

UAE JTWP Fourth Dialogue

Arab Group Interventions

Opening statement:

The Arab Group wishes to raise its deep concern and frustration with both the process and the substance of the note that was shared by you regarding this dialogue

- As mentioned by other groups, the concept note was shared far too late. This deprived Parties of sufficient time to study it, provide feedback, and ensure that the dialogue is conducted in a truly Party-driven manner, both in content and process.
- The report of the third dialogue has still not been released, despite the SB60 decision that the Secretariat must prepare and circulate a report of each dialogue ahead of every SB session. We stress that we will not accept a combined report for the third and fourth dialogues.
- We have consistently highlighted the shortcomings of the World Café format, and these concerns are also reflected in multiple decisions but have been ignored in this dialogue. We must again register our strong reservations about its use in this fourth dialogue, as it undermines inclusive and substantive discussions. While you have suggested a way forward where the first part of today will be in plenary mode, we fail to understand the insistence of continuing to include the World Café format despite our group's and others' serious reservations on it
- We are equally concerned by the framing of the concept note. It places the entire burden of mitigation on developing countries, while ignoring the failure of developed countries to meet their own obligations; both in taking the lead in mitigation and in providing finance. This framing ensures that the dialogue is unjust and misaligned with the purpose and core principles of the UAE Just Transition Work Programme.
- It is troubling that, after more than thirty years of the Convention and a decade of the Paris Agreement, we must remind colleagues that climate policy rests on the principles of equity and CBDR-RC. These principles are absent from the concept note, in both substance and intent.
- The note disregards the agreement within the UNFCCC: our plans are conditional on support, not the other way around. These plans are based on national circumstances, designed to benefit our people; not the interests and attempted top-down policies of developed countries. Developed countries are legally and morally obliged to provide support, not to offer imaginary financing mechanisms that have failed and continue to fail to deliver. Developing countries' plans target emissions while accounting for their realities, and we will never accept the targeting of our energy sources and developmental rights. Developed countries must demonstrate leadership by cutting emissions and providing

finance, rather than shifting burdens onto the Global South. Misrepresenting this balance leads to an unjust discussion, which is especially disappointing in the context of a work programme meant to advance just transitions.

- Developed countries bear historical responsibility for climate change and moreover failed to meet their mitigation and finance obligations under the Convention, Kyoto Protocol, and Paris Agreement.
- It is unacceptable that the concept note ignores these stark inequalities. Its guiding questions sidestep historical responsibility, contrary to the foundations of the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement.
- Developed countries already secured universal energy access through their historical exploitation of resources, including those of developing countries. For us, “just transitions” mean moving out of energy poverty and advancing sustainable development, with energy security and improved well-being as priorities. These goals will and should look different in each national context.
- Countries still struggling to deliver basic services and infrastructure cannot be forced into rigid, top-down transition pathways that target their energy security, developmental goals, and well-being. Each country must define its own pathway, suited to its national context, its realities, and its development priorities; without any infringement on its sovereignty.
- Finally, we stress that our views must be fully reflected in the report of this fourth dialogue, without selective interpretation or distortion, as we have unfortunately observed in the concept note.

World Café Tables 1, 2, 3

Thank you Chairs,

The Arab Group fully aligns itself with the statements made by Egypt on behalf of the G77 & China and Bolivia on behalf of the LMDC

Allow us to begin with expressing our sincere appreciation to the government of Ethiopia for hosting us, and our thanks are extended to the chairs, secretariat, and facilitators for your efforts in making this dialogue a success

1- How can nationally defined just energy transition pathways and holistic and multisectoral approaches to just transitions be designed to advance the implementation of the goals of the Paris Agreement and expand access to affordable, reliable, and sustainable energy for all, particularly in addressing persistent energy poverty and inequalities in access?

