COP31 Position Paper

Advancing Climate Justice in an Age of Crises

Global Campaign to Demand Climate Justice (DCJ)

Background

Climate Justice in an Age of Collapsing Glaciers, Ongoing Genocide and Rampant Militarism

COP31 (the 31st Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), from November 8-20, 2026 in Antalya, Turkiye) calls attention to countries' commitments for implementing the 2015 Paris Agreement. As collapsing glaciers unleash unfathomable flooding as seen now in Nepal, and imperialist aggression accelerates the global scramble to secure supplies of energy and critical minerals (all amid AI's hyperscaled infrastructure build-out), climate justice advocates focus on the powerful actors' avoiding any accountability for their legal commitments while we push forward our own proposals for fairness in implementation. If Antalya is to be about implementation and delivering on countries' commitments, then we need to see Global North governments come clean on their unfulfilled legal obligations under the Paris Agreement's Article 9.1, in which they agreed they "shall provide financial resources to assist developing countries".

DCJ stands in solidarity with Palestine and with the peoples across the world who have been on the receiving end of imperial wars, invasions, attacks to their sovereignty and their right to self-determination. We condemn the subjection of civilians to warfare for territory, natural resources, or religious conflict anywhere and everywhere. We stand in strong opposition to the perpetuation of human and environmental suffering across the world. We commit to a solidarity not based in words but in actions. There cannot be emancipation and liberation with ongoing imperial and colonial capitalism, which must be our first priority to dismantle.

This context matters because climate negotiations are not politically neutral spaces. They are shaped by the same global inequalities that produced the crisis. The countries and corporations most responsible for climate breakdown continue to hold disproportionate power over the terms of climate action, while the peoples and communities most affected continue to fight for their rights and justice. Every major issue on the agenda for COP31, from climate finance, adaptation, loss and damage to just transition, fossil fuel phase-out, mitigation and false solutions, reflects a broader struggle over rights, responsibility, redistribution and the future of multilateralism.

Is Nepal's nightmare the new abnormal?

We've been warned of Glacier Lake Outburst Floods (GLOFs) rates rising in both frequency and intensity along with today's warmer temperatures and thawing permafrost. Now almost

1,500 Nepalese were killed, over 5,000 still missing and 15,000 rescued. Nepal has suffered one of the worst disasters in its recent history. Yet as the planet continues to warm, communities across the Himalayas face the threat of even more devastating catastrophes. That is, unless we urgently end fossil fuels expansion, rapidly reduce their use and quickly adapt while transitioning to new equitable economic systems aligned with natural limits. Until then, we must build more readiness among international institutions' to responsibly avoid such catastrophes, let alone respond to and recover from more of them.

Nepal's disaster shows us that the Paris Agreement Finance Mechanism (including the new Fund for Responding to Loss and Damage, Adaptation Fund and Green Climate Fund) are currently failing front line communities and entire countries across the Global South who are at the frontline of this crisis that did not create and often pushing them further into debt.

A concept note for a project to protect communities in Nepal from GLOFs was submitted to the Green Climate Fund (GCF) in February 2018. The $36 million project was approved in July 2025, only seven years later, and commenced in March 2026. While the area struck by the August 2026 disaster is not included in the project, the slow approval process raises serious questions about the capacity of international climate finance to respond quickly to known and growing risks. Frontline communities need resources, safer infrastructure and early warning systems to prepare for disaster. They need the money while there is still time to prevent the loss of lives, livelihoods, culture, ways of living, and not after the damage has been done.

Across the world, not only now in Nepal, communities are confronting escalating climate impacts alongside deepening militarisation, debt crises, economic instability, shrinking civic space, rising authoritarianism and the continued concentration of wealth and power in the hands of a small number of states, corporations and financial actors. The climate crisis is unfolding not in isolation, but resulting from a global political order structured by histories and ongoing acts of colonisation, imperialism, racial capitalism, patriarchy, extractivism and the continued sacrifice of peoples and ecosystems in the pursuit of profit for a few.

Growing Militarism vs Climate Justice

The ongoing genocide in Palestine, carried out by Israel with the military, political and economic backing of the United States and its allies, has laid bare the brutality and hypocrisy of the present international order. The destruction of Palestinian life, land, food systems, water infrastructure, energy systems, homes, hospitals, schools and places of worship is not only a humanitarian catastrophe. It is also a profound indictment of an international system that claims to uphold human rights, international law and multilateral cooperation while enabling impunity for occupation, apartheid and genocide. For climate justice movements, this moment demands political clarity that there can be no climate justice while genocide is normalised, while occupation is greenwashed, and while current economic systems driven by militarism and fossil fueled capitalism continue to destroy both peoples and ecosystems.

The relationship between militarism and the climate crisis is not incidental. Fossil fuels remain central to modern military power, geopolitical conflicts and domination, and global economic control. Military operations depend on oil, gas and petrochemical supply chains; fossil fuel revenues and infrastructure shape conflicts and geopolitical alliances; and the military-industrial complex absorbs vast public resources that could otherwise be directed towards climate finance, adaptation, public services and just transition. At the same time, war and occupation destroy the very ecosystems that communities need to survive climate impacts: land, water, food, healthcare, housing, energy and social infrastructure.

The Global South continues to bear the brunt of this injustice. Countries and communities that contributed least to the climate crisis are facing the most severe impacts while being denied the resources necessary to respond. Many developing countries are trapped in cycles of debt servicing, austerity and extractive dependency that restrict their ability to invest in adaptation, public services, food sovereignty, energy transition and resilient development. International financial institutions, unequal trade rules, intellectual property barriers and investor protections continue to constrain the policy space required for an ambitious climate action. In this context, calls for ambition that do not address finance, debt, technology and historical responsibility only become new forms of shifting burden.

Real risks to Belem's breakthroughs

COP30 in Belém created important openings, but it did not resolve these contradictions. The agreement to establish the Just Transition Mechanism (Belém Antalya Mechanism) represented a significant victory for developing countries, workers, Indigenous Peoples, feminist movements, youth, frontline communities and climate justice organisations. It reflected years of organising to ensure that transition is not reduced to market-led technological substitution but understood as a question of justice, rights, livelihoods and systems change. The roadmap process on transitioning away from fossil fuels also opened a political space to confront the root cause of the climate crisis. Progress on adaptation and related implementation processes created additional possibilities for advancing rights-based and peoples-centred climate action.

Yet COP30 also demonstrated the continued resistance of developed countries to fulfilling their obligations. Article 9.1 of the Paris Agreement, in which developed countries agreed that they "shall provide climate finance" to developing countries, continued to be contested and diluted. Adaptation and loss and damage remained underfunded. Fossil fuel interests and false solutions perpetrators continued to shape climate action. Carbon markets, offsets, carbon capture, financialised nature schemes and other mechanisms continued to be promoted as substitutes for real emissions reductions, public finance and system change.

The outcomes of Belém therefore created both opportunities and risks. COP31 in Antalya is where many of these political battles now move from recognition to operationalisation. This distinction is critical. The fight after Belém is no longer only about whether Parties acknowledge the need for climate finance, just transition, adaptation, loss and damage or

fossil fuel phase-out. It is about how those commitments are interpreted, governed, financed and implemented.

