social partners to shape policy design and implementation from the bottom up. This extends beyond participation in policy processes to influencing the criteria and requirements that govern funding allocation. Where grant conditionalities are rigid, they can limit flexibility for local and regional actors; but empowered regional institutions with strong analytical capacity and close ties to industry and union networks are better positioned to negotiate flexible, accountable arrangements suited to local circumstances (Crawford et al., 2026b). This reflects a broader strength of Spain's approach: institutional capacity has been built incrementally across both public bodies and civil society, creating durable foundations for just transition governance.

Lastly, successes in territorial sectoral planning in one sector can build overall political trust and lead to developments in other sectors. In Spain, trade unions report that political trust and policy learning engendered from the JTA process have facilitated cooperation on transitions in the automotive and transport sectors. Major union confederations have successfully promoted key reforms in favour of sustainable mobility and regulatory modernisation through the Sustainable Mobility Act and the Law for Industry and Strategic Autonomy. Unions indicate that high participation in the design of some reforms and investments included in Spain's National Recovery and Resilience Plan provided the basis for the package of sustainable mobility reforms which enabled the drawdown of Next Generation EU funds for strategic investment projects. A worker-led conversion plan for the SEAT Martorell plant was among the successful projects in the 2021 allocation round (Crawford et al., 2025).

The capacity-building function of the JTM should be designed to complement existing institutional capacities and capabilities held by various UN bodies, including the ILO, UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), UN Environment Programme (UNEP), UN Development Programme (UNDP), UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN).

The JTM should not replicate or duplicate existing capacity-building efforts. Capacity-building for stakeholder engagement, social dialogue and just transition is already embedded in numerous UN bodies and programmes. As a priority task, detailed mapping of institutional offerings can serve as an input to identify complementarities and gaps. **Appendix 1** contains an illustrative mapping of relevant ILO programmes and capacities. Through careful programme design and partnership development, the JTM can create crucial connections between initiatives, augmenting collective capacity.

Policy coordination is specifically needed across the following key bodies and programmes to increase the coherence of capacity-building and technical assistance for country-level technological, sectoral and employment transition planning:

- **The ILO Social Dialogue and Tripartism Unit (DIALOGUE):** This has core competencies providing technical support and capacity-building for designing, implementing and strengthening social dialogue mechanisms, including national tripartite councils and collective bargaining.
- **The Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN):** This promotes the transfer of technologies for low-carbon transitions, at the request of developing countries. It also provides

capacity-building and advice on policy, legal and regulatory frameworks. The JTM could ensure integration with country sectoral transition planning processes and strategies.

- The **PAGE Country and Sector Readiness Assessments** programme: This includes stakeholder and institutional capacity mapping for national transition planning. PAGE access is competitive. The JTM could expand the scope of PAGE to provide sustained institutional capacity-building by creating early engagement and support for countries which face barriers to access and extending support beyond the five-year window.

The JTM can also help proactively identify and address capacity gaps in key sectors, countries and regions where worker or producer representation is weak and provide targeted assistance for civil society actors and networks. For example, the Bureau for Workers’ activities (ACTRAV) of the ILO and the Bureau for Employers’ Activities (ACT/EMP) have established networks and direct links with workers and employers’ organisations. As part of a JTM operational arm with dedicated funding, these bodies could quickly scale-up training and engagement initiatives for workers, and advice, research support and consultancy services for organisations and networks. In coordination with the ITUC and other union confederations, the JTM could also support network development of social partners across countries and co-sponsor capacity-building initiatives.

Recommendations on the capacity-building function:

- Support countries to engage in employment-focused sectoral transition planning that institutionalises social dialogue. Sectoral planning should be aligned with pathways set out in nationally determined contributions and long-term strategies.
- Provide advice and peer-learning opportunities on, for example, the design of territorial action plans, coordination mechanisms and frameworks for participatory and experimental governance that balance top-down and bottom-up approaches.
- Build capacity of key stakeholders to participate meaningfully in social dialogue and just transition policy processes, including through providing direct support for education and training, network development and collaborative organising, and research on transition planning and design of policy positions.

3.2. Technical assistance

Parties face a complex and shifting landscape when mobilising finance for just transitions. The JTM should provide holistic technical assistance that helps countries navigate the tensions between different financing pathways, mechanisms and governance structures.

At a systemic level, financing for just transitions faces deep structural challenges that the JTM can help counteract through a technical assistance function.

Drawing on the framework developed by Wang (2025), just transition finance faces a set of underlying structural challenges which manifest as headwinds (see **Tables 2.1** and **2.2**).

Table 2.1. Structural constraints on just transition finance

Architecture	Global financial rules and institutions favour ‘bankable’ contexts, systematically locking out vulnerable communities most in need of support.
Boundaries	National, territorialised framings of justice ignore cross-border interdependence and allow harms to be shifted along global value chains.
Complexity	Standardised ‘solutions’ and checklist approaches mask context-specific needs, turning justice into procedural box-ticking rather than meaningful engagement with local realities.
Markets	Profitability and scalability dominate financial logic, sidelining community-led, redistributive and context-specific approaches to transition.
Power	Justice remains peripheral to financial and economic systems – treated as an add-on rather than a design principle embedded in political economy.