- The design of nationally defined just energy transition pathways must be rooted in the principles of equity and Common but Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities (CBDR&RC). These principles are missing from the concept note. Without reinstating them at the center of discussions, the outcomes will be inherently unjust and non-reflective of the UAE JTWP nor the Paris Agreement principles as a whole.
- For developing countries, transitions are inseparable from the challenges of eradicating poverty, achieving sustainable development, diversifying economies, and ensuring energy security. As we just witnessed a few minutes ago, just energy transitions have different contexts for different Parties and regions. In the Global South, reliance on fossil fuels is linked to energy access, eradication of energy poverty, and national development needs. Moreover, fossil fuel sectors remain a major source of both formal and informal employment. Therefore, any discussions targeting energy sources is unacceptable.
- The framing of transitions as equally urgent for all overlooks the historical context on which the developed world capitalized on heavy emissions to develop and the discussions now are ignoring the historical and moral obligations by shifting the burden onto the developing world
- For developing countries, “just transitions” mean first overcoming energy poverty. Priorities should focus on sustainable development, energy security, and the well-being of populations, and of course respecting national circumstances. Developed countries must lead in mitigation efforts and in providing support as highlighted in the convention and the Paris Agreement.
- Policies must avoid imposing prescriptive and punitive measures that hinder poverty eradication and the right to development. They should instead reflect the diversity of development pathways and respect the sovereign right of each country to determine its own context

2- What policies, financing mechanisms and approaches could be most effective in ensuring universal access to clean cooking solutions, including through the development of innovative

and fair financial and technological solutions to increase access, while safeguarding vulnerable communities from the social and economic risks of energy transitions?

- Access to clean cooking is not optional, it is a basic right tied to life and development. Treating it as a by-product of targeting energy sources or market finance, while omitting any role for public finance, is unacceptable.
- The framing of the question must change: clean cooking should be recognized as a fundamental need, not reduced to “innovative financing” schemes. It demands grant-based and public support, not approaches that shift responsibility away from developed countries.
- Policy design must prioritize the needs of people and respect the sovereign authority of states to meet them, rather than follow externally imposed financial or transition agendas.

3- How could renewable energy deployment and energy efficiency be upscaled through nationally determined just energy transition pathways and harnessed to improve energy access and affordability, empowering local communities and ensuring that benefits are equitably shared across different social groups, including women, youth, and marginalized populations?

- The question merges very different issues; renewables, efficiency, and access. Expanding renewable energy does not in itself deliver universal access, especially without grid upgrades, reserves, and reliability measures. These trade-offs must be acknowledged openly. More importantly, discussions need to focus on how all energy sources and solutions are needed to overcome the challenges faced by developing countries
- Empowering women, youth, and marginalized communities requires addressing deep inequities in access first. If developed countries choose to advance their own fossil fuel transitions, that is their decision. But dictating terms to others is not.
- The responsibility for transition cannot be shifted onto those least responsible for climate change. Equity must guide the discussion, and policies must remain flexible and sensitive to national contexts.
- The suggestion that subsidy reform is a universal tool for just transitions is flawed. Just transitions are nationally determined, there is no single model. Imposing a uniform prescription contradicts the very principle of nationally defined pathways and infringes on national rights of development pathways.
- Energy subsidies are a matter of national sovereignty. We reject conditioning subsidy design or access to support on the adoption of carbon pricing, ETS, offsets, or similar market mechanisms. International processes cannot dictate how they should be structured.

- Subsidies in developing countries often serve broader goals that are consistently ignored and undermined by developed countries. This includes poverty eradication, food security, and sustainable development. Forcing populations to absorb higher costs for essential goods so developed countries can avoid their own responsibilities is unacceptable.

4- *How can subsidies be (re)designed to best support nationally defined just energy transition pathways through supporting enhanced energy access, scaled-up deployment of renewable energy, energy efficiency, clean cooking solutions, and other measures, including through phasing out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies that do not address energy poverty or just transitions?*

