ADVANCE VERSION

United Nations

FCCC/SB/2026/6

Framework Convention on Climate Change

Distr.: General
9 November 2026

English only

Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
Sixty-fifth session
Antalya, 9–14 November 2026
Item 7 of the provisional agenda
United Arab Emirates just transition work programme

Subsidiary Body for Implementation
Sixty-fifth session
Antalya, 9–14 November 2026
Item 7 of the provisional agenda
United Arab Emirates just transition work programme

Views on the review of the United Arab Emirates just transition work programme, including proposals for improving its modalities

Synthesis report by the secretariat

Summary

This report synthesizes views submitted by Parties and non-Party stakeholders on the review of the United Arab Emirates just transition work programme on the basis of the terms of reference agreed at the sixty-fourth sessions of the subsidiary bodies. The views cover the effectiveness and efficiency of the work programme, proposals for improving the modalities of the work programme and the continuation of the work programme, as well as the elements of the scope of the review of the work programme as set out in its terms of reference.

Abbreviations and acronyms

CMA	Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement
LDC	least developed country
SB	sessions of the subsidiary bodies
SBI	Subsidiary Body for Implementation
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
SIDS	small island developing States

I. Introduction

A. Background and mandate

1. The United Arab Emirates just transition work programme was established at CMA 4[1] and operationalized at CMA 5.[2] CMA 5 confirmed that the objective of the work programme shall be the discussion of pathways to achieving the goals of the Paris Agreement outlined in Article 2, paragraph 1, in the context of Article 2, paragraph 2, and decided on the elements of the work programme.[3]

2. CMA 5 also decided that the work programme shall be implemented under the guidance of the SBI and the SBSTA through a joint contact group convened at each of their sessions with a view to the SBI and the SBSTA recommending a draft decision for consideration and adoption at each session of the CMA; and that at least two dialogues shall be held each year as part of the work programme, one prior to the first and one prior to the second regular sessions of the subsidiary bodies, in hybrid format to allow both in-person and virtual participation.[4] It invited Parties, observers and other non-Party stakeholders to submit views on work to be undertaken, as well as possible topics for the dialogues, under the work programme by 15 February of each year and requested the Chairs of the subsidiary bodies, taking into consideration the submissions, to decide on and communicate the topics to be discussed at each dialogue no later than eight weeks beforehand.[5] It invited Parties, observers and other non-Party stakeholders to submit views on opportunities, best practices, actionable solutions, challenges and barriers relevant to the topic of each dialogue no later than four weeks before each dialogue.[6]

3. SB 60 encouraged the Chairs of the subsidiary bodies to prepare and publish, following each dialogue, an informal summary of the discussions at that dialogue.[7] CMA 5 requested the Chairs to prepare an annual summary report on the dialogues.[8] It noted that outcomes of relevant work of the UNFCCC constituted bodies and under other UNFCCC workstreams, of the annual high-level ministerial round table on just transition and of ongoing work on pathways to just transition outside the UNFCCC process may be taken into consideration under the work programme, as appropriate; and encouraged consideration of the relevant outcomes of the work programme by UNFCCC constituted bodies and under relevant work programmes.[9]

4. CMA 5 agreed to review the effectiveness and efficiency of the work programme and consider its continuation at CMA 8.[10] CMA 7 requested SB 64 to develop terms of reference for the review and to consider, inter alia, ways to improve existing modalities of the work programme in developing the terms of reference, without prejudice to the outcome of the consideration of the continuation of the work programme.[11] SB 64 developed the terms of reference for the review and agreed that the review will be conducted at SB 65 in accordance with the terms of reference.[12]

5. The terms of reference provide that, in undertaking the review, the SBI and the SBSTA will consider:[13]

[1] Decision 1/CMA.4, para. 52.
[2] See decision 3/CMA.5.
[3] Decision 3/CMA.5, paras. 1–2.
[4] Decision 3/CMA.5, paras. 4–5.
[5] Decision 3/CMA.5, paras. 6–7.
[6] Decision 3/CMA.5, para. 8.
[7] FCCC/SBI/2024/13, para. 45, and FCCC/SBSTA/2024/7, para. 98.
[8] Decision 3/CMA.5, para. 10.
[9] Decision 3/CMA.5, paras. 9 and 12.
[10] Decision 3/CMA.5, para. 3.
[11] Decision 2/CMA.7, paras. 27–28.
[12] FCCC/SBI/2026/15, para. 37; and FCCC/SBSTA/2026/5, para. 63. The terms of reference are contained in annex I and the annex to those documents respectively.
[13] FCCC/SBI/2026/15, annex I, para. 5; and FCCC/SBSTA/2026/5, annex, para. 5.

(a) Progress in implementing the work programme since its establishment in decision 1/CMA.4;

(b) Contributions of the work programme in achieving its objective as defined in paragraph 1 of decision 3/CMA.5;

(c) How all elements of the work programme, as set out in paragraph 2 of decision 3/CMA.5, have been comprehensively and systematically considered;

(d) The usefulness of the outputs of the work programme for Parties, non-Party stakeholders and constituted bodies, as well as relevant processes, under the Convention and the Paris Agreement;

(e) The effectiveness and efficiency of the modalities of the work programme, including the dialogues, annual high-level ministerial round table on just transition and reports;

(f) The inclusiveness of the modalities of the work programme, including with regard to enabling participation of Parties and non-Party stakeholders in implementing the work programme;

(g) Opportunities for improving the modalities of the work programme;

(h) How the review of the work programme could inform or be informed by the process for the operationalization of the just transition mechanism, without prejudice to the mandate set out in paragraph 25 of decision 2/CMA.7.[14]

6. SB 64 invited Parties and non-Party stakeholders to submit views on the review of the work programme on the basis of the terms of reference and requested the secretariat to prepare a report on those views, including proposals for improving the modalities of the work programme.[15]

B. Scope

7. This report synthesizes the views set out in the 16 submissions received as at 4 November 2026 in response to the invitation referred to in paragraph 6 above, for which the deadline was 15 September 2026.[16] Of the submissions, 11 were received from Parties or groups of Parties,[17] 1 from a United Nations entity,[18] 1 from an admitted intergovernmental organization,[19] 2 from admitted non-governmental organizations[20] and 1 from a non-admitted entity.[21]