Source: Adapted from Wang (2025)

Table 2.2. Headwinds facing just transition finance

Eroding fiscal foundations	The retreat of grant-based and concessional public finance drives reliance on private capital and loan-based mechanisms. Justice goals become subordinated to market imperatives; equitable outcomes become conditional on profitability, and debt entrenches existing vulnerabilities.
Governance fragmentation	Complex, high-cost institutional architecture excludes vulnerable states through high transaction costs, overlapping rules and performative participation. Finance flows to the 'ready' rather than the 'needy', and implementation slows under bureaucratic weight.
Political legitimacy crisis	Domestic policies fluctuate, transition burdens shift across borders, trust erodes and justice narratives are weaponised rather than realised. Short political cycles make long-term investment deeply uncertain.
Transparency capture	Disclosure regimes serve investor information needs first. Data proliferates but is not oriented towards people's wellbeing – transparency without redistribution entrenches asymmetry, making finance appear cleaner on paper while injustices persist on the ground.

Source: Adapted from Wang (2025)

While the JTM cannot address the structural challenges alone, it can help mitigate headwinds by providing:

- A venue for cross-border collaboration to counteract the political legitimacy crisis and incoherence between domestic and international policy
- A space for sharing needs and strategies and facilitating support to address eroding fiscal foundations and over-reliance on market-driven finance
- A space to profile and support emerging models for Party- and place-driven collaboration to push back against governance fragmentation and its exclusionary effects
- Connections to existing UNFCCC processes to resist transparency capture and ground disclosure in broader accountability frameworks.

At a national level, the JTM can help Parties address layered coordination challenges. Just Energy Transition Partnerships (JETPs) reveal systemic challenges and shortcomings that provide lessons for JTM technical assistance delivery.

Within the JETPs, grants represented a small share of overall JETP commitments and were front-loaded in the delivery cycle, creating time-bound institutional capacity with 'cliff effects' when funding ends (Selvaraju et al., 2025). Grant allocations did not necessarily reflect national budgetary and capacity needs and often followed donor cycles which left funding gaps when these cycles ended (e.g. in South Africa, ~US\$70 million or 10% of total grants went to just transition-focused initiatives; in Indonesia, this was ~US\$25 million or 15% of total grants). The absence of a clear organising framework for grants biases activity towards initiatives that are easy to initiate but difficult to institutionalise.

Contextualised technical assistance is key for identifying just transition needs and pathways – the JTM must avoid one-size-fits-all approaches or static blueprints. Existing initiatives like JETPs hold valuable lessons, and emerging platforms (such as the Country Platform Hub announced at COP30) offer avenues to advance the principles and priorities envisioned for the JTM. Capacity-building and information-sharing support could build the planning capacity needed to coordinate across different types and sources of finance.

To enable this coordination in alignment with the principles agreed in the JTWP at COP30, the JTM should operationalise a strong definition of country ownership.

This does not require new language. The COP30 decision recognises equity and common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDR-RC), affirms that "there is no one-size-fits-all approach" and calls for avoiding exacerbating debt burdens while creating fiscal

space for low-emissions development. The JTM should operationalise these existing commitments as the basis for a strong definition of country ownership.

These principles directly support the case for differentiated access to grant-based financing. Any financing modalities supported through the JTM should include the following: a defined minimum grant share for least developed countries (LDC) and high-vulnerability emerging market and developing economy (EMDE) recipients; an explicit anti-debt-creating safeguard embedded in eligibility criteria; and a streamlined access pathway for countries with constrained institutional capacity.

To illustrate what this could enable in practice, co-design with national and local partners should be prioritised to drive economic transformation and mitigate short-termism or isolated project delivery. Country ownership must also be balanced with accountability: disbursements should be connected to observable milestones to sustain momentum across election and budget cycles. Cross-border initiatives should be identified and supported where they lower costs in multiple jurisdictions (e.g. electricity transmission, adaptation, supply chain clusters).

At the interface between policies, projects and financing mechanisms, the JTM can help Parties identify options and consider trade-offs.

The JTM can serve as a knowledge-sharing and learning platform for institutional innovations – helping Parties understand the range of options, the trade-offs involved, and how to match instruments to context. By housing dedicated capacity for technical assistance, the JTM can help surface and disseminate emerging best practice without imposing rigid templates, recognising that context-specificity and principled flexibility must coexist. Existing processes for operationalising just transition across institutional actors hold insights for the JTM.

Multilateral development banks (MDBs) offer illustrative examples of how institutions are operationalising just transition commitments in practice (Tyson et al., 2025). Broadly, MDBs are adopting two pathways for institutionalising and operationalising the just transition. MDBs increasingly recognise the importance of ensuring a ‘social licence’ for successful climate action, which goes beyond managing social risks to reflect context and transition priorities.