- The question should not focus solely on the role of renewable energy and energy efficiency to achieve just transitions and improve energy access. Instead, the question should focus on identifying the opportunities in scaling up all low-emission technologies in supporting countries nationally determined just transition pathways. Therefore, this is the expected starting position from the perspective of our group.
- This may include scaling up renewable energy, energy efficiency, clean hydrogen, nuclear energy, carbon capture utilization and storage, low-emission fuels and Carbon Dioxide removal to support countries in achieving their just transitions.
- Parties decide their own transition pathways, including relevant domestic economic and/or fiscal measures that may be relevant. Accordingly, we must respect national circumstances and priorities, rather than incentivizing one-size-fits-all approaches.
- For many developing countries, subsidies are essential to ensure affordable energy access and energy security. Transitions and subsidy reforms must be nationally driven and occur in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication.
- Impacting supply and fossil fuel prices is not a climate change strategy and can end up delaying climate action as well as impacting the poorest and most vulnerable.
- Rather than targeting the phasing out “inefficient fossil fuel subsidies,” greater focus should be placed on ensuring that barriers for developing countries in accessing finance and attracting investments are addressed for enhancing energy access, ensuring energy security, and achieving just transition outcomes through all low-emission technologies. JTWP guidance should be technology-inclusive and non-market-prescriptive; no linkages to Article 6 market approaches or price-based measures

World Café Tables 4, 5, 6

1- How can nationally defined just energy transition pathways be designed to maximize opportunities associated with workforce transitions, including through the reskilling and upskilling of workers, while ensuring a fair transition for informal workers who may lack access to formal protections? What could be the role of the private sector, including micro, small and medium enterprises, in this context?

- The question ignores the realities of differences between developed and developing countries and has a superficial view by assuming reskilling and workforce transitions are universally beneficial without addressing the risks associated with them. Informal workers in developing countries face distinct challenges that cannot be solved by prescriptive, one-size-fits-all approaches.
- There is no guarantee that workers leaving fossil fuel-linked jobs will be absorbed into renewables. Evidence shows renewable energy generates far fewer jobs per unit of energy than fossil fuels, meaning overall employment opportunities will shrink. So not only is the current framing of the question supporting energy insecurity and less access – it is encouraging higher unemployment as well
- While the private sector has a role, governments bear the primary responsibility for ensuring just transitions; these responsibilities are continuously being ignored by the developed world. Protecting workers, securing livelihoods, and distributing opportunities fairly, not leaving outcomes to market forces.
- MSMEs can play a role in economic diversification; but this requires predictable finance, capacity-building, and enabling conditions including honoring financing obligations by developed countries, not the disruption of existing energy markets through actions such as unilateral trade measures, illicit finance flows and allowing techniques for evading costs, which unfairly disadvantage MSMEs.

2- How can social protection systems be strengthened or adapted to address the socioeconomic risks faced by workers and communities affected by energy transition pathways?

- For developing countries, fossil fuel use is tied directly to growth, jobs, and energy access. So, we repeat our position of rejection to any targeting of our vital energy sources. Transition discussions must tackle energy access and poverty eradication; these are key issues that are continuously being ignored despite having direct consequences for security and affordability.
- Social protection must remain nationally determined, rooted in local realities and structures, demographics, and development goals. These systems should serve poverty eradication and well-being, not be diverted to align with mitigation targets set by developed countries.

- For many countries, this means expanding protections within existing sectors, including fossil fuel industries.

3- *How can just energy transition pathways be designed to maximize health and environmental co-benefits, and how can these benefits be equitably distributed across society?*

- Health and environmental benefits must be addressed within a broader sustainable development lens, not framed as justification to restrict energy options.
- Health and environmental gains depend on recognizing unequal access to basic services. Benefits must flow first to those most affected by energy poverty and poor infrastructure.
- Reliance on biomass and traditional cooking fuels causes deadly indoor air pollution in developing countries. Tackling this must be treated as a priority, separate from mitigation discussions. Developed countries must refrain from lecturing developing countries on how to meet essential needs like clean cooking and infrastructure while their solutions exacerbate them.

4- *What are the key social and economic considerations related to the extraction and use of critical minerals for clean energy technologies, and how can policies ensure that their development supports sustainable livelihoods, protects workers, and avoids exacerbating existing or creating new forms of vulnerability?*

- The push for critical mineral extraction must not reproduce old patterns of exploitation. Policies should guarantee fair value, protect workers, and sustain livelihoods, without burdening developing countries under the banner of “clean transitions.”
- Sovereign control over mineral resources must be respected. Developed countries cannot dictate policies for emerging sectors to serve their own interests.