Collapsing glaciers causing massive floods downstream now mark a new moment in today's climate crisis, where treatment by international institutions of the impacted communities fighting for their own survival signals uncertain prospects for forthcoming climate finance. History shows that implementation is often where justice is diluted. Commitments secured through struggle can be narrowed through technical processes, weakened through procedural delays, captured by corporate interests or redirected towards market mechanisms. COP31 must therefore be approached as a political battleground over the future direction of climate action.

DCJ's Topline Demands for COP31

DCJ demands for COP31 are rooted in our clear understanding of climate justice:

1. Developed countries must fulfil their obligations under Article 9.1 and provide public, grant-based, predictable and adequate finance to developing countries.
2. Adaptation & loss and damage must be financed as matters of rights and reparative justice.
3. Just Transition Mechanism (Belem-Antalya Mechanism or BAM) must be operationalised in ways that support systemic transformation across energy, food, care, labour, public services, critical minerals and development pathways.
4. Transitions away from fossil fuels must be rapid, equitable, anti-extractivist and grounded in the political vision emerging from Santa Marta.
5. Article 6 and other false solutions must not be allowed to delay real action or create new markets for pollution and dispossession.
6. Mitigation must remain anchored in equity, CBDR-RC and means of implementation rather than becoming another tool for shifting burdens onto developing countries.

COP31 must also ensure that, human rights and international law must be a central to the climate multilateralism itself by:

- protecting civic space, ensuring meaningful participation of rights-holders and movements, and confronting corporate capture within the UNFCCC. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change must urgently establish an Accountability Framework to end this corporate capture.
- putting military and conflict-related emissions and military spending on the UNFCCC agenda. Suspend Israel from the UNFCCC and exclude it from COP spaces until it complies with international law and upholds Palestinian rights, including refugees' right of return and reparations;
- understanding that climate governance will lose legitimacy if it continues to treat demands of the peoples most affected as negotiable while protecting interests of people most responsible.

The climate crisis is often described as a crisis of emissions. It is that, but it is also far more. It is a crisis of colonial history, economic organisation, political power and moral accountability. Addressing it requires more than technical implementation. It requires reparations, redistribution, democratic participation, public finance, energy sovereignty, food sovereignty, gender justice, Indigenous sovereignty and the dismantling of the systems that have made both people and planet expendable.

This position paper sets out DCJ's priorities for COP31 from that perspective. It is written in the understanding that climate justice will not be delivered through incremental adjustments to an unjust system. It will require confronting the structures that created the crisis and building pathways rooted in collective resistance and survival, feminist care, dignity and liberation. Systems change, not climate change.

Antalya's Priority Outcomes

Climate Finance Work Programme and Article 9.1

Climate finance remains COP31's defining test of whether the climate regime is prepared to uphold the principles of equity and historical responsibility agreed at Rio in the 1992 UNFCCC. Developed countries continue to fall far short of their obligations despite overwhelming evidence that sufficient resources exist to finance transformative climate action. Antalya's struggle over Article 9.1 is not merely a debate about financial flows but a struggle over responsibility itself.

As articulated in its official submission, DCJ rejects attempts to frame climate finance as aid, philanthropy or voluntary support. Climate finance is an obligation rooted in historical responsibility and climate debt. Developed countries must provide public, grant-based, predictable and adequate finance consistent with their commitments under the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement. Climate finance must also be understood within a broader framework of reparative justice that includes debt cancellation, reform of the international financial architecture and mechanisms to ensure that those who have profited most from climate destruction contribute proportionately to addressing its consequences.

Adaptation Finance and the Global Goal on Adaptation

Adaptation is a matter of survival for billions of peoples across the Global South. Yet adaptation finance remains dramatically inadequate despite rapidly growing needs. Communities are already confronting severe climate impacts while lacking access to the resources necessary to strengthen resilience and protect livelihoods.

DCJ calls for a *substantial increase* in public, grant-based adaptation finance and rejects efforts to rely on private finance and market mechanisms. Adaptation must be grounded in rights, participation, Indigenous knowledge, food sovereignty and community leadership. The

continued development of the Global Goal on Adaptation must support implementation rather than becoming an exercise in technocratic measurement detached from lived realities.

Loss and Damage

The climate crisis is already causing irreversible harms that cannot be prevented through mitigation or adaptation alone as seen during the catastrophic floods in Nepal this year. Communities are losing homes, livelihoods, ecosystems, cultures and territories as climate impacts intensify. COP27's establishment of the Fund for Responding to Loss and Damage (FRLD) represented an important political victory, but current levels of finance remain wholly inadequate compared to actual needs.

DCJ reiterates that loss and damage finance must be understood as reparative finance. It must be new, additional, grant-based and distinct from adaptation and mitigation finance. Polluter-pays mechanisms, including taxes on fossil fuel extraction, extreme wealth and corporate windfall profits, should be advanced as important sources of finance.

S**cience and equity reset**

The International Panel on Climate Change, one of the chief sources of scientific information for UNFCCC, must update its methodologies to better inform its scenarios and pathways, particularly by incorporating more views from Global South contributors that include justice and equity.

Overshoot scenarios must account for food security, inequality, energy poverty and more equitable sharing and distribution of benefits and resources. Antalya will also address emerging equity issues in scientific research and IPCC's role in informing policy such as in the upcoming GST2.

Operationalising the Belem-Antalya Mechanism for Just Transition (BAM)

The agreement to develop the Just Transition Mechanism at COP30 represented a significant achievement. However, the creation of a mechanism alone does not guarantee justice. A central question in Antalya is whether the way COP31 defines and designs the Mechanism will support transformative change or merely manage the social consequences of existing economic models.

DCJ rejects narrow approaches that reduce just transition to energy sector restructuring or workforce adjustment. Just transition must encompass food systems, care economies, public services, critical minerals, workers' rights, Indigenous sovereignty and democratic control over resources. The Mechanism must be supported by adequate finance and meaningful participation by workers, Indigenous Peoples, peasants, fisherfolk, women, youth and frontline communities.

The DCJ Just Transition WG has prepared this short briefing about what's on the table for the COP31 Just Transition negotiations. It also explains the role and vision for peoples

participation - from design, to delivery to knowledge generation. Included in the briefer is the key messages prepared by the WG that they will take to the negotiations! Link here.

Transitioning Away from Fossil Fuels

COP28's commitment in Dubai to transition away from fossil fuels marked an important breakthrough, but implementation remains contested. The "roadmap" process initiated under the Brazilian COP30 Presidency (as opposed to any agreed mandate by all countries) must not become a vehicle for delaying action or reproducing extractivist development models under new forms.

Drawing on the political vision emerging from Santa Marta, DCJ calls for a transition rooted in justice, sovereignty, care and democratic control. The transition away from fossil fuels must not be used to justify new forms of extraction, including the expansion of critical mineral supply chains that sacrifice communities and ecosystems in the Global South. Climate justice requires confronting both fossil fuels and the systems of power that sustain them.

Article 6 and False Solutions

Climate justice movements continue to confront the expansion of false solutions that allow polluters to delay structural transformation while claiming climate leadership. Carbon markets, offsets, carbon capture technologies, geoengineering and the financialisation of nature all risk entrenching existing power structures while failing to address the root causes of climate breakdown.