- First, they are connecting just transition to existing activities and instruments – e.g. through adopting environmental and social safeguard (ESS) policies or leveraging trust funds like the Climate Investment Funds (CIF).
- Second, they are developing novel approaches. For example, the Asian Development Bank (ADB) is using regional and sectoral pilots; the African Development Bank (AfDB) has developed a just transition theory of change; and the World Bank has produced a taxonomy for just transitions in coal regions, as well as bespoke financing mechanisms like Amazonia bond frameworks, and provided technical advice and project preparation support.

However, these cases also illustrate challenges and limitations. The increasing reliance on derisking and guarantees to ‘crowd-in’ private finance can place large and difficult-to-control financial burdens on states. The case of Vietnam illustrates how the use of feed-in tariffs can attract domestic and regional financiers who have different perceptions of the risk environment, accelerating renewables adoption while avoiding offtake commitments, compensation for project delays, or incurring dollar-denominated debt (Larsen, 2026).

Together, these initiatives illustrate that there is no standard ‘playbook’ for operationalising the just transition. Adapting high-level just transition commitments to operating routines is a complex organisational challenge. Balancing a principled approach to just transition technical advice with context-specific adaptation is inherently challenging; focusing on just processes (rather than prescribing outcomes) offers one strategy.

The JTM's technical assistance function should help Parties navigate systemic headwinds, strengthen national coordination capacities in line with country-owned transition pathways, and support institutional learning so that emerging practice in one context can inform adaptation in others.

Recommendations on the technical assistance function:

- The JTM should provide holistic technical assistance that helps countries navigate the tensions between different financing pathways, mechanisms and governance structures. This should complement existing channels for technical assistance (such as via MDBs) and could connect or refer to these existing channels where pathways identified align with those other offerings.
- JTM technical assistance could help Parties confront 'headwinds' from structural challenges, leveraging opportunities for cross-border collaboration, facilitating space for sharing needs and strategies between Parties and local or other non-state actors, profiling and supporting emerging models for Party- and place-driven collaboration, while helping connect to existing UNFCCC processes.
- JTM technical assistance could help Parties address layered coordination challenges. Dedicated capacity can help avoid static blueprints or one-size-fits-all approaches and offer contextualised assistance that responds to specific needs. This should also embed a strong definition of country ownership, building on the principles of paragraph 12 of the JTWP COP30 decision.
- JTM technical assistance can help Parties identify options and consider trade-offs between different policy, project and financing mechanism options. By housing dedicated capacity for technical assistance, the JTM can help surface and disseminate emerging best practice without imposing rigid templates, recognising that context-specificity and principled flexibility must coexist.

3.3. Knowledge-sharing

The JTM can play a crucial role as a knowledge broker, and it can act as a permanent observatory to centralise information-sharing on just transition planning and implementation. This should complement the JTM's capacity-building and technical assistance functions discussed above.

The unique mandate of a JTM within the architecture of the UNFCCC

While there are a broad range of national and regional initiatives seeking to share resources on just transition planning, design and implementation, the landscape is fragmented and disconnected from the global goals of the Paris Agreement and the principle of CBDR-RC. As part of the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement structure, the JTM is uniquely placed to foster knowledge-sharing on just transition pathways that accounts for the cross-border implications of climate transition policies (Wang and Cerrato, 2024). With support from Parties, observer groups and international organisations, it can provide a platform for technical discussions and information-sharing on transition risks, impacts and policy solutions.

Providing a space for Parties to collectively build and access a shared evidence base can help encourage innovation and unlock deadlocks on negotiations elsewhere by the Conference of the Parties (COP) and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA). Research carried out in national contexts has shown that deliberative processes can help overcome polarisation, shift opinion on climate change among citizens, and lead to transformative effects on the discourse and opinions of participants (Machani et al., 2025). While this is not a direct parallel to international negotiations, where negotiators arrive with pre-set institutional mandates rather than personal priorities, structured dialogue can still add value. Deliberative processes typically consist of a 'learning' phase, a 'deliberation' phase supported by facilitators, and a 'decision-making' phase. The latter phase is already built into the

JTWP process. Institutionalising a regular ‘learning’ phase through the JTM offers an opportunity to move towards consensus on just transition pathways. This is particularly important in areas like the phaseout of fossil fuels, which remain a highly polarising issue in negotiations. In facilitating knowledge-sharing, the JTM can at least progress Parties’ technical understanding on the risks, impacts and opportunities of phaseout policies (see **Box 2.3**).

Box 2.3. Why knowledge-sharing on fossil fuel phaseout matters

An institutionalised platform and regular cycle for knowledge-sharing through the JTM is important for areas like fossil fuel phaseout, which involve significant political, social and economic concerns. National and regional transitions away from fossil fuels, and the impacts of these transitions, are globally connected (Newell et al., 2026). The financing and production of fossil fuels are globally organised (ibid.). International cooperation is essential to ensure equity in the transition. Knowledge-sharing and open discussion on how these transitions can be carefully managed to ensure sustainable development and equitable outcomes can help foster consensus over time. Institutionalising a knowledge-sharing forum within the formal negotiations process ensures participation from all Parties.