World Café Tables 7, 8, 9

Before diving into the questions, we would like to remind our colleagues that cherry-picking of decisions and taking them out of context is not constructive and is a flawed understanding of what we agreed on. This is one of the reasons we asked the Chairs to address Element (b) in its entirety as these sectoral focuses do not align with what we agreed on as Parties and are causing quite a divergence in opinion, risking diverting the discussions from constructive solution-finding into punitive and prescriptive lecturing of top-down measures that does not reflect agreed views of the Parties

1- How can nationally defined just energy transition pathways strengthen energy security and reliability while accelerating efforts globally towards net zero emission energy systems?

- In science, “net-zero” refers to balancing all emissions and sinks together. It does not apply to individual sectors, technologies, or systems. Using the term in that way has no basis, and discussion under this framing is misplaced.
- Energy security must remain the priority, with transitions reflecting national needs and historical responsibility. Developed countries must move first and fastest regarding mitigation action, not shift the burden onto developing countries.
- Energy security is a core pillar of just transitions, especially for developing countries. Any pathway that undermines reliability, affordability, or availability of energy risks being unjust by design.
- Nationally defined pathways must preserve a balanced and diversified energy mix, that ensures energy is secure, affordable, and supports the developmental needs of the country.
- A one-sided focus on “net-zero energy systems” may create new forms of insecurity; particularly in regions where renewable deployment is not yet scalable or reliable.

2- How can nationally defined just energy transition pathways be designed to ensure that future energy systems are resilient to climate impacts, supply chain disruptions, and geopolitical risks, while also remaining affordable and accessible to all?

- Affordability and resilience must be anchored in national circumstances. Transitions cannot be imposed externally. The right to development and energy access must stay central, particularly for developing countries.
- Resilience means ensuring domestic control over energy planning and diversification, not dependence on volatile global supply chains (e.g., rare earth minerals, imported tech).
- Pathways must allow countries to leverage their own comparative advantages, including resource endowments and infrastructure, to secure reliable energy access.

- Energy system resilience also depends on continued investment in critical infrastructure, grids, fossil fuels with lower emissions (e.g., CCS), and regional cooperation, not disruption such as what we see with the imposed unilateral trade measures

3- *In what ways can human rights– based and gender-responsive approaches be integrated into nationally defined just energy transition pathways to ensure that secure and reliable energy systems are also equitable and inclusive?*

- Equity and CBDR-RC must be the foundation of any discussion and as long as these core principles are not central to discussions then these are considered distractions from the main issue which is the blatant sidelining of principles on which the UAE JTWP was built on
- Denying developing countries their fair share of the carbon budget violates these principles and undermines the rights of vulnerable groups.
- Since developed countries are fond of lecturing us on what to do, then go ahead. cut emissions rapidly, achieve net-zero before 2030, and move into net-negative territory thereafter, while honoring your financial obligations to the developing world. This would free up carbon space for developing countries to meet the needs of their populations; including women, children, indigenous peoples, and communities most affected by climate change they did not cause.

4- *How can cooperation at national, regional, and international levels support the development of resilient, secure, and just energy systems that safeguard both people and ecosystems?*

- Real progress requires multilateral cooperation; not unilateral trade measures disguised as climate policy, which harm developing countries and contradict the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement and is quite an innovative way to have a reverse NCQG where we pay the developed to solve the issues they caused in the first place
- International cooperation should empower developing countries to define their own just transition pathways, grounded in sovereignty, equity, and recognition of diverse development priorities.
- Cooperation must go beyond statements: it should enable knowledge-sharing, access to appropriate technologies, and capacity-building that strengthens local actors. Equity-driven partnerships are the only way to support inclusive, resilient transitions where no country is left behind.