The continued promotion of false solutions reflects the influence of fossil fuel interests and corporate actors within climate governance. COP31 must resist efforts to expand reliance in Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) on market-based approaches and instead prioritise real solutions rooted in public accountability, food sovereignty, Indigenous stewardship, community-controlled renewable energy and systemic transformation.

Mitigation Work Programme

The Mitigation Work Programme must remain firmly grounded in equity and CBDR-RC. Developing countries have repeatedly raised concerns regarding attempts to use the MWP as a vehicle for shifting mitigation burdens onto countries least responsible for the climate crisis while developed countries continue to evade obligations on finance and support.

Mitigation ambition cannot be separated from developed nations' historical responsibility and means of implementation. Climate finance, technology transfer, debt justice and policy space remain essential prerequisites for equitable climate action.

Cross-Cutting Priorities

Across all negotiating tracks, DCJ calls for climate action grounded in equity, historical responsibility, human rights, Indigenous sovereignty, feminist climate justice, democratic

participation and protection from corporate capture. Climate governance must strengthen civic space, ensure meaningful participation by rights-holders and adopt robust conflict-of-interest policies that prevent fossil fuel interests and big polluters from shaping climate action.

The Challenge Before COP31

A central challenge facing COP31 is not the absence of solutions. Communities, movements and frontline peoples have long advanced pathways capable of addressing both climate breakdown and social injustice. The challenge is whether governments are prepared to confront the structures of power and privilege that continue to benefit from the crisis.

For DCJ, climate action must be rooted in reparative justice, international solidarity and system change. Anything less will preserve the unequal and unjust systems that created the climate crisis while leaving its underlying causes intact.

COP31 must therefore advance implementation in ways that strengthen accountability, uphold historical responsibility and support the system change grounded in the peoples led solutions necessary to secure a just, equitable, healthy life and planet for all.

Climate Justice in an Age of Genocide and Climate Breakdown

Palestine, Energy Embargo and Climate Justice: Confronting Genocide, Occupation and Fossil-Fuelled Militarism

The Global Campaign to Demand Climate Justice unequivocally condemns the ongoing genocide being carried out against the Palestinian people and the continued occupation, apartheid and settler-colonial violence imposed by the genocidal state of Israel with the political, military and economic backing of the United States and its allies. The systematic destruction of Palestinian life cannot be treated as a peripheral issue; it is central to any real understanding of justice, accountability and international cooperation. The world has witnessed the destruction of entire families, neighbourhoods, refugee camps, hospitals, schools, universities, places of worship, agricultural lands, water systems and energy infrastructure. Palestinians have been murdered, displaced, starved, besieged and denied access to the basic rights necessary for survival.

The struggle for Palestine liberation is inseparable from the broader struggles against colonialism, imperialism, militarism, racism, patriarchy and economic exploitation that climate justice movements have long confronted. The same systems that dispossess Palestinian communities are the systems that displace Indigenous Peoples, destroy forests, privatise

water, criminalise land defenders, expand fossil fuel extraction and sacrifice communities across the Global South in the pursuit of profit and geopolitical power.

Fossil Fuels, Militarism and the Architecture of Imperial Power

The genocide in Palestine, and the US-Israel led imperlist wars on Lebanon, Syria, Iran, Venezuela, and Cuba also reveals the deeper relationship between fossil fuels, militarism and global systems of power. Climate negotiations often treat fossil fuels primarily as sources of greenhouse gas emissions but fossil fuels are also infrastructures of geopolitical power. Modern militaries are among the most fossil-fuel-dependent institutions in the world and the carbon footprint of Israel's war on Gaza exceeds that of many countries. The fossil fuel economy does not merely emit carbon but also fuels the machinery of imperialism, war, occupation, colonialism, extractions and destruction of the planet.

These dynamics are visible across other regions of the Global South. Economic coercion, unilateral sanctions, resource extraction, military intervention and geopolitical competition continue to shape the realities of countries such as Iran, Venezuela and Cuba. Across Africa, Asia and Latin America, communities confront extractive industries, resource grabs and energy projects imposed without consent in the name of development, security or economic growth. The same global order that treats Palestinian life as expendable also treats territories across the Global South as sacrifice zones for continued extraction and profit.

The Peoples Summit Declaration emerging from Santa Marta recognised these common realities. Hence the struggle for climate justice is much broader than emissions reductions and must also confront the political and economic structures through which fossil fuels sustain systems of violence and extraction.

Military Emissions, Military Expenditure, and the Climate Governance Blind Spot

One of the most significant contradictions within international climate governance is the near absence of discussion around militarism and military emissions. The UNFCCC process devotes enormous attention to emissions accounting, transparency frameworks and mitigation pathways. Yet military activities remain among the least scrutinised sources of emissions globally. Military emissions reporting remains inconsistent, incomplete and frequently shielded from public scrutiny.

This omission is not merely technical. It reflects political choices about which sources of emissions are considered legitimate subjects of international accountability and which are protected by claims of national security, geopolitical interest or military necessity. The contradiction becomes even sharper when viewed alongside climate finance. Governments that argue that public finance for adaptation, loss and damage or just transition is fiscally constrained continue to allocate vast sums to military expansion. The same states resisting obligations under Article 9.1 routinely mobilise resources for weapons, military bases, border regimes and geopolitical competition. In 2024, worldwide military expenditure had its steepest rise since the end of the cold war, reaching $2.7tn an increase of 9.4 per cent in

real terms from 2023. The question is therefore not whether public resources exist, but whose security is prioritised and whose lives are considered expendable. SB64 should begin recognising that climate finance, fossil fuel phase-out and mitigation cannot be separated from the structures of militarism that continue to consume resources, produce emissions and devastate communities.

From Solidarity to Accountability: Energy Embargo on Israel

The growing calls emerging from Palestinian movements for a global energy embargo on Israel is a demand to move from symbolic expressions of support towards material accountability.

These demands recognise that systems of violence are sustained through energy supply chains, financial institutions, insurers, shipping companies, infrastructure providers and corporations that continue to profit from occupation and genocide. Energy embargoes are interventions aimed at disrupting the infrastructures that sustain occupation and not just a foreign policy tool.

This also raises an integral issue around corporate accountability. Fossil fuel corporations cannot simultaneously present themselves as partners in climate solutions while benefiting from systems of militarism, occupation and ecological destruction. Similarly, financial institutions cannot claim climate leadership while underwriting activities that enable violence and dispossession. Governments cannot claim commitment to international cooperation while allowing energy trade and infrastructure to fuel genocide.

