



TWN

4

BELEM CLIMATE NEWS UPDATE
PUBLISHED BY THIRD WORLD NETWORK

12 November
2025

Strong and united call from developing countries for a Just Transition Mechanism

Belém, Nov 12 (Hilary Kung): At the inaugural contact group meeting of the Just Transition Work Programme (JTWP) in Belém held on 12 Nov. at the on-going climate talks, developing countries, led by the **G77 and China**, presented a unified front in advocating for the creation of a Just Transition Mechanism. Their call emphasized the need to strengthen international cooperation and ensure that just transitions are equitable, inclusive, and responsive to the diverse needs of all nations.

Egypt, for the **G77 and China** presented the group's proposal, which outlined the objectives, key functions and features of the mechanism. The proposal was strongly supported by all developing countries including the **Independent Alliance of Latin American and the Caribbean Nations (AILAC)**, the **African Group (AG)**, the **Least Developed Countries (LDCs)**, the **Like-Minded Developing Countries (LMDC)**, the **Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS)**, and the **Arab Group**.

However, developed countries including **Japan**, **Norway**, **United Kingdom (UK)**, the **Environmental Integrity Group (EIG)**, **Australia**, **Canada** and the **European Union (EU)**, did not support the G77/China proposal.

The contact group convened on 12 Nov and is Co-chaired by **Federica Fricano (Italy)** and **Joseph Teo (Singapore)**. The Co-chairs proposed to start with the [informal note](#) transmitted from the 62nd sessions of the UNFCCC's Subsidiary Bodies (SB62) held in June 2025, focusing first on the three areas that are least defined. (These are the three main areas, each with a range of options, in the informal note prepared by the co-chair in June 2025).

The three main areas include: (i) the question of how the JTWP should advance work, whether through improving existing modalities, new institutional arrangements or defer to 2026; (ii) the manner in which high level messages from the dialogues held should be reflected in the JTWP decision; (iii) and a placeholder on promoting international cooperation and addressing the concerns with climate change related to trade-restrictive unilateral measures (UTMs).

When the Co-chairs proposed to start discussions on the high-level messages from the dialogues, the **G77 and China** requested that discussions begin with the focus on institutional arrangements, as Parties needed more time to review the fourth dialogue .

TWN
Third World Network

Third World Network is an independent non-profit international research and advocacy organization involved in bringing about a greater articulation of the needs, aspirations and rights of the peoples in the South and in promoting just, equitable and ecological development.

Address 131, Jalan Macalister, 10400, Penang, MALAYSIA.

Tel 60-4-2266728/2266159 Fax 60-4-2264505

E-mail tw@twnetwork.org Website <https://twn.my/>

report and the annual summary report of JTWP dialogues, which were just released few days before the start of COP30. Most Parties supported this request, except **Japan**, which raised concerns about the informal note and proposed projecting the text on the screen for a line-by-line negotiation, and to also focus on the “controversial issues.”

Parties agreed to begin deliberations on how the JTWP should advance work.

Egypt for the **G77/China** presented the Group’s proposal to establish a just transitions mechanism to systematically integrate the principles of the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement (PA) into the JTWP.

The G77 and China said that the new mechanism would aim to ensure the operationalization of the principles of fairness, equity, and common but differentiated responsibilities and respective Capabilities (CBDR-RC) in climate action across all levels of implementation in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication; enhance understanding and execution of all elements of the JTWP consistent with paragraph 2 of decision 3/CMA.5 (the 2023 Dubai decision); provide a structure for effective information exchange, facilitation, and cooperation at international and national levels; offer coherent, action-oriented, and inclusive support for implementing national just transition pathways, with international cooperation and multilateralism at its core, among others.

Egypt explained further that some of the key functions of the proposed mechanism include: the provision of technical assistance and facilitate knowledge and exchange between Parties; promote international cooperation and mobilise resources for just transition pathways across all sectors and thematic areas; assess support gaps and recommend actionable solutions, among others.

The Group also emphasized that the mechanism should be party-led, bottom-up, and with a multi-stakeholder approach; be non-prescriptive, complementary, and non-duplicative; focused on practical implementation and delivering tangible benefits and respective of national sovereignty.

Chile, for **AILAC**, highlighted that discussions on institutional arrangements respond to the real challenges faced by countries. It underscored that

establishing the just transition mechanism is essential to strengthen the agenda nationally and internationally, enhance efficiency and effectiveness, and ensure the JTWP’s continued relevance ahead of its 2026 review.

Tanzania, for the **AG** said the mechanism must contribute to sustainable development, promote clean cooking and access to energy, and enhance climate resilience, all supported by international cooperation.

Ethiopia, for the **LDCs**, said it expects to see the relevant paragraphs in the informal note be updated to reflect the G77/China’s proposal and emphasized that the JTWP needs to advance work by coordinating to support the implementation of just transitions through finance, technology transfer, and capacity building, recognizing the systemic inequalities and the different starting points among countries and the special circumstances of LDCs. It also called for universal access to clean affordable renewable energy, eradication of poverty, sustainable development and facilitate the right to development. It also highlighted the need to discuss how to improve the existing modalities of the JTWP and that these are not mutually exclusive to the proposal of establishing a new institutional arrangement.