Various international platforms and initiatives (the G20, G7, and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum (APEC), UN Sustainable Development Goals, and COP26, COP27 and COP28) have attempted to coordinate on fossil fuel phaseout, mostly by announcing joint commitments to phase out *inefficient* fossil fuel subsidies. However, these initiatives have lacked clarity across countries on, for example, the scope of subsidies covered (Hizliok et al., 2024). Cross-Party platforms like the JTM are important for building shared knowledge on more technical questions on operationalisation, such as how to develop guidelines to map and identify these subsidies (ibid.). To remain useful and relevant, the JTM must ensure it stays connected to broader international developments. This includes being aware of and engaged with international events such as the upcoming [Conference on Transitioning Away from Fossil Fuels](#), co-hosted by Colombia and the Netherlands in April.

A priority task should be to systematically consolidate and categorise information across various platforms already used by key stakeholders active in just transition policymaking and research.

It is crucial that the JTM does not duplicate or disregard existing initiatives that have emerged to track and understand diverse just transition approaches. However, existing resources with global outreach are often available in English only. Recognising this, the JTM can play a crucial role in enhancing accessibility by translating knowledge products across languages. This includes the following resources – note that this list is not exhaustive.

- Region- or sector-specific knowledge repositories, such as:
 - The European Union [Just Transition Platform Knowledge Hub](#), which provides resources to support stakeholders implementing just transitions across Europe, and the [JTPeers Expert Database](#) – a database of local experts across regions involved in the European Union Just Transition Fund.
 - [South to South Just Transitions](#) covering research and stakeholder engagement across nine countries in the Global South (Argentina, Bangladesh, Colombia, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Laos, Malawi and Vietnam).
 - [Just Energy Transition in Coal Regions Knowledge Hub](#), which collates information from articles, research papers, news stories and events related to just energy transitions away from coal.

- Global knowledge repositories:
 - Databases that collect and track climate change laws and policies globally, such as [Climate Change Laws of the World](#), [Climate Policy Monitor](#), and the [Inclusive Forum on Carbon Mitigation Approaches Climate Policy Database](#).
 - Assessment tools that provide country-level indicators for just transition policies and international climate finance contributions, such as [Assessing Sovereign Climate-related Opportunities and Risks \(ASCOR\)](#).¹
 - Database of just transition initiatives and projects, like the [JUST Stories](#) project.
 - Guidance on planning climate transitions, such as the [Just Transition Planning Toolbox](#).
- International green transition research networks and platforms:
 - [ILO Green Jobs Assessment Institutions Network \(GAIN\)](#), which develops tools to help understand the effects of green policies on employment.
 - [Green Growth Knowledge Partnership \(GGKP\)](#), which provides three knowledge platforms: [Green Policy Platform](#), [Green Industry Platform](#) and [Green Finance Platform](#).

In line with the principle of CBDR-RC, the knowledge-building arm of the JTM should remain cognisant of when regionalisation of information is necessary.

Global standards and pathways do not always consider the local realities and development priorities of EMDEs (see Recommendation 5 in [GRI, 2024](#)). This can constrain financial flows. The lack of regional nuance in typical climate assessments may lead to investors withdrawing from high-emitting EMDEs in order to decarbonise their investment portfolios ([Scheer and Nuzzo, 2024](#)).

Contextualised pathways and metrics, such as regionalised emissions benchmarks, enable both public and private investors to undertake transition planning in EMDEs, taking into account their development priorities and differing starting points ([Gilbey et al., 2025](#)). The JTM can provide a credible platform for knowledge-sharing that provides direct support to EMDEs in their development of sectoral pathways for highest-emitting and urgent sector sectors (e.g. mining, agriculture, forestry and other land use, and manufacturing) ([GRI, 2024](#)).

To support countries in enhancing adaptation and climate resilience in the context of just transitions, the knowledge-sharing function of the JTM should also strengthen awareness, availability and access of weather and climate information (WCI).

WCI forms a key part of climate risk and vulnerability assessments, early warning systems and early action ([Leiter et al., 2025](#)). It informs climate-proofed infrastructure and services, and strategies for risk transfer, such as through insurance and social protection ([Dookie, 2024](#)). This is a central part of delivering a just transition, as WCI can inform mapping of hazard-prone areas, which can then inform policy planning and development of prevention measures or evacuation plans, and prioritise the safety of at-risk populations. Supporting the gathering, dissemination, access, use and uptake of WCI can also empower communities to take agency and enable them to make informed decisions on how to respond to climate risks ([Leiter et al., 2025](#)).

However, there are currently barriers to WCI access, use and uptake ([Dookie et al., 2023](#)). This includes a lack of awareness of the existence of WCI and how to apply it. For example, there can be uncertainty on how to identify which climate models best fit a particular context, or limited opportunities for countries to engage with WCI providers to ask questions and clarify information

¹ The tool is now exploring adding a sectoral scope to the framework ([Hizliok et al., 2025](#)) which would enable the users to make comparisons across countries based on their sectoral emissions profile and decarbonisation policies.