What COP31 must deliver

1. **Suspend Israel from the UNFCCC and exclude it from COP spaces** until it complies with international law and upholds Palestinian rights, including refugees' right of return and reparations.
2. **End the illegal extraction of Palestinian energy resources.** Call on Dana Petroleum to withdraw from its consortium with Ratio Energies and oppose the EU–Egypt–Israel gas agreements.
3. **Impose a comprehensive energy embargo on Israel.** Halt direct and indirect supplies of oil, gas and coal, including through intermediaries and third countries. As COP31 host, Türkiye should stop Israel-bound oil shipments through its territory and ports and publish independently verifiable information on enforcement. Workers organising to stop these shipments should have legal support and protection from retaliation.
4. **End Agribusiness complicity in occupation and water apartheid.** Boycott and divest from complicit agribusiness firms, terminate agreements with Mekorot, end joint climate research with Israel and complicit institutions, and oppose solar geoengineering and other false solutions.
5. **Put military and conflict-related emissions on the UNFCCC agenda.** Launch a formal process for mandatory military emissions reporting, accounting for conflict-related emissions and commitments to reduce both. Build support through

COP32 for a decision by COP33. Require transparency on military fuel supplies, adopt a conflict-of-interest policy covering fossil fuel, arms and apartheid-linked corporations, and assess how the costs arising from Israel's actions affect finance for just transition and loss and damage.

Climate Finance and Article 9.1

Reparative Justice, Redistribution and Climate Finance

Climate finance remains the defining political fault line within the climate regime. More than three decades after the adoption of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and ten years after the Paris Agreement, the central question confronting COP31 negotiations remains unresolved: will those most responsible for the climate crisis provide the resources necessary for an equitable global response, or will the costs of climate action continue to be shifted onto those least responsible for creating the problem?

This question sits at the centre of nearly every agenda item before COP31. The implementation of the Just Transition Mechanism, progress on Adaptation, operationalisation of the new Fund to Respond to Loss and Damage, implementation of NDCs and transitions away from fossil fuels not to mention the ability of developing countries to pursue equitable development pathways all depend upon the availability of adequate, predictable and public finance. Climate finance is therefore not one negotiating issue among many. It is the foundation upon which meaningful implementation across the climate regime depends.

The persistent failure of developed countries to meet their obligations continues to undermine trust in the multilateral process. While climate impacts intensify across the Global South, many developed countries continue to expand fossil fuel production, increase military spending and protect corporate interests while resisting efforts to provide climate finance at the scale required by science and justice.

Defending Article 9.1 and Historical Responsibility

For many developing countries and climate justice movements, Article 9.1 legal obligations represents maybe the most important safeguards against attempts to shift discussions away from obligations and towards broader narratives of shared responsibility, voluntary contributions and private capital mobilisation. These approaches frequently present climate finance as a collective challenge requiring contributions from all actors while downplaying the specific obligations of developed countries.

Such narratives are deeply problematic. They obscure the historical realities that gave rise to the climate crisis and undermine the political foundations of international cooperation. The climate regime was never built on the assumption that all countries bear equal responsibility for climate change. It was built on the recognition that responsibility, capability and vulnerability are distributed unequally and that climate action must therefore be guided by

equity and Common but Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities (CBDR-RC).

Industrialised countries accumulated wealth through development pathways that relied upon unrestricted fossil fuel use and the large-scale extraction of resources, labour and ecological wealth from colonised territories in the Global South. These processes enabled a relatively small number of countries to achieve industrialisation while occupying a disproportionate share of the Earth's carbon budget. The benefits of this development remain concentrated within those economies, while many of the social and ecological costs have been shifted onto communities across the Global South.

The concept of climate debt emerges from this history. It recognises that the climate crisis is not merely the result of emissions but of unequal social, economic and political relations that have shaped both development and vulnerability. Climate debt therefore challenges attempts to frame climate finance as aid or charity. Instead, it locates climate finance within a broader framework of accountability and reparative justice. This perspective is particularly important at a time when many developed countries continue to portray climate finance as discretionary support rather than an obligation arising from historical responsibility.

Many developing countries now face an increasingly unsustainable combination of debt burdens, climate vulnerability and fiscal constraints. Large portions of public revenue are directed towards debt servicing while governments struggle to finance healthcare, education, social protection, adaptation and climate resilience. Climate disasters frequently exacerbate these pressures, forcing governments to assume additional debt in order to rebuild infrastructure and support affected communities. Hence, debt cancellation, financial reform and expanded fiscal space must therefore be understood as integral components of climate action.

Article 9.1 Climate Finance Work Programme

The current Climate Finance Work Programme (CFWP), arrived at as a compromise in Belem due to rigid opposition by developed countries to the original proposal, therefore needs to bring back the rightful focus on Article 9.1 of the Paris Agreement (PA) which clearly mandates the legal obligations and commitments of developed countries to provide climate finance, “in continuation of their existing obligations under the Convention”.

Specifically, Article 4.3 of the Convention provides for “new and additional” financial resources by developed countries to developing countries as well as the “need for adequacy and predictability in the flow of funds and the importance of appropriate burden sharing” among developed countries; furthermore, it directly links to Article 11 of the Convention which defines the “Financial Mechanism” as a “mechanism for the provision of financial resources on a grant or concessional basis, including for the transfer of technology”. All these fundamental elements, based on the underlying principles of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, are therefore legally tied to Article

9.1 of the PA and must be addressed comprehensively by the thematic pillars of the work programme to arrive at concrete outputs and outcomes that are actionable and meaningful.

The role and delivery of Article 9.1 is key in the context of the new collective quantified goal on climate finance (NCQG) of at least USD 300 billion per year by 2035 and the aspirational target of at least USD 1.3 trillion per year by 2035. Solid and substantial provision of finance is imperative to enable the mobilisation expected to meet these figures - and to go beyond, given that the NCQG is a highly unambitious goal falling far short of both demand and actual needs (with the latest Needs Determination Report citing USD 5.01-6.88 trillion up to 2030 for developing countries' NDCs alone, not taking into account additional costs of the energy transition away from fossil fuels).

Read DCJ's submission on Article 9.1

DCJ calls on countries to strengthen Article 9.1 positions and be ambitious about what the Climate Finance WP can look like and accomplish. Beyond basic assessments of actual financial flows and agreements on definitions, we must make a compelling case for financial goals aimed at meeting actual needs. CFWG is to test the integrity of implementation and international trust through an attempt at collective assessment of where we are and why, then agree a plan for what next and how to ensure accountability for commitments to provide climate finance to developing countries

Accountability for the legal commitments of developed countries to contribute finance and technology according to agreed equity principles is in the ICJAO:

"...climate change treaties set forth binding obligations for States parties to ensure the protection of the climate system and other parts of the environment from anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions. These obligations include the following: …(h) States parties to the Paris Agreement have obligations of adaptation and co-operation, including through technology and financial transfers, which must be performed in good faith."

As DCJ and cross-constituency allies pointed out in our PayUp campaign prior to NCQG at 2024's COP29 in Baku, Global North governments possess plenty of finance and thus must: 1) tap top sources such as shifting financial flows from fossil fuels subsidies and military budget while changing policies for tax, trade, finance (esp debt) and tech justice; as well as 2) push out opponents to providing climate finance and proactively countering disinformation

The Baku-to-Belém Roadmap and the Future of Climate Finance

The decisions adopted at COP29 and COP30 have created a new phase in climate finance discussions. The establishment of the NCQG and the development of the Baku-to-Belém Roadmap have generated expectations regarding the scale, quality and delivery of finance required to support implementation across the climate regime. Yet significant concerns remain regarding the direction of these discussions.