Day 1 Breakout Discussions

Theme 1: Climate finance for just energy transition pathways

1- *What lessons are being learned on financing nationally defined just energy transition pathways aligned with the outcome of the first Global Stocktake, including through enhancing access to climate finance, innovative and blended finance, crowding in of the private sector in a way that complements public finance, and financing for social protection systems?*

2- *What innovative financing mechanisms and policy frameworks could support enhancing the provision of climate finance for transitioning away from fossil fuels in a just, orderly and equitable manner, in line with national development priorities and while safeguarding affected workers and communities?*

- In order to have predictable, accessible finance, the need to assess the impacts of unilateral measures is crucial. Unilateral trade measures decided in one jurisdiction is set to cost developing countries around USD 6 billion in lost income, while developed countries are set to gain USD 3 billion – widening the gap between North and South.
- The private sector does not provide concessional finance to developing countries. There has been a dramatic increase in countries facing high debt levels - from 22 countries in 2011 to 59 countries in 2022 - which the private sector does not address. Therefore, shifting our focus to the private sector will not contribute to sustainable development and poverty eradication, but rather to increase debt burdens in developing countries. Developed countries must uphold their obligations to provide climate finance to developing countries in line with Article 9.1, through highly concessional and grant form instruments for just transitions.
- In line with decision 5/CP.7, we call on developed countries to cooperate in the technological development of non-energy uses of fossil fuels, and requests Annex II Parties to support developing country Parties to this end. We also call upon developed countries to cooperate in the development, diffusion and transfer of less greenhouse gas-emitting advanced fossil-fuel technologies, and/or technologies relating to fossil fuels, that capture and store greenhouse gases, and requests Annex II Parties to facilitate the participation of the least developed countries and other non-Annex I Parties in this effort.
- Illicit finance flows create an unfair economic environment for developing countries. We must track all illicit finance flows in developed countries and shift such finance flows towards just transitions in developing countries. In doing so, we would tackle illegal practices and allow for the enhanced implementation of just transitions. While some profit techniques are “illicit” we must acknowledge that other evasive techniques are within legal

bounds but unfairly disadvantage developing countries. Such practices are notoriously exhibited in business models where resources are extracted in low-cost areas and are then sold at higher cost areas, leading to great losses in jurisdiction where resources are harvested. Certain climate-related industries take on such practices. We must also consider the increase in negative finance flows going towards developed countries through debt-servicing, illicit finance flows and unilateral trade measures.

- We also note with concern that over 90% of private climate finance flows to mitigation – ignoring the critical role of adaptation which should have an equal setting.
- The GST was designed to inform Parties to enhance their action and support, in a nationally determined manner. Therefore, there is no metric of measuring a country’s “alignment” with the GST, nor would that be consistent with the bottom-up nature of the Paris Agreement.
- Financing just transitions must therefore support all transition pathways rather than imposing a uniform model.
- The GST underscores that finance, technology, and capacity-building are indispensable for just transitions. The first GST showed that without scaled and predictable support from developed countries, developing countries cannot translate their ambitions to implementation.
- The GST highlighted persistent gaps in adaptation finance and accessibility of finance. Financing just transitions requires developed countries to step up in closing these gaps, particularly through public finance that can de-risk and unlock private flows.
- The GST reaffirmed that transitions must occur in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication. Financing just pathways means structuring resources to enable economic growth in developing countries, not constraining it.
- The GST outcome provides a long menu of options, not a checklist. Financing must therefore be flexible and tailored to support whichever elements a country prioritizes in its nationally defined pathway.
- Let us refrain from cherry-picking specific provisions. Just transitions must not be used to transfer the obligations of developed countries to developing countries or to pressure developing countries to compromise their development needs. In implementing transitions, “just, orderly and equitable” must be key. “Just, orderly, equitable” must be understood to mean that developing countries need just transitions in this regard, which is enabled by the MOI to do so. At the same time, national contexts, circumstances and national determination of developing countries in how they transition must not be compromised.
- Attempts to isolate certain provisions from the rest of the GST decision also prove counterproductive because doing so would effectively disregard and discard important

contextual paragraphs of the GST decision that highlight the need for equity and CBDR-RC to be reflected. The GST decision, for example, “notes with concern the pre-2020 gaps in both mitigation ambition and implementation by developed country Parties and that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change had earlier indicated that developed countries must reduce emissions by 25–40 per cent below 1990 levels by 2020, which was not achieved” (paragraph 17). Several paragraphs in the GST decision also reflect the finance needs of developing countries, the challenges they face in accessing finance as well as the failure of the developed countries in meeting their commitments. The decision also highlights the gaps in technology experienced by developing countries, the need for enhancing their access to technologies and international cooperation in this regard, and the importance of technology in the achievement of the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement. The GST decision also highlights gaps in capacity building faced by developing countries and the urgent need to address them.