8. In the light of the objective of the review, which is to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the work programme, as well as ways to improve its modalities,[22] chapter II below sets out the main messages identified in the views submitted pertaining to the effectiveness and efficiency of the work programme, understood as views reflected in more than one submission, and chapter III below the main proposals for improving its modalities, also understood as views reflected in more than one submission. Chapter IV below

[14] FCCC/SBI/2026/15, annex I, para. 5; and FCCC/SBSTA/2026/5, annex, para. 5.
[15] FCCC/SBI/2026/15, paras. 38–39; and FCCC/SBSTA/2026/5, paras. 64–65.
[16] The submissions are available at https://submissions.unfccc.int/?cfsid=1550.
[17] Bhutan on behalf of the Group of Landlocked Developing Countries; Canada; Ghana on behalf of the African Group of Negotiators; Ireland and the European Commission on behalf of the European Union and its member States; Palau on behalf of the Alliance of Small Island States; Panama on behalf of the Independent Association of Latin America and the Caribbean; Saudi Arabia on behalf of the Like-minded Developing Countries; Timor-Leste on behalf of the LDCs; United Republic of Tanzania; and Uruguay on behalf of the Group of 77 and China.
[18] United Nations Environment Programme.
[19] International Livestock Research Institute on behalf of CGIAR.
[20] Center for Climate and Energy Solutions; and (jointly) Observatório do Clima, LACLIMA, Plataforma CIPÓ, Geledés – Instituto da Mulher Negra, WWF Brazil, Instituto E+ and Greenpeace Brazil.
[21] International Indigenous Peoples' Forum on Climate Change.
[22] As per documents FCCC/SBI/2026/15, annex I, para. 4; and FCCC/SBSTA/2026/5, annex, para. 4.

summarizes the views relevant to the consideration of the continuation of the work programme. Views relevant to each of the elements set out in paragraph 5 above are contained in the annex.

II. Views on the effectiveness and efficiency of the work programme

A. Effectiveness

9. The submissions broadly converged on the view that the work programme has delivered on its objective[23] and most discussed the extent to which the work undertaken under the work programme is useful for informing and facilitating the implementation of just transition pathways. In most of the submissions, it was recognized that the work programme, in particular through the dialogues, has provided Parties and non-Party stakeholders with a regular and structured space for the exchange of views, experience, barriers, challenges and best practices pertaining to pursuing just transition pathways, and that it has contributed to a shared understanding of those pathways and of their importance for achieving the goals of the Paris Agreement. In some submissions, it was observed that the work programme has been effective in progressively broadening the understanding of just transition pathways from a predominantly workforce-centred to a more holistic, multisectoral and cross-cutting perspective. The modalities of the work programme were generally considered to have served their purpose: most submissions acknowledged the value of the outputs as a record of the discussions; several noted that the dialogues have addressed all or a broad range of the elements of the work programme;[24] many considered that the modalities have enabled broad participation of Parties and non-Party stakeholders; and some noted that the outputs of the work programme have informed other processes under the Convention and the Paris Agreement, noting in particular the key messages recognized in paragraph 12 of decision 2/CMA.7, and that the annual high-level ministerial round table on just transition has led to sustained political visibility of the topic.

10. At the same time, it was noted in most submissions that the shared understanding and knowledge generated under the work programme have yet to be sufficiently reflected in national planning and policies or translated into practical, implementation-oriented guidance, with it being observed in several submissions that the dialogues have proven more effective in terms of enabling exchange and identifying challenges than facilitating implementation of just transition pathways on the ground. It was noted in several submissions that the effectiveness of the work programme should be assessed in terms of its ability to assist Parties in understanding and addressing constraints and barriers faced in pursuing, as well as in facilitating the implementation of, nationally determined just transition pathways, rather than the number of dialogues held or reports produced. Most considered that the elements of the work programme have not been addressed to an equal extent, with those set out in paragraph 2(c),[25] (d)[26] and (g)[27] of decision 3/CMA.5 most frequently identified as having received less attention. It was considered in several submissions that inclusiveness should be assessed on the basis of the quality, diversity and balance of participation rather than solely on the basis of the number of participants, and in some cases it was noted that technical expertise and perspectives from developing countries have been underrepresented. Some submissions observed that the high-level ministerial round table on just transition has not been clearly distinguished from the dialogues, and some that discussions during both the ministerial round table and the dialogues have on occasion reverted to statements of negotiating positions.

[23] As set out in decision 3/CMA.5, para. 1.

[24] As set out in decision 3/CMA.5, para. 2.

[25] Opportunities, challenges and barriers relating to sustainable development and poverty eradication as part of transitions globally to low emissions and climate resilience, taking into account nationally defined development priorities.

[26] Approaches to enhancing adaptation and climate resilience at the national and international level.

[27] International cooperation as an enabler of just transition pathways towards achieving the goals of the Paris Agreement.

B. Efficiency

11. There was no common assessment of the efficiency of the work programme in the submissions, with few explicitly addressing the efficiency of the work programme or distinguishing it from its effectiveness. In those few submissions, the existing modalities of the work programme were generally assessed positively in terms of efficiency, with the holding of two dialogues per year seen as a reasonable and balanced approach and their holding in conjunction with UNFCCC climate weeks viewed as an efficient arrangement. Further, the modalities of the work programme, including the dialogues and annual high-level ministerial round table on just transition, were considered, in those submissions, as having improved over time. Some submissions considered that the efficiency of the work programme cannot be fully assessed on the basis of the information that is available and suggested that the review consider the resources required for the work programme to be undertaken in line with the current modalities and whether UNFCCC resources have been used effectively and efficiently across the modalities and in facilitating outputs from the work programme, including with regard to the frequency of dialogues, round tables and reports. Some submissions linked efficiency to the avoidance of duplication of effort and to the efficient use of resources across the work programme, the just transition mechanism referred to in paragraph 25 of decision 2/CMA.7 and other UNFCCC workstreams. None of the submissions contained proposals for increasing the number of dialogues or round tables, instead centring on the focus, organization, follow-up to and outputs of the existing modalities (see chaps. D–G in the annex).