(Dookie et al., 2019; Leiter et al., 2025). Even in contexts where there is awareness or interest in WCI, a lack of funding, technical expertise or digital infrastructure can constrain implementation. Together with the capacity-building and technical assistance functions, the JTM can foster enabling conditions for the collection and use of WCI.

Recommendations on the knowledge-sharing function:

- The JTM should provide a permanent observatory where practical resources and expertise can be collated and managed, filling knowledge gaps identified by the Parties in the Just Transition Work Programme dialogues. This can facilitate open technical discussions on the risks, impacts and opportunities of phaseout policies.
- The operating and implementing body of the JTM should, as a priority, systematically consolidate and categorise information across various knowledge-sharing platforms already used by key stakeholders active in just transition policymaking and research. The JTM can enhance accessibility by providing resources to create knowledge products in languages other than English.
- Recognising the cross-cutting nature of just transition, the knowledge consolidation process should consult and build on existing expertise across constituencies, including: Business and Industry (BINGO), Environmental (ENGO), Farmers, Indigenous Peoples (IPO), Local Government and Municipal Authorities (LGMA), Research and Independent (RINGO), Trade Union (TUNGO), Women and Gender (WGC), Youth (YOUNGO) and other coordinated stakeholder groups, such as the Disability Caucus.
- The knowledge-sharing function of the JTM should adhere to CBDR-RC and provide targeted knowledge generation and support for regionalisation of resources, where necessary. For example, to ensure public and private financial flows towards low-carbon transitions in EMDEs, the JTM can support development of, and knowledge-sharing on, sectoral pathways for high-emitting sectors in EMDEs, accounting for their development priorities, differing starting points and practical data challenges.
- Support countries to strengthen awareness, access and use of weather and climate information (WCI) as part of climate-resilient just transition planning, including by facilitating knowledge-sharing on effective uses of WCI and addressing barriers such as limited funding and lack of technical expertise or digital infrastructure.

3.4. Institutional forms for the JTM: comparison and concluding recommendations

The institutional structures that operationalise the JTM should correspond to the agreed functions. Drawing on existing mechanisms and initiatives within the UNFCCC process, we summarise several options that respond to the details of the functions proposed earlier in this section. Importantly, these options can also be used in combination with each other.

Based on the desired functions of the JTM outlined in this submission (capacity-building, technical assistance and knowledge-sharing), we believe a dual-arm structure comprising **a policy arm and an operational arm with an embedded funding coordination hub** is the model best suited to performing the functions summarised above.

The policy arm should provide analysis, develop frameworks and toolkits, and coordinate with existing UNFCCC bodies. The operational arm should deliver demand-driven technical assistance, capacity-building and knowledge brokerage, hosted by or networked through existing UN agencies. Financing coordinated through the JTM should adhere to the principles agreed in paragraph 12 of the JTWP COP30 decision text. This structure mirrors existing models within the UNFCCC – notably, the Technology Mechanism. Parallel initiatives offer important insights into how to mitigate the risk of fragmentation between bodies (e.g. WIM) and the financing arrangement of the Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT). See **Table 3.1**.

Table 3.1. Institutional forms for the JTM: comparison of indicative options and precedents

Option (and corresponding capacity)	Description	Precedents (see Appendix 2 for details)	Summary of strengths and limitations
Expert committee as policy advisory body	A constituted body of experts, with balanced representation between developed and developing countries, with a mandate to analyse just transition policies, develop frameworks and toolkits, provide recommendations to COP/CMA and subsidiary bodies, and liaise with other UNFCCC bodies and external institutions.	Technology Executive Committee (TEC); Adaptation Committee; WIM Executive Committee (ExCom)	<p>Strengths: Provides dedicated analytical capacity; can produce authoritative guidance; creates institutional continuity; moderate cost; familiar institutional form within the UNFCCC.</p> <p>Limitations: Advisory-only – does not on its own directly deliver technical assistance to countries. It relies on other bodies and institutions for implementation.</p>
Dual-arm mechanism (policy body and an operational network)	<p>A mechanism with two complementary arms: (a) a policy committee providing analysis, recommendations and coordination (essentially the expert committee structure above), and (b) an operational centre or network that delivers demand-driven technical assistance and matchmaking on just transition planning, funding, implementation, and monitoring.</p> <p>The operational arm could be hosted by an existing UN agency or consortium. Precedents include UNEP/UNIDO hosting the CTCN or the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR)/UN Office for Project Services (UNOPS) hosting the Santiago Network. This can be completed with a funded network of national focal points and technical partners.</p>	Technology Mechanism – TEC and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN); WIM ExCom and Santiago Network	<p>Strengths: Clear alignment with the scope of the COP30 decision text. Similar to existing models within the UNFCCC.</p> <p>Limitations: Higher cost and institutional complexity. Requires careful management and design to avoid replicating the CTCN’s challenge of insufficient and unpredictable voluntary funding. More time to operationalise.</p>
Coordination hub with dedicated funding window	A support unit or hub that coordinates with the existing multi-donor trust fund or operates a dedicated funding window for just transition capacity-building. Funding could come through a dedicated window within an existing mechanism (e.g. a just transition window within the Green Climate Fund [GCF] or Global Environment Facility GEF) or a new fund.	Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) model; NDC Partnership, elements of the GCF readiness programme	<p>Strengths: Window for earmarked funding provides concrete resources to countries. CBIT illustrates how mechanisms initiated through the UNFCCC can be operationalised through an existing UNFCCC financial mechanism (e.g. the GEF) without requiring a new stand-alone institution.</p> <p>Limitations: Dependent on donor willingness to capitalise a new funding window. Risk that funding is insufficient and fragmented across multiple implementing partners.</p>