Developing countries and climate justice movements have repeatedly warned against approaches that prioritise accounting exercises and mobilisation narratives while avoiding the central question of public finance obligations. There is a growing tendency within climate finance debates to focus on aggregate financial flows without adequately distinguishing between public and private finance, grants and loans, or obligations and voluntary contributions. Such approaches create the appearance of progress while leaving underlying inequalities intact.

The success of the Roadmap process will ultimately depend not on the volume of finance that can be claimed on paper but on whether it strengthens accountability, increases public grant-based finance and delivers resources to the communities and countries that need them most. A roadmap that substitutes private investment for public obligations or that obscures developed country responsibilities behind broader mobilisation targets will fail to address the political crisis at the heart of climate finance negotiations.

What COP31 Must Deliver

For climate justice movements, COP31 must reaffirm that climate finance remains an obligation rather than a voluntary contribution and any discussions on implementation must strengthen, rather than weaken, the principles embedded in Article 9.1 and CBDR-RC. Progress on adaptation, loss and damage, just transition and the transition away from fossil fuels will remain impossible without substantial increases in public, grant-based finance provided by developed countries in line with their historical responsibilities.

COP31 should therefore advance discussions that strengthen accountability under Article 9.1, the NCQG, detail developed country obligations, support debt justice and fiscal sovereignty, reject efforts to substitute private finance for public responsibility and ensure that climate finance is delivered in ways that support transformative, community-led and rights-based approaches to climate action.

Adaptation Finance

Financing Survival, Resilience and Climate Justice

Adaptation finance has long occupied a paradoxical position within the climate regime. While adaptation is recognised as an urgent priority for billions of peoples across the Global South, it continues to receive only a fraction of the resources required to address rapidly escalating climate impacts. Communities are already confronting increasingly severe floods, droughts, storms, heatwaves, sea-level rise and ecosystem degradation, yet the financial support necessary to strengthen resilience and reduce vulnerability remains profoundly inadequate. Unlike many mitigation discussions that focus on avoiding future warming, adaptation concerns the realities that communities are experiencing today. Across Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Caribbean, and the Pacific, climate impacts are already disrupting food systems, threatening water security, damaging livelihoods and placing enormous strain on

public infrastructure and social systems. The need for adaptation finance therefore reflects existing realities rather than future projections.

Adaptation is often presented as a technical challenge involving infrastructure, technology and risk management. While these dimensions are important, such framings can obscure the political and social realities that shape vulnerability as communities do not experience climate impacts equally. Exposure to climate hazards is profoundly influenced by access to land, housing, healthcare, education, social protection, public services and political power. The communities most vulnerable to climate change are also confronting poverty, marginalisation, land dispossession, discrimination and economic exclusion. Financing adaptation cannot be reduced to building infrastructure or deploying technologies. It must also support the social, economic and political conditions that enable communities to respond to climate impacts with dignity and agency. Adaptation finance must therefore strengthen food sovereignty, public services, social protection systems, community-led adaptation, Indigenous territorial governance and ecosystem stewardship rather than focusing narrowly on technical interventions.

The Adaptation Finance Gap

Despite repeated commitments by developed countries, adaptation finance remains dramatically below identified needs. The Adaptation Gap Report 2026 by UNEP clearly shows that the need for adaptation finance is at more than US$305 billion a year by 2035, yet the international public adaptation finance flows to developing countries were US$28.2-31.7 billion in 2024. At the same time, National Adaptation Plans submitted by developing countries estimate total adaptation finance needs at $842-844 billion. While climate impacts continue to intensify, financial support has failed to keep pace with growing needs. This gap reflects broader political choices regarding how climate finance is mobilised and distributed.

Adaptation requires large scale grants-based public financing to strengthen public healthcare systems, climate resilient food systems and agriculture, restore ecosystems, improve water management and expand social protection. However, the lack of adaptation finance clearly demonstrates why public finance remains indispensable to climate justice when one of the most troubling trends is the continued reliance on loans as a source of support.

Communities are being forced to adapt because they are experiencing the consequences of a crisis disproportionately created by others. Requiring vulnerable countries to assume additional debt in order to respond to climate impacts effectively transfers the costs of climate breakdown onto those least responsible for causing it.

Global South countries should not be forced to choose between investing in resilience and managing debt burdens. Adaptation should not become another mechanism through which wealth is extracted from vulnerable countries under the guise of climate support. Rather, adaptation finance must contribute to expanding fiscal space and strengthening public

resilience. Countries must come together and set a replenishment target for adaptation that is ambitious and meets the trillions of dollars of the scale of need of the Global South.

Food Sovereignty, Agroecology and Community Resilience

The growing climate crisis is placing enormous pressure on food systems across the Global South. Unpredictable rainfall, prolonged droughts, flooding, soil degradation and ecosystem disruption are already affecting the ability of communities to produce food and sustain livelihoods. Adaptation finance must support transformative approaches to food systems rather than reinforcing industrial agricultural models that contribute to environmental degradation and dependence on fossil-fuel-intensive inputs. Agroecology, food sovereignty, Indigenous food systems and community-controlled seed systems offer pathways that strengthen resilience while supporting biodiversity, local economies and community autonomy.

These approaches are particularly important because they simultaneously address multiple dimensions of vulnerability. They improve food security, strengthen livelihoods, support ecosystem health and reduce dependence on external inputs. Yet they remain significantly underfunded compared to large-scale infrastructure and market-based interventions.

A climate justice approach to adaptation finance therefore requires a substantial shift in priorities towards community-led and ecosystem-based approaches that strengthen resilience from the ground up.

Adaptation Finance After COP30

The outcomes emerging from COP30 reinforced the importance of adaptation while highlighting the continuing challenges associated with implementation. Progress on adaptation frameworks and indicators has generated new opportunities for monitoring and accountability, but these developments cannot substitute for the mobilisation of adequate resources. For this reason, adaptation finance must remain central to discussions at Antalya. The success of adaptation-related outcomes adopted in recent years will ultimately be judged not by the sophistication of reporting systems but whether communities gain access to the resources necessary to strengthen resilience and protect livelihoods.

What COP31 Must Deliver

- Substantially increase public, grant-based adaptation finance in line with developed countries' obligations under Article 9.1 of the Paris Agreement.
- Operationalise and establish a pathway to deliver on the commitment made at COP30 on tripling adaptation finance from developed to developing countries.
- Close the adaptation finance gap through predictable, accessible, and adequate finance that does not create additional debt burdens.
- Ensure adaptation finance reaches frontline communities directly and supports locally led adaptation efforts.

- Prioritise funding for food sovereignty, agroecology, Indigenous Peoples' stewardship, ecosystem restoration, public services, and social protection systems.
- Guarantee that adaptation action advances climate justice, self-determination, human rights, and democratic participation.
- Reject loan-based approaches and ensure adaptation finance supports sustainable development pathways rather than deepening inequalities.

Loss and Damage Fund

From Recognition to Reparative Justice

COP27's creation of the Fund for Responding to Loss and Damage (FRLD) was a hard-won victory secured through decades of struggle by climate-vulnerable countries and climate justice movements. It reflected the recognition that communities across the Global South are already experiencing irreversible climate impacts, including the loss of lives, livelihoods, ecosystems, cultures, territories and ways of life, despite having contributed least to the climate crisis. At its core, loss and damage is not simply a question of finance but of reparations, historical responsibility, accountability and climate justice.