III. Proposals for improving the modalities of the work programme

12. In most submissions, a stronger focus on implementation under the work programme was proposed, with the dialogues to focus on practical, technical exchange and on recurring issues and barriers in relation to pursuing just transition pathways while remaining inclusive, Party-driven spaces for discussion and exchange of experience. Several submissions proposed that the objective and broad scope of the work programme should be retained, with all of its elements considered in a comprehensive, balanced and systematic manner in future work. Many submissions suggested that more attention should be paid to the element in paragraph 2(g) of decision 3/CMA.5, in particular the enabling role of finance, technology development and transfer, and capacity-building in implementing just transition pathways; and several to paragraph 2(c), (d) and (e).[28] Several submissions proposed that the specific needs and circumstances of developing country Parties, including the LDCs and SIDS, should be afforded greater attention, while several others emphasized that any improvements made to the modalities of the work programme should respect the nationally determined and non-prescriptive nature of just transition pathways and not create additional reporting burden or obligations for Parties.

13. On the dialogues specifically, some submissions contained proposals that Parties drive the selection of topics for the dialogues on the basis of transparent criteria, that guiding questions for the discussions at the dialogues be circulated in good time and that previous dialogues and relevant outputs under other workstreams be built upon. Some proposed focusing each dialogue on one clearly defined theme or specific topics; and some the development of a multi-year, Party-driven workplan that ensures continuity across dialogues while retaining flexibility for emerging issues to be taken up. As for the format of the dialogues, some proposed exploring more interactive and participatory formats, such as use of breakout groups and small-group exchanges rather than plenary sessions, scene-setting presentations by a wider range of actors, ensuring balanced regional representation and stronger participation of developing country Parties.

[28] Just transition of the workforce and the creation of decent work and quality jobs in accordance with nationally defined development priorities, including through social dialogue, social protection and the recognition of labour rights.

14. Several submissions contained proposals for the broader participation in the dialogues, including as presenters and moderators, of representatives of subnational governments, industry, workers' organizations, employers' organizations, Indigenous Peoples, local communities and other groups affected by transitions, as well as women, youth and persons with disabilities. Some proposals were for the provision of financial and logistical support dedicated to the participation of developing country Parties and community representatives in the dialogues, while some were for the further use of virtual participation formats. Some submissions requested the provision by the secretariat of disaggregated information on participation in the dialogues, and some suggested concrete measures for strengthening the formal participation and inclusion of Indigenous Peoples therein.

15. With regard to the annual high-level ministerial round table on just transition, in some submissions it was proposed that clarification be given regarding how its role differs from that of the dialogues and that exchange of information across the dialogues, as also reflected in the reports thereon, and the round table be strengthened so that technical findings from the dialogues inform the political discussions at the round table, with the resulting high-level political messages guiding subsequent work under the work programme.

16. Regarding the outputs of the work programme, most of the submissions proposed that the informal summaries of and annual reports on the dialogues move beyond compilations of views expressed at the dialogues towards analysis thereof, setting out lessons learned applicable across different national circumstances, policy options, best practice examples and practical tools that Parties may use on a voluntary basis, including in relation to incorporating just transition considerations into nationally determined contributions, national adaptation plans and long-term low greenhouse gas emission development strategies. Some submissions suggested that the annual reports be published well in advance of negotiation sessions, and some that they reflect more fully, in a balanced and accurate manner, all views expressed by Parties, including priorities, challenges and barriers identified by developing country Parties. Several proposed stronger and more systematic follow-up on the outcomes of the dialogues, so that lessons, needs and barriers identified can feed into recommendations, into the work of constituted bodies and under relevant workstreams and processes, and subsequent dialogues. In several submissions, it was mentioned that the findings of the dialogues should feed into practical outputs and implementation support for just transition pathways through the just transition mechanism.

17. In most submissions, stronger coherence and coordination of work carried out under the work programme with that of the constituted bodies and under relevant workstreams and processes under the Convention and the Paris Agreement, as well as with that of financial institutions and relevant organizations and initiatives within and beyond the United Nations system, was proposed, respecting existing mandates and avoiding duplication of work. In most submissions that addressed the relationship between the work programme and the just transition mechanism, the need for the two to have a clear and complementary relationship was emphasized, with the mechanism to respond to the needs identified under the work programme, and having clear institutional linkages and feedback loops between the two was proposed in several submissions.

IV. Views relevant to the consideration of the continuation of the work programme

18. Several submissions explicitly supported the continuation of the work programme beyond 2026, but in a strengthened form. They pointed to the continued relevance of the circumstances that led to its establishment and to its value as a dedicated multilateral space in which Parties, and observers and other non-Party stakeholders can exchange experience and discuss the economic and social dimensions of transitions, as well as issues not adequately captured in discussions focused on individual sectors or technologies. These submissions proposed a work programme that remains the principal political platform for dialogue on just transition under the Paris Agreement and remains nationally determined and inclusive, but is more implementation-oriented and operates in complementarity with the just transition mechanism. In one submission it was emphasized that the continuation should build on the lessons learned in the first three years of implementation of the work programme.

In another, it was highlighted that the continuation of the work programme should be based on the understanding that nationally determined just transition pathways should not be understood as requiring countries to address structural international constraints solely through domestic action. In some submissions, it was stressed that the mechanism should not replace the work programme or result in the loss of the political and technical space it has created. In another submission it was suggested that the work programme should be enveloped in the just transition mechanism.