The process of developing the JTM should be iterative. The UNFCCC’s country-owned and country-led approaches emphasise continuous stakeholder engagement, allowing countries to refine their plans over time in response to evolving national circumstances, as well as the availability of technical and financial resources. It should learn from existing UNFCCC institutional arrangements to avoid fragmentation and operational delays, while also learning from other ILO or broader initiatives that embed principles of meaningful participation and social dialogue.

Functionally, the JTM should support countries through three mutually reinforcing areas: (a) capacity-building for employment-focused sectoral transition strategies grounded in social dialogue, (b) technical assistance to mobilise and coordinate financing for just transitions while safeguarding national ownership, and (c) knowledge-sharing through the establishment of a permanent observatory that consolidates resources and facilitates learning across countries and sectors. International cooperation is the crucial connection between the above mutually reinforcing functions. The JTM’s value lies precisely in linking these functions within a framework for multilateral dialogue.

References

- Advisory Board to the Climate Technology Centre and Network (2025) AB/2025/25/13.2.a, 26th meeting, 15–17 September. https://www.ctc-n.org/sites/default/files/2025-08/AB_2025_26_13.2.a_Interim%20Financial%20Report%20and%20Briefing.pdf
- Byrnes R and Surminski S (2019) Addressing the impacts of climate change through an effective Warsaw International Mechanism on Loss and Damage. Blog post, 16 October. Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment. <https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/news/addressing-the-impacts-of-climate-change-through-an-effective-warsaw-international-mechanism-on-loss-and-damage/>
- Crawford B, Dumas M, Green F, Petrescu I and Stefan G (2025) Evidence of labour unions' understanding of, perceived impacts of, and responses to the EU Just Transition towards climate neutrality for Germany, Romania, Spain, and the UK. Unpublished work. Report submitted to the European Commission.
- Crawford B, Dumas M and Green F (2026a, forthcoming) How can trade unions act strategically in response to decarbonization? Union strategic capacity and automotive transition policies in Germany, Spain and the UK. *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research*. Special Issue: 'Workers as climate actors: what can unions do about climate change?'
- Crawford B, Dumas M and Green F (2026b, forthcoming) *Carbon captured? Union politics and fossil energy phaseout in the UK North Sea transition*. Grantham Research Institute Working Paper Series.
- Crawford B, Dumas M, Hernandez Carballo I, Garcia X, Petrescu I and Stefan G (2026c) *Assessing Institutional Capacity for a Just Transition: case studies in focus regions*. Unpublished work. Report submitted to the European Commission.
- Dookie DS (2024) *The essential role of climate information systems for early action interventions and resilience-focused decision-making*. ODI Working Paper. London: ODI. www.odi.org/en/publications/role-of-climate-information-systems
- Dookie DS, Conway D and Dessai S (2023) Perspectives on climate information use in the Caribbean. *Frontiers in Climate* 5: 1022721. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fclim.2023.1022721>
- Dookie DS, Enenkel M and Spence J (2019) From science to science-based: using state-of-the-art climate information to strengthen DRR in Small Island States. In: Khonje WH, and Mitchell T (eds) *Strengthening disaster resilience in small states*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat. <https://doi.org/10.14217/04f647b3-en>
- Gilbey B, Scheer A and Rose A (2025) *Sector transition plans: a bridge between national ambition and company transition plans*. International Transition Plan Network and the TPI Global Climate Transition Centre. <https://itpn.global/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/Sector-Transition-Plans-A-bridge-between-national-ambition-and-company-transition-plans.pdf>
- Global Environment Facility [GEF] (2025) Progress report on the capacity-building initiative for transparency. 70th GEF council meeting, 15–19 December. https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2025-11/EN_GEF.C.70.Inf_.13_Progress%20Report%20on%20the%20CBIT.pdf
- Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment [GRI] (2024) *Submission to the United Arab Emirates Just Transition Work Programme topic for the second dialogue*. London: Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment, London School of Economics and Political Science. <https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/publication/submission-to-the-united-arab-emirates-just-transition-work-programme-on-the-topic-of-the-second-dialogue/>
- Hizliok S, Monsignor G and Scheer A (2024) Closing off the taps: time for the G20 to phase out fossil fuel subsidies. Blog post, 15 November. Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment. <https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/news/closing-off-the-taps-time-for-the-g20-to-phase-out-fossil-fuel-subsidies/>
- International Labour Organization [ILO] (2015) *Guidelines for a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all*. Geneva: ILO.