Today, climate-related losses are escalating at an unprecedented pace. Communities are confronting increasingly severe floods, droughts, typhoons, sea-level rise, devastating heatwaves, and ecosystem collapse, while non-economic losses such as cultural heritage, traditional knowledge, biodiversity and community identity continue to disappear. Yet current financial commitments remain dramatically disconnected from the scale of need. Existing pledges to the FRLD represent only a tiny fraction of the hundreds of billions of dollars lost to losses and damages annually, while projected needs are expected to reach trillions of dollars by 2030. The gap reflects not a lack of available resources, but a continued refusal by developed countries to meet their historical responsibilities.

As discussions continue at Antalya, there is a growing risk that loss and damage is reduced to a humanitarian or charitable issue rather than being treated as a matter of reparative justice. Loss and damage finance is an obligation arising from historical emissions and climate debt principle. The finance is needed to respond to climate impacts that already exist and will increase over the years and should include measures such as diverting military spending, ending fossil fuel subsidies, taxing big polluters, windfall profit taxes, etc.

What COP31 and the FRLD Must Deliver

At Antalya, Parties must move beyond discussions on institutional arrangements and focus on delivering finance at the scale required by affected communities from new, public, grant-based finance from developed countries and other polluters, reflecting their historical responsibility for climate breakdown. Finance must be additional to existing climate finance commitments and must not create new debt burdens for developing countries.

COP31 and the FRLD must also:



- Deliver on Nepal's request for funds under FRLD to address the losses and damages from the catastrophic floods this year
- Secure predictable, adequate, new and grant based public finance to the tune of 1 trillion USD annually by 2030
- Ensure direct and simplified access for frontline communities, Indigenous Peoples, farmers, small landholders, pastoralists, peasants, forest dwellers and workers, fisherfolk and coastal communities, youth, women, workers and other affected groups.
- Recognise and respond to both economic and non-economic losses and damages.
- Establish democratic, transparent and rights-based governance that prioritises affected communities over financial and corporate interests.
- Maintain loss and damage as a distinct pillar of climate action, separate from adaptation and mitigation finance.

The credibility of the FRLD will ultimately be judged not by the sophistication of its governance structures but by whether it delivers meaningful, accessible and adequately resourced support to communities already bearing the costs of a crisis they did not create.

Resetting Science with Equity

Issues with IPCC AR6 models and scenarios

IPCC AR6 models and scenarios do not consider principles of equity and UNFCCC "common but differentiated responsibility and respective capabilities" (CBDR-RC). Instead, they use assumptions that include socio-economic variables and mitigation options that end up perpetuating inequalities between the global north and the global south till 2050. When findings from these scenarios inform decisions that are directly adopted at COP, they become problematic policy targets that impose higher mitigation burdens on developing countries with no scope of development while allowing developed countries to continue overusing more than their fair share of the remaining carbon budget.

The first Global Stocktake (GST1) decision from Dubai adopted in 2023 in its paragraph 27 calls for reducing global greenhouse gas emissions by 43 percent by 2030 and 60 percent by 2035 relative to the 2019 level and reaching net zero carbon dioxide emissions by 2050 for limiting warming to 1.5 °C, with no or limited overshoot. This target was also spotlighted in the summary for policy makers (SPM) of the mitigation report (working group III) of IPCC's sixth assessment report, however, the SPM was accompanied by a caveat that clearly stated the limitations of modelled pathways and scenarios regarding the absence of equity in them. But when this target made its way into the GST1 decision, it did so without this caveat.

Worse, developed countries then "skewed science" by applying IPCC's *global* goal to their own national targets, or NDCs, thus rejecting their historical responsibilities not to mention legal obligations to provide finance and transfer technology. "Net zero" is yet another sad

skewing of science by Global North governments, when they again took what was a global goal from the Paris Agreement and applied it to individual countries, even corporations.

When developing countries oppose the imposition of emission reduction targets that stem from biased scenarios that are a part of the IPCC, they are accused of being against science by developed countries. But what developing countries are actually saying is that emission reduction goals need to be agreed in an equitable manner, as recognised in UNFCCC and its Paris Agreement wherein developed countries take the lead given their historical responsibilities in contributing to the problem of climate change, and their much higher capabilities for undertaking faster emission reductions. Emission reduction targets that stem from scenarios and models that do not account for equity as provided in the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement cannot be deemed as 'best available science', even if part of IPCC.

Meena Raman and Leon Sealey-Huggins explain what this omission means for developing countries in their Climate Home News op-ed on equity in IPCC assessments.

Who Lost 1.5C? A brief history of developed countries' broken promises

It is often argued that emission reduction targets provided by IPCC scenarios are crucial for keeping the 1.5 °C goal alive. However, the fact of the matter is that developed countries' continued emissions and overuse of the remaining carbon budget has already brought us to breaching the 1.5 °C goal. IPCC reported in 2022 that a global carbon budget of only 500 gigatonnes was left for meeting the 1.5 °C goal and yet, despite pledging ambitious mitigation targets for thirty years, developed countries' emissions between 1990 – 2019 was 504 gigatonnes.

In Antalya, the European Union will be led by Ireland, whose Climate Minister is now considering approval of a new LNG import facility to fuel new AI data centers, against strong local and global opposition. And just weeks before COP31, the UK gave a greenlight to its new gas field known as Jackdaw while French President Emmanuel Macron flew to the Persian Gulf to secure more gas supplies. Rosebank, an even larger UK oil field, would lock us into decades of fossil fuel extraction and, if approved, release more climate pollution than the combined annual CO_2 emissions of the 73 lowest-emitting countries and territories.

As the world approaches breaching the 1.5 °C goal, imposing stringent mitigation targets on developing countries that already have low per capita emissions will not make the dent that is required for achieving steep reductions in global emissions to limit warming to 1.5 °C. Such an impact can happen only if developed countries undertake rapid, deep, and sustained emission reductions immediately, as they have repeatedly promised to do. Further, they also need to provide means of implementation to developing countries to help them urgently implement adaptation measures and address loss and damage caused due rising temperatures.

Global North countries ignored legal commitments and even today run from their responsibilities to avoid any risk of accountability. Shirking their promises to provide public

finance they are instead cutting contributions to climate funds while providing their own populations public finance to subsidise fossil fuel demand despite their own fiscal crises — at times borrowing while producers' profits reach record high numbers.

Timing IPCC reports for GST2

Now, after IPCC ignored equity, and still amid its reset of scenario modeling, attacks on science reveal Europeans' misread of science and desperation to deflect from their own failure to deliver adequate climate finance. Developed countries' claim as defenders of science is contradicted by the continued subsidising of the consumption and the financing of fossil expansion with public money for infrastructure that locks-in more emissions.

The way IPCC findings informed the GST1 outcome was through their call for 45% emissions cuts by 2035 as a global goal, yet Global North governments skewed IPCC science by applying this global percentage as the target for their own nationally determined contributions (NDCs), thus ignoring their historical responsibility and respective capabilities. For the US, its "fair share" contribution toward the global effort to keep 1.5C within reach was almost four times the IPCC's global goal, as calculated using the Civil Society Equity Review's methodology (which includes costs for providing finance and transferring technology to developing countries).