- We would like to reiterate that we do not accept segmenting or cherry-picking from the GST in any agenda item, including in the UAE JTWP.
- The framing of the question confines innovative financing and policy frameworks for enhanced provision of climate finance for transitioning away from fossil fuels. This question excludes all other energy transition pathways and restricting the discussion on enhancing the provision of finance to a single pathway. This is against the principles of equity and CBDR which ensure that parties continue to determine their own pathways according to their national circumstances, priorities and needs.
- The GST informs parties in enhancing their action and support in a nationally determined manner, with various parts of the GST acting as a “menu of options” for countries to consider in designing their national action. It is not a top-down roadmap for all countries to implement in the same way.
- Therefore, the question should address countries bottom-up policies and frameworks to achieve just, orderly and equitable transitions, without imposing top-down mitigation policies.
- Prejudice towards certain transition pathways will hamper development and innovation in others, risking disproportionate progress and missed opportunities. An example would be the growing market of abatement and removal: “climate finance for transitioning away from fossil fuels” would in effect exclude and hinder all ongoing development in this market despite large consensus on its essential role in climate action.
- Modelled pathways that limit warming to 1.5°C and 2°C vary in terms of national approaches and deployed technologies, all of which are based on a variety of assumptions and based on different national and regional circumstances.

- According to the IPCC, CDR “is part of all modelled scenarios that limit global warming to 2° or lower by 2100”. Additionally, “in global modelled pathways that limit warming to 2°C or below, almost all electricity is supplied from zero or low-carbon sources in 2050, such as renewables or fossil fuels with CO2 capture and storage.” Moreover, CCU/S is the subject of growing attention by academics and policymakers.
- Discussions of net-zero depict various tools that may be deployed including electrification, low-emissions hydrogen, and other important technologies, to counterbalance residual emissions, emphasizing that the most appropriate strategies depend on national and regional circumstances, including enabling conditions and technology availability according to IPCC
- Deployment of many technologies that are needed to limit warming 1.5°C and 2°C face significant technological, economic, institutional, ecological-environmental and socio-cultural barriers.
- As per the UNFCCC Convention and its Paris Agreement, developed country parties shall take the lead in combating climate change based on the principles of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDR-RC).
- Historical cumulative net CO2 emissions between 1850-2019 amount to about four fifths of the total carbon budget for limiting global warming to 1.5°C and to about two thirds for limiting global warming to 2°C. The IPCC AR6 report indicated that the World can emit only about 500 gigatons of CO2 starting January 1, 2020 for a 50% chance of limiting warming to 1.5°C.

Theme 2: Innovation and technology transfer

1- How can innovation and technology transfer foster holistic and multisectoral approaches to just energy transition pathways that leaves no one behind, including through inclusive innovation, local knowledge integration and identification of scalable solutions?

- Developing countries must be supported to enhance their ability to endogenously develop climate technologies relevant to their circumstances: Developing countries must be adequately supported, through financial, technical and capacity building support, to enhance their sustainable capacity to develop, disseminate and deploy climate technologies relevant to their national just transition pathways. By enabling developing countries to advance the development and deployment of these technologies, they can more sustainably pursue their climate objectives while ensuring sustainable development and economic co-benefits.
- Waiving of property rights in technology transfer is a must, such waiving will allow developing countries to have more ambition in mitigating climate change
- More needs to be done through the financial mechanism of the Convention: Developing countries require support from the financial mechanism of the UNFCCC to advance research and development, early access and deployment of technologies. We have agreed this in 1992 and reaffirmed it in 2015 within the Paris Agreement.
- The upcoming Technology Implementation Program is an opportunity to rectify these challenges and realize opportunities – particularly as it relates to operationalizing the linkages between the technology and financial mechanism in a manner that meaningfully drives forward implementation.