<https://www.ilo.org/publications/guidelines-just-transition-towards-environmentally-sustainable-economies>

- International Labour Organization [ILO] (2021) *The self-assessment method for social dialogue institutions (SAM-SDI)*. Geneva: ILO. <https://www.ilo.org/publications/self-assessment-method-social-dialogue-institutions-sam-sdi>
- Just Transition Finance Lab (2025) *Case study: Spain's just transition energy tenders*. London: Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment, London School of Economics and Political Science.
- Larsen M (2026) *Lessons from attracting international capital for renewables in Vietnam*. London: Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment, London School of Economics and Political Science. <https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/publication/lessons-from-attracting-international-capital-for-renewables-in-vietnam/>
- Leiter T, Dookie D, Chan T, Gannon K and Wang J-A (2025) *Submission to the Third Dialogue of the UAE Just Transition Work Programme: approaches to enhance adaptation and climate resilience in the context of just transitions*. London: Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment, London School of Economics and Political Science. <https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/publication/submission-to-the-third-dialogue-of-the-uae-just-transition-work-programme-approaches-to-enhance-adaptation-and-climate-resilience-in-the-context-of-just-transitions/>
- Machani A, Averchenkova A, Accogli A and Torney D (2025) The impact of deliberative mini-publics: lessons from Belgium, Ireland, and Sweden. *Zenodo*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17527119>
- Newell P, Slothuus L, Daley F and Hernández DS (2026) Power in fossil fuel supply-side policy: closing down and opening up opportunities to phase out fossil fuel production. *Global Environmental Politics* 26(1): 79–99.
- Scheer A and Nuzzo C (2024) How can climate assessment tools support investment in emerging markets? Blog post, 22 January. Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment. <https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/news/how-can-climate-assessment-tools-support-investment-in-emerging-markets/>
- Selvaraju S, Indah Pratiwi A, Sabogal L and Ahlgren V (2025) *Just Energy Transition Partnership grants and country platforms: lessons from Indonesia and South Africa*. London: Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment. London School of Economics and Political Science. <https://justtransitionfinance.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/Just-Energy-Transition-Partnership-grants-and-country-platforms-lessons-from-Indonesia-and-South-Africa.pdf>
- The Loss and Damage Collaboration (2025) What is at stake under the third review of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage at COP30? Blog post, 8 November. <https://www.lossanddamagecollaboration.org/resources/what-is-at-stake-under-the-third-review-of-the-warsaw-international-mechanism-for-loss-and-damage-at-cop-30>
- Tyson J, Orme L, Charkowsa Z and Dagnino Conteras V (2025) *Multilateral development bank green, social and sustainability (GSS) bonds: lessons for private investors*. London: Just Transition Finance Lab, London School of Economics and Political Science. <https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/publication/multilateral-development-banks-use-of-green-social-and-sustainability-gss-bonds-lessons-for-private-investors/>
- UNFCCC (2013) Decision 2/CP.19. <https://unfccc.int/documents/8106#beg>
- UNFCCC (2015) *Technology mechanism: enhancing climate technology development and transfer*. https://unfccc.int/ttclear/misc_/StaticFiles/gnwoerk_static/TEM/0e7cc25f3f9843ccb98399df4d47e219/174ad939936746b6bfad76e30a324e78.pdf
- UNFCCC (2025a) CMA 7. <https://unfccc.int/documents/653888>
- UNFCCC (2025b) Draft decision [-/CP.30] [-/CMA.7]. https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/WIM_review_cop30_1.pdf
- Wang J (2025) *Headwinds and structural constraints: mapping forces challenging just transition finance*. London: Just Transition Finance Lab, London School of Economics and Political Science.

- Wang J and Cerrato D (2024) *Interconnected justice: understanding the cross-border implications of climate transition policies*. Taskforce on Net Zero Policy. <https://public.unpri.org/taskforce-on-net-zero-policy/interconnected-justice-understanding-the-cross-border-implications-of-climate-transition-policies/12853.article#storytext-end>
- Wang J and Chan T (2024) *Submission to the United Arab Emirates Just Transition Work Programme on the dialogues mandated by decision FCCC/PA/CMA/2023/L.14*. London: Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment, London School of Economics and Political Science. <https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/publication/submission-to-the-united-arab-emirates-just-transition-work-programme-on-the-dialogues-mandated-by-decision-fccc-pa-cma-2023-l-14/>
- Wang J and Robins N (2024) *Submission to the United Arab Emirates Just Transition Work Programme topics for the dialogues*. London: Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment, London School of Economics and Political Science. <https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/publication/submission-to-the-united-arab-emirates-just-transition-work-programme-topics-for-the-dialogues/>

Appendix 1. Mapping JTM complementarities with ILO programmes and initiatives

As an intermediate step in the development of this submission, the authors conducted additional mapping of ILO activities that complement our vision for the JTM and align with the functions referenced in the COP30 decision text. Learning from – and building upon – existing initiatives is one way to avoid duplicating efforts and revisiting operational challenges.