19. Other submissions did not address the continuation of the work programme as such, but set out views on future work thereunder. Some emphasized that a decision on the continuation should not be prejudged before or during the review and that the recommendations emerging from the review should be developed without prejudice to the consideration of the continuation of the work programme. In their view, the review should be primarily backward-looking, meaning assessing the performance of the work programme since its establishment, while also identifying some solutions for improving its modalities. In another submission it was suggested that the review should be forward-looking and evidence based, drawing on the experience gained through the work programme to identify how work under the work programme can continue to strengthen ambitious, inclusive and effective climate action. In one submission, it was suggested that the results of the review should clarify whether the work programme is effectively meeting its objective and, if not, identify the necessary improvements or determine whether in its current form it should be complemented or entirely replaced by the just transition mechanism, with guidance given on how such complementarity or replacement would operate in practice. In another submission, it was suggested that, should Parties agree to continue the work programme, its future role could be designed to complement the mechanism through the establishment of clearly defined policy, knowledge, dialogue and agenda-setting functions, and that the review should help to ensure that the work programme remains relevant, balanced, inclusive and responsive to the needs of developing countries.

Annex

Views relevant to the elements of the scope of the review as set out in its terms of reference*

1. This annex synthesizes the views and inputs received from Party and non-Party stakeholders that are relevant to each of the elements identified in the scope section of the terms of reference.[1] Some submissions contain views that cut across the elements of the scope; such views are reflected under the element to which they relate most closely. For the full detail and context of the views expressed, see the original submissions via the submission portal.[2]

A. Progress in implementing the work programme since its establishment in decision 1/CMA.4

2. Almost all of the submissions reflect on the progress made in implementing the work programme since its establishment. Most of the submissions recognize the progress made under the work programme, pointing to the fact that it has played an essential role in providing Parties and non-Party stakeholders with a regular space for the exchange of experiences and best practices relevant to just transition pathways through the dialogues, the informal summaries and the annual reports on the dialogues produced. Some submissions recognize that the annual HLMRTs have helped maintain the political visibility of just transition. Some submissions note that the dialogues have been successful in progressively broadening the scope of the work programme towards a more systemic, holistic, multisectoral and cross-cutting understanding of just transitions. One submission sees the growing uptake of just transition considerations in NDCs as the clearest evidence of progress, whereas another submission finds little evidence so far that the outputs of the work programme have been reflected in NDCs or other national policy documents.

3. Despite the general recognition of progress, most of the submissions consider that the shared understanding and knowledge generated under the work programme have not yet been sufficiently translated into implementation. In this regard, several submissions point to a gap between the discussions under the work programme and the integration of just transition into national planning and policies; several to the lack of practical guidance that Parties can use in policy design and implementation; and several to the lack of actionable and country-accessible support, particularly for developing country Parties, at the scale required to enable advancing on nationally determined just transition pathways.

4. Several submissions consider that progress in implementing the work programme should be assessed not by the number of dialogues held, reports produced or issues discussed, but by whether the work programme has helped Parties to understand and overcome the constraints they face, enhance international cooperation and facilitate the implementation of nationally determined just transition pathways. Several submissions see the decision to develop a just transition mechanism as evidence of the need to move from dialogue to implementation. Several submissions stress, however, that the work programme should nonetheless retain its role as an inclusive space for dialogue, the exchange of experiences and the identification of emerging challenges related to just transition pathways.

B. Contributions of the work programme in achieving its objective as defined in paragraph 1 of decision 3/CMA.5

5. Most of the submissions address the contributions of the work programme in achieving its objective. Of these, most consider that the work programme, in particular

* Not formally edited or formatted.

[1] FCCC/SBI/2026/15, annex I, para. 5; and FCCC/SBSTA/2026/5, annex, para. 5.

[2] All submissions are available at https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/submissionsstaging/Pages/Home.aspx (in the search field, type “just transition”).

through the dialogues, has helped build a shared understanding of just transition pathways and of their importance for achieving the goals of the Paris Agreement. Some submissions note that the discussions have moved beyond a predominantly workforce-centred perspective towards a more holistic, multisectoral and multidimensional understanding of just transitions. One submission considers that the work programme has become the primary multilateral platform for political dialogue on just transition and has contributed to the recognition of the need to integrate just transition considerations into NDCs, NAPs and LT-LEDS.

6. Some submissions suggest that the contribution of the work programme to its objective should be assessed by the extent to which the work programme has enabled Parties, particularly developing country Parties, to discuss nationally determined just transition pathways; by whether its modalities have generated focused and practical outcomes; by whether it has improved understanding of the enabling environment for just transitions and systemic opportunities, barriers and challenges that lie beyond domestic policy control; by the extent to which it has contributed to concrete action at the national, regional and international levels; and by the extent to which its outputs have been taken up by Parties, including through their NDCs, NAPs and LT-LEDS, as well as by UNFCCC constituted bodies and relevant workstreams. One submission notes that Article 2, paragraph 1(c), of the Paris Agreement has not been well explored under the work programme.

C. How all elements of the work programme, as set out in paragraph 2 of decision 3/CMA.5, have been comprehensively and systematically considered

7. Most of the submissions reflect on how the elements of the work programme have been covered. Several submissions note that the dialogues have engaged with all seven elements or a broad range of them, and none of the submissions suggests that any element has been left out, with one submission describing the approach undertaken in discussing the multiple layers and aspects of just transitions as relatively balanced. Most of the submissions consider, however, that the elements have not all been covered with the same depth. The elements most often identified by submissions as having received comparatively less focus are element (c), in particular aspects related to industrialization, economic diversification and productive capacity; element (d); and element (g), in particular aspects related to the delivery of means of implementation. Some submissions consider that the dialogues that took place so far and related discussions have focused more on domestic policy instruments, mitigation and energy, and one submission finds, on the basis of its analysis of the guiding questions of the dialogues, that elements (b)[3] and (f)[4] have been the most frequently addressed. On whether the consideration of the elements has been systematic, views differ. One submission considers that all seven elements have been systematically addressed across the dialogues. Another submission, on the basis of an analysis of the guiding questions, finds that each element has been considered mainly in one specific dialogue most closely related to it and hardly by the other dialogues. The same submission considers that the guiding questions for the HLMRTs have focused on elements (a)[5] and (g), with the other elements discussed only when Parties raised them; the same submission notes, however, that the key messages recognized in decision 2/CMA.7 cover all seven elements of the work programme.