Saudi Arabia for the **LMDC** also expressed strong support for the just transitions mechanism adding that the “mechanism would provide coherent, action-oriented, and inclusive support for implementing nationally-defined just transition pathways, with the right to development, international cooperation and multilateralism at its core”.

Fiji, for **AOSIS**, said just transition needs a transitioning away from fossil fuels and that the International Court of Justice (ICJ) has recognized just and fast transition in line with best available science. Elaborating further, it said global energy transition means massive challenges and this is one of the reasons for this work programme to ensure that the transition is just.

Norway said that it will be much more efficient to use existing mechanisms that Parties have already established under the PA, especially on the means of implementation since there are already in place institutions such as the Technology Mechanism. It warned against duplicating the work of institutions adding that establishing a new mechanism would

take easily five years.

It also warned that there are serious problems with funding as currently less than 50% of activities are funded under the core budget and that new institutional arrangements would require more funds. It then suggested that Parties focus on giving guidance to existing institutions on how to implement just transitions in their respective institutions.

India commented that the establishment of the just transitions mechanism can allow Parties to move beyond just discussions and provide space for exploring concrete ways in which just transitions can be implemented.

“We are discussing this issue here, because we know that transitions can very easily be unjust, denying those who have contributed the least to the problem of climate change, the right to develop and burdening them with unfair mitigation burdens and costs. The impact of this on developing countries is not abstract, but it has real consequences for communities, the formal and informal sector workers in our countries,” said India further.

In response to Norway’s concern about duplication, India said, “We have heard some of our colleagues speak about duplication, especially with the Technology Mechanism. However, we think the establishment of the (JT) mechanism can allow us to explore the relationship between technology and society. We are confident that we can collectively find ways in which we avoid duplication...”

The **EU** emphasised on the need to “capitalise on the substantive work” that Parties have done for the past 2 years, noting that the key messages from the third and forth dialogues are particularly important. It reiterated that Parties should be given sufficient time for discussion, as otherwise, it would be “hard to discuss institutional arrangements without the substance”. The EU then sought clarification on the G77/China proposal, specifically on what substance the mechanism would be focusing on. It also highlighted that there are many initiatives that Parties should seek to build upon, strengthen complementarity and enhance synergies. At this stage, however, the EU

noted it that it is “unclear how the suggested mechanism would avoid the duplication”. It also added that the EU intends to engage constructively to see how to enhance just transitions domestically

Switzerland, for the **EIG**, said its group supported improving existing modalities instead of new institutional arrangements.

The **UK** said that it does not support the proposal on a new institutional arrangement and had set out extensive concerns in this regard. It then highlighted two key questions, that it said, remain unanswered: what is the function and value add of the G77 proposal that are distinct from existing initiatives; and why is something new needed since there are already existing institutions/initiatives. It echoed Norway that a new arrangement may take years to be operationalised and it will not achieve the intended results.

It also said that just transitions have two aspects - one is ambition, which is the destination; and another is the how we get there, which is the journey. “JTWP must represent both aspects while leaving no one leaving”, said the UK further.

The UK also commented that in previous discussions, “just transition” is being used to reduce ambition and highlighted that temperature goal (under the PA) is inextricable and must be recognised and supported AOSIS’s statement regarding the transitioning away from fossil fuels.

Japan said it is necessary to map all existing initiatives and avoid duplication. It said it is important to examine the interlinks between just transition and mitigation and the 1.5-degree C temperature goal. It requested the secretariat for the budget implications of having a new institutional arrangement.

Australia echoed the UK’s concerns and said it expects to see a strong link between just transitions and ambition, grounded in social protection, decent work and human rights. It also commented that a new mechanism may duplicate work and strain resources. Australia also said that there are at least 50 bodies and institutions working on just transitions and so mapping who is doing what and develop ways to collaborate is key.

Canada said it has a lot more questions than answers at this stage and also advocated for the mapping exercise as it is “procedurally important” to inform the future arrangements of the JTWP.

Trade Union NGOs (TUNGO), speaking for cross-constituencies (**Environmental NGOs, Women and Gender, Children and Youth**) said the “cross-constituencies have been asking for a step change in the way in which the UNFCCC is delivering on Just Transitions”.

It reiterates its demand to establish a “Belem Action Mechanism for Just Transition (BAM) to accelerate, consolidate and achieve a holistic Just Transition across the whole economy within and between countries”. The cross constituencies also advocated for the the coordination entity of the Mechanism to have meaningful inclusion and

participation from both developed and developing countries, other relevant UN agencies and observers constituencies (each of which should have a representative seat during the meetings), as well as other stakeholders.

The contact group will convene daily until Friday (14 Nov).

Earlier in the day before the contact group convened, the COP30 Presidency organised a 2-hour open dialogue with Parties and NGO Constituencies on ‘Just Transition: status of negotiations and opportunities for an ambitious outcome’, signalling the high importance of this agenda for the COP.