2- How can innovation and technology transfer best support the implementation of nationally defined just energy transition pathways, including through energy efficiency, clean cooking solutions, scaling of renewable energy and enhancing energy access?

- Just transition pathways must respect national sovereignty. Innovation and technology transfer cannot be defined only as renewables or efficiency, but must include the full range of technologies that Parties choose for their own pathways including CCUS
- The real barrier is not innovation itself but the intellectual property regimes that keep developing countries locked out
- For innovation to support just transitions, developed countries must fulfill their obligation to make technologies accessible, affordable, and free of restrictive patents, while also supporting manufacturing and development of solutions within the Global South.
- Clean cooking solutions are integral to just transitions and should not be where support from developed countries ends. In fact, developed countries must empower developing countries to

industrialize and have energy access and affordability solutions in line with their own national priorities and determination

- It is crucial to support the development of CCUS infrastructure as well as a global emission abatement solution

Theme 3: Capacity-building and knowledge sharing

1- How can capacity-building and knowledge-sharing initiatives under nationally defined just energy transition pathways ensure that Indigenous Peoples and local communities are empowered as active partners, with their cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and practices recognized, valued and protected?

- In designing just transition pathways, developing countries require capacity to effectively assess the potential impact of their policy measures: Developing countries require the skills, knowledge, tools and frameworks to effectively assess the potential socioeconomic impacts of their potential policy measures in order to design just transition pathways that are consistent with their needs, priorities and circumstances. Different countries will naturally have different pathways and priorities due to different national circumstances
- Capacity-building for assessing unilateral trade measures on developing countries: due to the evolving nature and emergence of climate policies, developing countries will require the necessary capacity to circumvent unilateral measures and mitigate its impacts on their economy and development plans.
- According to the IPCC, for example, effective policy packages would be comprehensive, consistent, balanced across objectives, and tailored to national circumstances and scaling up and enhancing the use of regulatory instruments can improve mitigation outcomes in sectoral applications, consistent with national circumstances. However, in order to effectively design these policies, set timelines and targets and design pathways, developing countries must have the tools, skills and capacity to effectively assess the potential positive or negative impacts of different options. This is a gap in terms of capacity building that must be addressed in order to fully enable countries to pursue just transition pathways that actually benefit people, the economy and advance their national climate priorities.

2- What mechanisms or platforms could strengthen the exchange of experiences, skills, and resources to build capacities for just energy transition pathways that reflect diverse local contexts and leave no one behind?

- Before we speak on any mechanism or platform, the crucial and primary platform is under the UNFCCC and its Paris Agreement where developed countries require to fulfill their obligations on capacity building: Developed countries obligation under the convention and the Paris Agreement requires providing support to developing countries.
- Developing countries' groups have submitted proposals for institutional arrangements such as the LMDC's Just Transitions Technical Assistance Network (JTTAN), but developed countries' first reaction was to reject any discussion on any content related to institutional arrangements

- Developed countries continue to minimize the importance of the JTWP and developing an institutional arrangement such as the JTTAN is crucial to enable knowledge and technology transfer in a voluntary, bottom-up, and nationally determined manner

Day 2 Breakout Discussions

Theme 1: Identifying concrete and actionable outcomes for the JTWP in the context of just energy transition pathways and holistic approaches to just transitions, including through synergies within and outside the UNFCCC

1- What could be some concrete and actionable outcomes for the JTWP in the context of just energy transition pathways and holistic approaches to just transitions?

2- How can the JTWP best capitalize on synergies within and outside the UNFCCC in this context, including through its dialogues?