8. Many submissions emphasize the importance of giving greater attention to element (g), with one submission noting that international cooperation has not yet been the theme of a dedicated dialogue; these submissions highlight in particular the need to focus on the enabling role of finance, technology development and transfer and capacity-building, with several underlining the need for affordable and predictable finance in the context of high cost of capital and limited fiscal space and some reflecting on the need to focus on the implications

[3] Just and equitable transition, which encompasses pathways that include energy, socioeconomic, workforce and other dimensions, all of which must be based on nationally defined development priorities and include social protection so as to mitigate potential impacts associated with the transition.

[4] Inclusive and participatory approaches to just transitions that leave no one behind.

[5] Just transition pathways to achieving the goals of the Paris Agreement outlined in Article 2, paragraph 1, in the context of Article 2, paragraph 2.

of what they have framed as climate change-related trade measures. Several submissions highlight the importance of greater focus on element (d), with one submission highlighting the need to recognize climate vulnerability and loss and damage as part of the transition context; several on element (c), in particular aspects related to industrialization, economic diversification, productive capacity, structural transformation, connectivity and regional integration; and several on element (e), in particular aspects related to social protection and decent work, including for informal workers. Other aspects identified as warranting further attention include, under element (a), the consistency of finance flows with just transition pathways, in line with Article 2, paragraph 1(c), of the Paris Agreement, and the integration of the outcomes of the first global stocktake, both highlighted by some submissions; and, under element (b), energy security and the transition away from fossil fuels, each underlined by some submissions, and sectors such as transport, buildings and waste, heat resilience and sustainable cooling, and agrifood systems, each suggested by one submission. In relation to the rights, knowledge systems and priorities of Indigenous Peoples and the racial, gender and territorial dimensions of inequality, some submissions suggest that these aspects be considered across all elements rather than only under element (f).

D. The usefulness of the outputs of the work programme for Parties, non-Party stakeholders and constituted bodies, as well as relevant processes, under the Convention and the Paris Agreement

9. Most of the submissions address the usefulness of the outputs of the work programme. Most of these acknowledge the value of the informal summaries of the dialogues, the annual summary reports and the informal notes on the HLMRTs as a record of the discussions that has captured perspectives, experiences, lessons learned and areas of convergence and divergence, consolidated knowledge and helped to build a shared understanding of just transition pathways as relevant to the different topics that were discussed. Some submissions highlight that the outputs of the work programme have proved their usefulness by informing processes under the Convention and the Paris Agreement, in particular through the key messages recognized in decision 2/CMA.7. One submission notes that numerous organizations have drawn on the discussions and outputs of the work programme in their own work, while finding, on the basis of a preliminary analysis of the NDCs submitted since July 2024, that few contain an identifiable reference to the work programme.

10. At the same time, most of the submissions see scope to make the outputs of the work programme more useful for implementation. Most submission suggest that the outputs, in particular the informal summaries and annual reports, should move beyond compilations of views towards analytical synthesis, identification of lessons learned that are applicable across different national circumstances, catalogues of policy options, good practice examples and practical tools, such as case studies and methodologies, that Parties may use on a voluntary basis, including in incorporating just transition considerations into NDCs, NAPs, LT-LEDS and development strategies, and that could facilitate peer learning and the uptake of successful approaches. Some submissions stress that such outputs should respect the nationally determined and non-prescriptive nature of just transition pathways and should not create new obligations. One submission stresses that any use of the outputs of the work programme by other processes should be consistent with the mandates of those processes. One submission suggests that the work programme could provide greater value by consolidating the available evidence and analysis on the economic, social and distributional consequences of transitions, including the implications of changes in trade, production, energy systems, technology, infrastructure and investments. In its view, such analysis should consider who bears the costs of a transition and who benefits from it, how costs and benefits are distributed within and across countries, and what forms of international cooperation are required to address constraints that cannot be resolved through domestic action alone. The same submission suggests that the analytical and knowledge-sharing work to be undertaken by the work programme should be organized around different transition circumstances rather than relying on sectoral discussions.

11. Several submissions highlight the opportunity to enhance the usefulness of the outputs through a stronger focus on implementation. Several see a role for the just transition

mechanism or a link to its operationalization in this regard: some submissions suggest that the mechanism should draw on the outputs of the work programme in providing knowledge-sharing, coordination, technical assistance and capacity-building, and that the outputs of the work programme and of the mechanism inform each other. One submission suggests that the mechanism should develop, on the basis of the findings of the dialogues, policy options, approaches, case studies, methodologies and tools that Parties may use on a voluntary basis, Another submission considers that the usefulness of the outputs would be significantly enhanced by clearer connections to other UNFCCC processes and constituted bodies, such as the Sharm el-Sheikh joint work on implementation of climate action on agriculture and food security, and that without such connections the outputs of the work programme risk not becoming actionable. Some submissions emphasize that the outputs should reflect, in a balanced and accurate manner, the views expressed by Parties, including the priorities, challenges and barriers raised by developing country Parties, while one submission notes that the specific concerns and challenges of the LDCs have been increasingly well reflected in the summary reports. Some submissions suggest that the outputs should be published in a more timely manner so that Parties and stakeholders can use them in better preparing for negotiations, subsequent dialogues and call for submissions, with one submission noting that the informal summaries of the first and third dialogues were published after the start of the following sessions of the subsidiary bodies. One submission suggests that the reports should be streamlined to facilitate reporting back to domestic stakeholders, and another that the review assess whether the number and substance of the reports are conducive to domestic implementation and an effective use of resources, also based on the use that Parties have made of the reports.

E. The effectiveness and efficiency of the modalities of the work programme, including the dialogues, annual high-level ministerial round table on just transition and reports

12. Most of the submissions address the effectiveness and efficiency of the modalities of the work programme, focusing in particular on the dialogues and the annual HLMRTs. On the dialogues, most of the submissions recognize that they have provided a structured space for the exchange of views, experiences, opportunities, actionable solutions, challenges, barriers and best practices among Parties and non-Party stakeholders. Several submissions consider that the dialogues have been more effective in enabling exchange of views and identifying challenges than in facilitating implementation of concrete approaches on the ground. Some submissions note that the dialogues have demonstrated their effectiveness by informing the development of the key messages on just transition recognized in decision 2/CMA.7 and some submissions describe the format of the dialogue as effective in bringing to the surface diverse perspectives while building shared knowledge and common ground. On the other hand, some submissions have observed that discussions have at times reverted to statements of negotiating positions. One submission considers that the dialogues have been effective in complementing the sectoral and technical work under the Sharm el-Sheikh mitigation ambition and implementation work programme by addressing how transitions can be implemented, including the social and workforce dimensions and gender and human rights approaches; another submission notes that the dialogues have improved over time in their efficiency and effectiveness.