Mapping of ILO initiatives and bodies

1. High-level coordination, knowledge production and guidance/toolkits

- Standard-setting and governance (conventions, standards, guidance)
- Just Transition Guidelines and guidance for social partners across thematic policy areas (including Green Employment Diagnostics for a Just Transition framework for assessment)
- Green Jobs Assessment Institutions Network (GAIN): supports a network of academic and individual researchers with methodology for country-level green jobs assessment reports
- Green Growth Knowledge Partnership (GGKP): platforms that share research, case studies, tools for policymakers, business and financial actors
- Constituent facing: Bureau for Workers' Activities (ACTRAV): Workers' organisations/ILO policy interface
- Constituent facing: Bureau for Employers' Activities (ACT/EMP): Workers' organisations/ILO policy interface

2. Direct on-the-ground assistance, including enterprise-level programmes

- ACTRAV: advocacy and policy advice; and capacity-building (training and worker education programmes, regional seminars):
 - This includes ad hoc examples of ACTRAV provision of technical and financial resources, including engaging researchers to inform union policy positions on labour law reforms, and convening national seminars, with a deliberate effort to build alliances between unions and academia/universities
 - Development Cooperation and Workers' Organisations
 - Grant-funded projects supporting trade union knowledge and skills base for skills development
 - Trade Unions in Transformation programme: equips unions to navigate shifting labour markets, climate change and digitalisation
 - Toolkits, knowledge exchange, commissioned research
 - ITCILO report plans for four Global Workers' Academies and six Regional Academies for workers' training
 - Country-level workshops
- ACTEMP: organisational development, policy guidance, research and training
- The International Training Centre of the ILO (ITCILO) provides a cross-cutting delivery platform for many ILO capacity-building offers (training, advice and consultancy services for individuals and organisations)
- Targeted country-level or sectoral implementation and specialised programmes (including enterprise-level models), e.g.:

- Sustaining Competitive and Responsible Enterprises (SCORE): technical assistance: training for SMEs and workers
- ILO/IFC Better Work Global Programme: garment sector conditions, rights and competitiveness: factory level assessment, advice and training, facilitating dialogue. Multi-donor multi-phase
- Partnership for Action on Green Economy (PAGE) (with UNEP, UNDP, UNIDO, and UNITAR) to support countries in developing policies that combine green growth with inclusive development:
 - Provides tailored technical support for green job creation, policy reform and social equity
 - Dedicated country and sector and policy readiness assessments for green transition (e.g. Green Jobs and Just Transition Policy Readiness Assessment in the Energy Sector in Indonesia)
 - Ad hoc PAGE-linked workshops (e.g. organising Senegal waste-pickers)

Appendix 2. Existing UNFCCC mechanisms and frameworks

This appendix sets out additional information on existing mechanisms and frameworks that the process and structure of the JTM can draw on. The Technology Mechanism illustrates one form for a mechanism under the UNFCCC. The Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency illustrates a mechanism responding to Paris Agreement commitments that mobilises funding to support Parties.

UNFCCC: Technology Mechanism

The Technology Mechanism consists of two complementary arms (UNFCCC, 2015). The Technology Executive Committee (TEC), which focuses on policy and is made up of 20 experts from developed and developing countries who carry out analysis and synthesis, produce policy recommendations, facilitate stakeholder engagement, and liaise with other UNFCCC bodies. The Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) is the operational arm, hosted by UNEP in collaboration with UNIDO. It consists of 11 partner institutions with expertise in climate technologies, and facilitates a network of national, regional, sectoral and international technology centres, networks, organisations and private sector entities. It provides technical assistance, access to information, and scaling up of international collaboration. National Designated Entities (NDEs) serve as country focal points for free advice. The annual budget target of the CTCN is approximately US\$10 million per year and in recent years, roughly 60% of the budget went to technical assistance (Advisory Board to the CTCN, 2025). It derives funding from voluntary contributions from countries, UNFCCC financial mechanisms (the Adaptation Fund, Green Climate Fund and Global Environment Facility) and other mechanisms like the NDC Partnership (ibid.).

UNFCCC: Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT)

The CBIT was established in 2016 to help developing countries meet enhanced transparency requirements under Article 13 of the Paris Agreement. The CBIT operates through a multi-layered architecture: country-level projects tailored to national needs; a Global Support Programme (CBIT-GSP) implemented by UNEP through the UNEP Copenhagen Climate Centre; and 10 regional Transparency Networks covering all developing countries, facilitating peer exchange (Global Environment Facility, 2025). The CBIT was operational within six months of the Paris Agreement's adoption – a notably fast timeline for a multilateral initiative. To date, 109 projects have been supported by US\$195.3 million in funding under the CBIT (GEF, 2025).