- We support the LMDC proposal for a Just Transitions Technical Assistance Network. Such an arrangement is not optional; it is essential for the continued effectiveness of the UAE JTWP
- It is deeply concerning that during SB62, developed countries consistently resisted even discussing the Network. This refusal goes against the spirit of constructive engagement and undermines the very purpose of the UAE JTWP, which is to support all Parties in designing nationally determined just transition pathways.
- The Arab Group stresses that the JTTAN must be established as an institutional arrangement under the UAE JTWP. Without such an arrangement, a network designed to support developing countries in achieving their own just transitions through capacity-building, technology assistance, and cooperation.
- We are disappointed that strengthening this important work program is being opposed, when the need for practical tools and institutional support has been highlighted by many developing countries.
- For us, the establishment of the JTTAN is a concrete, actionable outcome that would ensure the JTWP delivers beyond words — helping developing countries access the technical assistance, capacity building, and cooperation they need for nationally driven just transitions.
- As for linkages and guidelines, we reiterate our rejection for all top-down, externally imposed, energy source-targeting, and/or punitive guidelines that infringe on the nationally defined nature of just transitions

Theme 2: The role of trade and international cooperation in supporting just energy transition pathways

1- What lessons are being learned in terms of cross-border impacts of climate measures, including trade impacts, and what could be the role of trade in supporting nationally determined just energy transition pathways?

2- How can international cooperation and partnerships enhance and expand support for nationally determined just energy transition pathways?

- We are concerned with the framing of the question that not only refuses to call unilateral measures by its name, but also waters down its negative impacts and presents it in a way that is positive and legitimate as climate action policy, which threatens the very trust on which this process depends. Unilateral trade measures contradict Article 3.5 of the Convention and undermine the multilateral framework Parties have built together.
- For the Arab Group, these measures are not theoretical, they directly affect our economies, our trade, our exports, and our developmental efforts. They reduce fiscal space, penalize industries, and create instability for workers and communities. This is not compatible with the promise of “just transitions”
- The introduction of unilateral trade measures at a time when developed countries are failing to deliver on finance and technology transfer is deeply troubling. Instead of fulfilling their obligations, they shift burdens onto developing countries and restrict the very policy space needed for just transitions.
- Just transitions must be nationally determined, rooted in sovereignty, and guided by equity and CBDR-RC. They cannot be dictated through trade restrictions or external conditionalities that privilege some economies at the expense of others. Especially as we see preferential treatment within those unilateral measures themselves to Parties that are similar in developmental status
- This dialogue must explicitly recognize the harm caused by unilateral measures and call for their removal. At the same time, it should call for positive measures: grant-based finance, developed-to-developing debt relief, and technology transfer, that actually support just transitions in developing countries rather than punishing them
- We must maintain the strong credibility the UAE JTWP by addressing such inequities directly. Anything less will widen divides rather than building cooperation.

Theme 3: Sharing experiences on policy frameworks for just energy transition pathways and holistic approaches to just transitions that leave no one behind

1- How can enabling environments for just energy transition pathways, holistic approaches to just transitions and economic diversification be designed to reflect national defined development priorities?

2- What are some examples of bottom-up, community-led and participatory governance frameworks and approaches for just energy transition pathways that could be replicated and adapted to different contexts?

- The Arab Group would like to underline that equity and CBDR-RC must anchor any discussion of just transition pathways. Pathways must remain nationally determined, whole-of-economy focused instead of sectoral, and not imposed through prescriptive models or external conditionalities.
- For our region, just transitions cannot be discussed without energy security at the center. Hospitals, schools, and basic services in our countries rely on reliable and affordable power. This is a reality that cannot be equated with contexts where energy access has long been achieved.
- Developed countries are ignoring the calls for them to lead mitigation action, failing in honoring their responsibilities, all while calling on developing countries to accelerate transitions under debt-heavy finance. This double standard undermines trust and shifts burdens onto those least responsible for climate change.
- The Arab Group stresses that enabling environments cannot be created without removing the obstacles: high cost of capital, unilateral measures, and persistent barriers to finance and technology. These are the real constraints facing developing countries and are consistently ignored and undermined by the developed countries.
- For us, just transitions first mean lifting our people out of energy poverty, not targeting our development needs. Without concessional public finance, fair technology transfer, and policy space, talk of “just transitions” risks becoming another tool to restrict developing countries instead of empowering them.