13. Some submissions also comment on the organization of the dialogues. One notes that the agendas of the dialogues have often been broad and that concept notes and guiding questions have been circulated with little time for Parties to secure the participation of the most relevant experts and to prepare. Another submission notes that the number of guiding questions has grown from about 10 in the first two dialogues to 21 in the fifth, and that the criteria used to select the topics of the dialogues have not been communicated to Parties, and that the informal summaries of the first and third dialogues were published after the start of the following sessions of the subsidiary bodies. The same submission notes that the format of the fourth dialogue was changed from what was indicated in its concept note at the start of the dialogue itself, without prior communication to Parties.

14. On the annual HLMRTs, some submissions note that they have maintained the political visibility of just transition, reinforced the significance of just transition within the process, and provided a forum for engaging Ministers on the topic, including for what concerns enabling conditions and barriers to just transitions. Some submissions observe that the HLMRTs have not been clearly distinguished from the dialogues, with one submission noting an overlap between the two modalities. One submission considers that the HLMRTs have not been useful or relevant to the objective of the work programme, noting that they have not been referred to in subsequent outcomes under the work programme or negotiations, including decision 2/CMA.7.

15. On efficiency of the modalities of the work programme, one submission notes that it cannot be assessed in the absence of detailed information on the resource requirements of the modalities. Another submission suggests that the review should assess whether UNFCCC resources have been used effectively and efficiently across the modalities and outputs, including with regard to the frequency of dialogues, HLMRTs and reports. One submission considers that the frequency of two dialogues per year has provided a reasonable balance between continuity, political visibility, workload and budgetary discipline, while another submission considered that holding the dialogues in conjunction with UNFCCC Climate Weeks has been efficient. Without specifically reflecting on the efficiency of the current arrangement, another submission proposed holding only one dialogue a year and organizing it during the first regular session of the year. One submission considers that the efficiency of the dialogue format is constrained by the fact that the dialogues are not accompanied by structured follow-up, a synthesis of their outcomes into decision-relevant outputs or means of tracking how the views expressed feed into subsequent work.

16. With regard to the reports, including the informal summaries and the annual report on the dialogues, the submissions do not address their effectiveness and efficiency beyond the views on their usefulness summarized in section II.D above.

F. The inclusiveness of the modalities of the work programme, including with regard to enabling participation of Parties and non-Party stakeholders in implementing the work programme

17. Most of the submissions address the inclusiveness of the modalities of the work programme. Many of these submissions consider that the modalities have enabled broad participation, pointing to the hybrid and interactive formats of the dialogues, the calls for submissions, through which non-Party stakeholders contribute to defining the topics and content of the dialogues, and the involvement of a broad range of non-Party stakeholders, whose contributions have enriched the discussions. Some submissions describe inclusiveness as a strength of the work programme. One submission welcomes the emphasis, reflected in the key messages recognized in decision 2/CMA.7, on inclusive and participatory processes and the role of Indigenous Peoples, and another submission notes the growing interest and participation of participants from LDCs in the dialogues.

18. Several submissions consider that inclusiveness should be assessed not only by the number of participants but also by the quality, diversity and balance of participation, in particular whether developing country Parties representatives and experts and non-Party stakeholders have been able to participate meaningfully in agenda-setting, expert selection and knowledge generation, and whether their views and circumstances have been reflected in the outputs of the work programme. In this regard, some submissions note that technical expertise and perspectives from developing country Parties, including through expert presentations, have been under-represented, and that constraints relating to resources, travel and technical capacity have affected the participation of developing country Parties. Other observations, each made by one submission, are that the HLMRTs have been held in person only, which has limited participation; that the lack of translation has been a barrier to the full participation of Francophone and Lusophone LDCs; that the limit on credentials per constituency has restricted the participation of civil society and other non-Party stakeholders in the dialogues; and that the participation of the communities most affected, such as smallholder farmers, pastoralists, fisherfolk, Indigenous Peoples, women, youth and persons with disabilities, remains a challenge. One submission suggests that the assessment of

inclusiveness should also consider the extent to which Indigenous Peoples have been able to participate fully and effectively, including through their own representative organizations, and the extent to which their rights, views and knowledge systems have been reflected in the agendas, dialogues and outputs of the work programme.

G. Opportunities for improving the modalities of the work programme

19. All of the submissions propose improvements to the modalities of the work programme. Most suggest a more implementation-oriented work programme, with dialogues that focus on practical, technical exchange and on recurring issues and barriers, and with stronger follow-up on their outcomes, with one submission suggesting that the dialogues should be organized to best meet the needs of domestic decision-makers, policy developers and implementers, while retaining the nature of the work programme as an inclusive, Party-driven space for dialogue and the exchange of experiences. Several submissions emphasize that the objective and broad scope of the work programme should be retained, including the comprehensive, balanced and systematic consideration of all of its elements. Several submissions highlight that discussions should respect the nationally determined and non-prescriptive nature of just transition pathways and that improvements should not create additional reporting burdens or obligations for Parties, in particular developing country Parties. Several submissions suggest that the specific needs and circumstances of developing countries, including the LDCs, be given greater attention, including through dedicated space in the dialogues. Several submissions highlighted that there is no-one-size-fits-all approach to just transitions. Some submissions highlight that future work should be guided by equity, the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities and respective national circumstances, with one submission suggesting that discussions should not have a mitigation-centric focus. Some submissions suggest that future work give greater attention to the connection between just transition pathways and pursuing efforts to limit the global temperature increase to 1.5 °C, the implementation of the outcomes of the first global stocktake and transitioning away from fossil fuels in a just, orderly and equitable manner. Some submissions propose a multi-year, Party-driven workplan that builds on the work undertaken so far, ensures continuity between dialogues, retains flexibility to take up emerging issues and carries lessons from the dialogues into recommendations and follow-up, including by relevant UNFCCC constituted bodies and workstreams. One submission suggests that the work programme should focus on its area of comparative advantage, namely the social, employment, economic and participatory dimensions of climate action, while drawing on technical work undertaken elsewhere under the UNFCCC.