IPCC must use updated methodologies reflecting equity considerations to better inform scenarios and pathways by incorporating more views from Global South contributors that include justice and incorporate inequality into their methodologies.

Giving IPCC good guidance

COP31 also aims to give guidance to climate scientists and researchers as they assess the challenge of minimising "overshoot" of the Paris Agreement goal to limit warming to 1.5C. The UNEP recently reported that the world is about to breach that agreed average global temperature limit, and many questions arise as to how the world might minimize the depth and duration of any breach without causing greater food insecurity or further displacing people from their traditional territories.

To minimise the degree of overshoot, the world needs both urgent, dramatic cuts in emissions and equitably, sustainably managed carbon direct removals (CDR), through ecological restoration and agroecology, not through risky technologies. Emission cuts alone won't do the job anymore. We can also expect a renewed push for false solutions like nuclear energy, Carbon Capture and Storage, Solar Radiation Management and other geoengineering technofix fantasies.

DCJ urges governments to guide scientific researchers to provide pathways returning to 1.5C that account for food security, hunger, energy poverty, and displacement rather than false solutions.

Operationalising the Just Transition Mechanism

The establishment of the Just Transition Mechanism at COP30 marked a significant political breakthrough, recognising that addressing the climate crisis requires not only emissions reductions but also confronting the social, economic and political transformations associated with moving away from fossil fuels. However, the creation of the Mechanism is only the beginning. The key question facing COP31 is whether it will support a genuinely transformative transition rooted in justice, equity and democratic participation, or whether it will simply manage the social consequences of a transition shaped by existing economic and political interests.

Climate justice movements continue to challenge narrow approaches that frame transition primarily as a technological, investment and market-driven process. Emphasis needs to be on a just transition that addresses the structural drivers of the climate crisis, including colonialism, extractivism, corporate power, patriarchy and economic inequality. Transition must go beyond energy systems to encompass food sovereignty, care economies, labour rights, public services, resource governance and peoples led solutions for the development pathways.

The discussions and political declarations emerging from the Peoples' Assembly and movement spaces in Santa Marta reinforced this broader vision. Movements from across Africa, Asia, Latin America stressed that transitioning away from fossil fuels must be inseparable from struggles for Indigenous sovereignty, economic justice, gender justice, peace, self-determination and food sovereignty. Energy transition from fossil fuels to renewable energy must not be through new forms of extraction and corporate control as critical mineral mining rapidly expands due to high demand and can lead to creating new sacrifice zones across the Global South.

At the same time, major challenges remain. Developed countries continue to fall short of providing the public, grant-based finance, technology transfer and means of implementation required for developing countries to implement their NDCs, NAPs and TAPs. Without adequate support, just transition could become an unfunded political aspiration while the costs of decarbonisation are shifted further onto countries and communities least responsible for the climate crisis. Discussions on just transition therefore cannot be separated from climate finance obligations under Article 9.1, debt justice and broader questions of development justice.

The Belem-Antalya Mechanism for Just Transition (BAM) COP31 Must Deliver

At COP31, Parties must ensure that the operationalisation of the Just Transition Mechanism and the roadmap for transitioning away from fossil fuels are firmly grounded in climate justice principles. This includes:

- Ensuring the Just Transition Mechanism is guided by equity, CBDR-RC, human rights, Indigenous Peoples' rights and democratic participation.
- A mechanism that ensures active civil society participation, especially from the Global South to help shape a mechanism that delivers for the communities at the frontline of the crisis
- Recognising food sovereignty, care economies, labour rights, public services and community-controlled development as central pillars of just transition.
- Rejecting false solutions, green extractivism and market-led approaches that reproduce existing inequalities and corporate control.
- Guaranteeing meaningful participation of workers, Indigenous Peoples, peasants, fisherfolk, women, youth and frontline communities in all transition-related processes.
- Securing substantial new, public, grant-based climate finance in line with Article 9.1 obligations to support equitable transition pathways across the Global South.
- Ensuring that the roadmap for transitioning away from fossil fuels delivers a feminist, rapid, just, equitable and fully funded phase-out of fossil fuels while advancing development justice and peoples led solutions for a system change
- Operationalising Just Transition Mechanism by 2027

The struggle over just transition is ultimately a struggle over who shapes the future economy. COP31 must ensure that the Just Transition Mechanism becomes a vehicle for system change rather than a tool for managing the social impacts of an unjust economic model.

The DCJ Just Transition WG has prepared this short briefing about what's on the table for the COP31 Just Transition negotiations. It also explains the role and vision for peoples participation - from design, to delivery to knowledge generation. Included in the briefer is the key messages prepared by the WG that they will take to the negotiations! Link here.

COP Presidency's Electrification Agenda

Having few emission cuts and even less finance to present at COP31, Europe is instead spearheading a push for electrification by urging all countries to adopt a goal of "35 by 35", meaning 35% renewables in their electricity mix by the year 2035. The electrification target will not achieve emissions reductions, energy security, economic development or ensure energy access unless it's structurally designed to do so.

Even though electrification is advancing via the informal "Action Agenda" of voluntary pledges by mainly private sector "coalitions of the willing", COP31 Co-Presidencies Turkiye and Australia are already alerting Parties that they plan to push their electrification agenda into a formal cover decision. UNFCCC processes are purportedly "party-driven" and many previous attempts at top-down imposition of agendas have been rejected.

Any global target setting without the commensurate finance and right solutions will burden countries and communities, especially in the Global South. Challenges to grids, battery storage infrastructure all have huge costs, and too little provision of climate finance or transfer of technology is forthcoming for developing countries to trust new targets. Also, this initiative should not be the place for false solutions, since its proponents still refuse to promise that any new electrification capacity must be from renewables, not fossil fuels, nuclear or other dirty and or dangerous sources.

In order for the target to be meaningful it needs to be based on electrification from renewables that is aimed at ensuring energy access for the 700 million people who lack it. This means appropriate electrification including for mini grids and community based renewables.

DCJ urges governments:

- No electrification targets without means of implementation: Electrification targets must be accompanied by adequate, predictable, public and grant-based finance, technology transfer and capacity building for developing countries. The agenda must address structural barriers, including high costs of capital, debt burdens, inadequate grid infrastructure and unequal access to technology, rather than shifting additional responsibilities onto the Global South.
- Prioritise energy sufficiency and peoples' needs over corporate profits: Electrification must prioritise universal access to affordable, reliable and clean energy for communities and essential public services, rather than escalating electricity demand from AI data centres and energy-intensive industries. Energy sufficiency, equitable distribution and reduced excessive consumption, particularly in the Global North, must be central to the agenda.
- Reject extractivism and environmental destruction in the name of electrification: Electrification cannot justify a new wave of critical mineral extraction, land and water grabbing, displacement of communities and destruction of ecosystems. The agenda must uphold human rights, Indigenous Peoples' rights, Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), and binding environmental and social safeguards, while rejecting the reproduction of colonial and extractive supply chains.
- Electrification must deliver real fossil fuel phase-out with no false solutions: Success must be measured by actual reductions in fossil fuel dependence and emissions, equitable energy access and ecological protection, not merely the number of sectors electrified or the volume of electricity consumed. The agenda must prevent fossil fuel expansion, use of nuclear energy or waste to energy sources to power growing demand from data centres and industries, and support publicly accountable, decentralised, community-led renewable energy systems.