20. On the topics and design of the dialogues, some submissions suggest a Party-driven selection of topics on the basis of transparent criteria, with guiding questions circulated in good time. Some submissions propose that topics and guiding questions build on previous dialogues and on the relevant outputs of other workstreams to avoid repetition, with one submission suggesting that topic selection should also take account of the Paris Agreement implementation cycle, including the preparation of NDCs, NAPs and LT-LEDS and the follow-up to the global stocktake. Some submissions propose focusing each dialogue on one clearly defined theme or devoting entire dialogues to the in-depth consideration of specific topics, such as social dialogue, social protection and skills development. Other proposals, each made by one submission, include revisiting previously discussed topics to take stock of progress and persisting challenges; addressing the operationalization of the just transition mechanism in the dialogues; structuring the dialogues around challenges and solutions, implementation barriers, support needs and follow-up; situating the topic of each dialogue in relation to the elements of the work programme as a whole; ensuring that dialogue outcomes help operationalize the connection between limiting warming to 1.5 °C and just transition pathways; and strengthening the evidence base of the dialogues by drawing on science-based inputs from research institutions and other relevant inputs from UNFCCC constituted bodies and relevant workstreams. On format, some submissions propose more interactive and participatory formats, such as breakout groups, world café sessions and small-group exchanges rather than plenary sessions, with one submission also proposing expert- or practitioner-led discussions, practical case studies and targeted sessions between Parties and relevant stakeholders. Some submissions suggest scene-setting presentations by a wider range of actors beyond technical experts, with balanced regional representation. Further

proposals, each made by one submission, include extending the dialogues to two days, keeping to the format communicated in advance without last minute changes, holding the dialogues in conjunction with the sessions of the subsidiary bodies, providing opportunities for regional and peer-to-peer exchange, and inviting the instruments, initiatives and processes under the Convention and the Paris Agreement and relevant entities in the United Nations system identified through the mapping, as well as organizations outside the United Nations system, to present at the dialogues.

21. On participation, several submissions suggest more balanced expert panels and presentations, with stronger participation of experts from developing country Parties, in particular the LDCs, and several propose broader participation of subnational governments, industry, workers and their organizations, employers' organizations, Indigenous Peoples, local communities, communities of African descent, women, youth, persons with disabilities and other directly affected groups, as participants, presenters and moderators. Some submissions propose dedicated financial and logistical support for the participation of developing country Parties and community representatives, while some submissions suggest further use of virtual participation formats. Other submissions suggest that the secretariat should provide information on participation disaggregated by region, gender, age, stakeholder group and type of expertise, with one submission suggesting that this information be included in the summary report on activities under the work programme. Some submissions suggest concrete measures to strengthen the formal participation and inclusion of Indigenous Peoples, and one proposes addressing the limit on credentials per constituency.

22. On the annual HLMRTs, some submissions propose clarifying how their role differs from that of the dialogues and strengthening the two-way exchange between the dialogues, their reports and the HLMRTs, so that technical findings inform the political discussions and high-level messages guide subsequent work. Other proposals, each made by one submission, include organizing the HLMRT around the thematic area of that year's dialogue, with the report of the dialogue to be presented during the event; providing Ministers with concise findings from the year's activities in advance of each HLMRT, better connecting HLMRTs with the cumulative body of evidence and lessons built under the work programme; focusing the discussions on the political barriers to implementation, including international cooperation and means of implementation, and reflecting the outcomes of the HLMRTs in high-level political declarations that guide priorities for subsequent work; using the HLMRTs to engage Ministers at a critical point in the negotiations to identify common ground at the political level, and to send signals to the financial architecture; and bringing political attention to human rights, the rights of Indigenous Peoples and gender responsiveness. One submission proposes that the HLMRTs be discontinued.

23. On the outputs of the work programme, in addition to the suggested improvements reflected in section II.D above, several submissions propose propose stronger and more systematic follow-up on the outcomes of the dialogue so that the lessons, actionable solutions, needs and barriers identified are carried into recommendations and into the work of relevant UNFCCC constituted bodies, workstreams and processes, and can inform subsequent dialogues. Several submissions propose that the findings of the dialogues be connected to practical outputs and implementation support through the just transition mechanism, with the outputs of the work programme systematically informing the mechanism and the experience gained through the mechanism informing the work programme. Some submissions also suggest encouraging a more systematic uptake of the outcomes of the dialogues in NDCs, NAPs and LT-LEDS, with one submission proposing that the work programme should assess such uptake and coordinate a response to the gaps identified. Some submissions see the mapping of relevant instruments, initiatives and processes requested in decision 2/CMA.7 as a tool for this purpose: one submission proposes that the work programme should identify, based on the mapping, the institutions and processes capable of responding to the needs identified through the work programme, the mechanism and national planning instruments; another submission suggests that the work programme should systematically build on the instruments, initiatives and processes identified through the mapping, so that they can support the implementation of the approaches discussed under the work programme and so that the work programme, in conjunction with the mechanism, serves as an entry point for Parties to access existing knowledge, expertise and implementation support. Some submissions propose aligning the

work programme with the global stocktake process. Other proposals, each made by one submission, include ensuring that each dialogue builds on the cumulative body of evidence and lessons under the work programme; standardized note-taking and reporting templates for facilitators; promoting the production, systematization and use of disaggregated data in the outputs of the work programme, so as to identify the distributional impacts of different just transition pathways, including which groups would access their benefits and which would bear disproportionate costs and risks; a monitoring, evaluation and reporting system, through the mechanism, for tracking progress and lessons over time, including the views shared during the dialogues; stronger links to the enhanced transparency framework; and the translation, by the work programme, of the outputs of the mechanism and other relevant work into operational guidance, for example by signalling priority sectors and regions for implementation and recommending indicators for baselines and progress tracking.

24. Most of the submissions suggest improving the modalities of the work programme through stronger coherence and coordination with UNFCCC constituted bodies, relevant workstreams and processes under the Convention and the Paris Agreement, as well as with financial institutions and relevant organizations and initiatives within and beyond the United Nations system, respecting existing mandates and avoiding duplication. One submission suggests clearer links with the Sharm el-Sheikh mitigation ambition and implementation work programme and with the follow-up process to the Belém Mission to 1.5. Some suggestions see the mapping of relevant instruments, initiatives and processes as a basis for identifying gaps, complementarities and opportunities for cooperation and for identifying institutions capable of responding to the needs identified through the work programme. One submission proposes two further means of coordination: in-session workshops bringing together UNFCCC processes and workstreams whose mandates risk overlapping, with a view to resolving such overlaps, for example through joint activities; and inviting constituted bodies to report on how they have integrated just transition considerations into their work, further to decision 2/CMA.7, with the work programme organizing and synthesizing such reporting. Another submission notes that existing intergovernmental platforms, such as those on sustainable cooling and on buildings, could offer channels for cooperation as the work programme advances and the mechanism is operationalized.

H. How the review of the work programme could inform or be informed by the process for the operationalization of the just transition mechanism, without prejudice to the mandate set out in paragraph 25 of decision 2/CMA.7

25. Almost all of the submissions address the relationship between the review of the work programme and the process for the operationalization of the just transition mechanism. Most of these consider that the two processes should inform each other and proceed in parallel, in a coordinated and mutually reinforcing manner, while respecting their separate mandates under decisions 3/CMA.5 and 2/CMA.7 and without prejudging the outcome of either. Several submissions consider that the lessons, gaps and implementation needs emerging from the work programme, including the knowledge and experience accumulated through the dialogues, should inform the design and operationalization of the mechanism, with one submission considering that the review should be leveraged to build a shared understanding among Parties of the mechanism's functions, institutional arrangements and modalities. Some submissions consider, conversely, that the operationalization of the mechanism should provide an important substantive input for the conclusion of the review, noting that the consideration of the future scope and modalities of the work programme would benefit from further clarity among Parties regarding the functions, modalities and governance arrangements of the mechanism, and that it would be difficult to reflect on enhancements to the work programme until the discussions on the mechanism advance further. Some submissions suggest that the outcome of the review explicitly set out how a continued work programme and an operationalized mechanism would complement each other, while another submission suggests that the proposals for improving the modalities of the work programme be taken into consideration in the development of the mechanism, so as to assess whether the suggested roles and improvements would be more appropriate under the mechanism or under a continued work programme.

26. Most of the submissions that address this matter consider that the work programme and the mechanism should be complementary and clearly distinguishable, with distinct but mutually reinforcing functions, and that neither should duplicate or substitute for the other. In their view, the work programme should remain the Party-driven political, policy and knowledge-focused platform and space for dialogue, the exchange of experiences, agenda-setting and the identification of needs, challenges, priorities and solutions, while the mechanism should be the operational arm that responds to the needs identified, through international cooperation, technical assistance, capacity-building, knowledge-sharing and facilitated access to means of implementation, serving, in the views of some, as an enabler of country-led delivery. Several submissions support clear institutional linkages and feedback between the two, with the outputs of the work programme informing the mechanism and the experience gained through the mechanism informing future dialogues. Some submissions stress that the design of the mechanism should not narrow the scope of the work programme or prejudge its continuation, and that its establishment should not result in the loss of the political and technical space created by the work programme. Conversely, one submission stresses that the work programme should not be used to replace, weaken or duplicate the functions of the mechanism. On the institutional relationship between the two, one submission considers that the mechanism should operate under the authority of the work programme rather than as a new standalone institutional structure, while another submission suggests that functions be allocated between the work programme and the mechanism on the basis of agreed criteria, with the work programme best suited to deliberative functions, such as dialogue, exchange, synthesis and political signals and guidance, and the mechanism to operational functions, such as capacity-building and technical assistance, the matching of support to requesting countries, the brokering of partnerships and the mobilization of finance. Another submission proposes the reverse arrangement, integrating the work programme into the mechanism.

27. With regards to the mapping of relevant instruments, initiatives and processes requested in decision 2/CMA.7, several submissions see it as a useful basis for identifying complementarities, gaps, overlaps and opportunities for cooperation, and for the mechanism to build on existing expertise and support rather than duplicate it. Some submissions consider, however, that the interim mapping has limitations as an evidence base for the review and for the design of the mechanism. The concerns expressed in these submissions include that it relies on explicit references to just transition rather than on an analysis of the functions performed, and may therefore omit relevant structures; that the information provided by contributing entities is uneven in quality and comparability, which a standardized template, covering for example the geographic and beneficiary scope and the scale of support, would address; and that it records mandates and activities without assessing whether support is delivered at adequate scale, quality and accessibility. One of these submissions adds that, as the functions of the mechanism have yet to be agreed, the mapping cannot yet assess needs against them. Some submissions suggest that the final mapping and synthesis report identify where existing instruments, initiatives and processes fall short in supporting just transition pathways, so that it can inform the design of the mechanism and clarify its added value. One submission suggests that relevant United Nations mechanisms on the rights of Indigenous Peoples be considered in the mapping.

28. Some submissions also include views on the operationalization of the mechanism itself. These submissions suggest that the mechanisms should be facilitative of implementation, nationally determined and supportive, anchored in equity, the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities and nationally determined development priorities, with international cooperation and means of implementation as its central enablers; that it should incorporate racial, social and territorial equity criteria and ensure the participation of directly affected non-Party stakeholders in identifying needs and priorities; that it should advance the rights of Indigenous Peoples recognized in decision 2/CMA.7; and that its effectiveness will depend on clear functions, meaningful participation and adequate scale and resources. One submission cautions against a protracted design process.