Feminist, Rapid, Just, Equitable and Fully Funded Transition Away from Fossil Fuels

From Santa Marta to Antalya: Advancing a Climate Justice Roadmap Beyond Fossil Fuels

The launch in Belem of a COP30 Presidency's roadmap process for transitioning away from fossil fuels marked an important political milestone after growing pressure from climate justice movements. The roadmap process now enters a critical phase where the key question is no longer whether fossil fuels must be phased out, but how the transition will occur, who will control it, who will benefit from it, and whether it will address the structural injustices that underpin the fossil fuel economy. This section below is built from positions, demands, and pieces from diverse movements' extensive work developed for the first international conference to Transition Away from Fossil Fuels held in Santa Marta, Colombia in April 2026.

The Peoples' Assembly and movement convenings in Santa Marta provided a clear climate justice vision for this transition. The Peoples Declaration emphasised that the climate crisis is inseparable from systems of colonialism, extractivism, militarism, patriarchy and corporate power. Movements called for a transition rooted in self-determination, Indigenous sovereignty, food sovereignty, democratic control over resources, gender justice and public goods, new, additional, non-debt creating grant based finance for transition away from fossil fuels while rejecting market-led approaches that seek to create new opportunities for profit from the climate crisis.

A major challenge facing the roadmap process is the growing promotion of false solutions that allow fossil fuel production and corporate power to continue under the guise of climate action. Carbon markets, offsets, carbon capture and storage (CCS), direct air capture, bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS), geoengineering, fossil hydrogen, and large-scale nature commodification schemes continue to be advanced as pathways to delay real emissions reductions and avoid a genuine phase-out of fossil fuels. Rather than addressing the root causes of climate breakdown, these approaches often deepen land grabs, human rights violations, financial speculation and corporate control while shifting burdens onto communities in the Global South.

At the same time fossil fuel dependence cannot be replaced with a new era of extractivism driven by the demand for critical minerals. Across Africa, Asia and Latin America, communities are already confronting displacement, ecosystem destruction and violations of Indigenous rights linked to mining projects justified in the name of the energy transition. A just transition away from fossil fuels cannot simply replace one extractive model with another. It must transform systems of production, consumption and ownership while respecting community rights and ecological limits.

The just transition debate must also extend beyond energy systems. Food sovereignty, agroecology, Indigenous food systems, public services, care economies and social protection are essential pillars of a just transition. Similarly, developed countries must provide substantial public, grant-based finance, technology transfer and means of implementation in line with Article 9.1 and CBDR-RC to support equitable transition pathways across the Global South.

Food Sovereignty and the Transition Beyond Fossil Fuels

Discussions on the transition away from fossil fuels tend to focus almost largely on energy systems, while ignoring the industrial food systems that are deeply embedded within the fossil fuel economy. Fossil fuels play a large role in fertiliser production, petrochemical inputs, industrial processing, long-distance transportation and highly concentrated supply chains. Large scale industrial agriculture not only contributes significantly to greenhouse gas emissions but also drives biodiversity loss, soil degradation and contamination of the water systems, and elimination of the traditional knowledge and practices of the food systems.

Hence a meaningful transition away from fossil fuels must therefore include the transformation of food systems. Agroecology, food sovereignty, Indigenous food systems, traditional agricultural practices, and community-controlled seed systems offer pathways that reduce dependence on fossil-fuel-intensive production models while strengthening resilience, biodiversity and local economies. These approaches are increasingly recognised as important contributions to mitigation and adaptation, but they also represent an essential component of just transition. The roadmap process should explicitly recognise food sovereignty as a central pillar of transition.

Financing Just Transition to Uphold Equity

The transition away from fossil fuels will not occur in a just or equitable manner without substantial financial support for developing countries. Many countries across the Global South continue to confront energy poverty, infrastructure deficits, debt burdens and development challenges while simultaneously facing pressure to decarbonise. The ability of these countries to pursue equitable transition pathways depends heavily on access to finance, technology transfer, broader means of implementation, and capacity building.

Hence discussions on roadmaps cannot be separated from Article 9.1, climate finance and broader questions of historical responsibility. The trillions of dollars due can come from six major sources of financial flows, including redirected Global North military budgets and fossil fuel subsidies, as well as new arrangements for international tax, trade and debt justice, including waivers on intellectual property rights for climate technologies. Developed countries bear a responsibility not only to reduce emissions domestically but also to support transition efforts in countries that contributed least to the climate crisis. Without such support it will be just another mechanism through which costs are transferred onto those least responsible for climate breakdown.

What COP31 Must Deliver

As Parties advance discussions on roadmaps, Antalya must ensure that the transition away from fossil fuels remains grounded in climate justice principles rather than market mechanisms. Roadmaps should be explicitly aligned with CBDR-RC, human rights obligations, Indigenous Peoples' rights, and the right to development. Roadmaps should recognise food sovereignty, democratic governance, feminist energy justice and community control over resources as central dimensions of just transition rather than peripheral considerations.

Roadmaps must also reject approaches that rely on new forms of extractivism, corporate capture or false solutions to delay the phase-out of fossil fuels. They should be supported by substantial public finance provided in accordance with Article 9.1 and linked to broader efforts to operationalise the Just Transition Mechanism and support equitable development pathways across the Global South. Hence the priorities at Antalya for a feminist, fast, just, equitable, and fully funded fossil fuel phase out must prioritise:

- Substantial public, grant-based finance and means of implementation from developed countries to support just transitions in the Global South.
- Rejection of carbon markets, offsets, CCS, geoengineering and other false solutions that delay real action.
- Safeguards against new forms of extractivism linked to critical minerals and renewable energy supply chains.
- Recognition of food sovereignty, agroecology, feminist energy justice and community-controlled renewable energy systems as central pillars of transition.
- Strong links between roadmap processes and the operationalisation of the Just Transition Mechanism to ensure participation of affected communities and workers.

For climate justice movements, the transition away from fossil fuels will be judged not only by emissions reductions but by whether it dismantles the systems of exploitation, inequality and corporate capture that created the climate crisis in the first place. A transition built on false solutions and new sacrifice zones is not a just transition.

Article 6 and False Solutions

Ensuring Climate Action Centers Real Solutions and rejecting Market Expansion, Technofixes, and Corporate Capture

As the climate crisis accelerates, the gap between what science demands and what action governments are prepared to take remains stark. While communities around the world and especially across the Global South continue to experience escalating climate impacts, many of the policy responses advanced within international climate governance remain fundamentally disconnected from the scale and urgency of the transformation required.

There is a continued promotion of schemes that attempt to retroactively account for continued emissions– false solutions like market-based mechanisms, carbon trading systems and a growing array of technological interventions like geoengineering.

For decades, climate justice movements, Indigenous Peoples, frontline communities and civil society organisations have warned that many of the mechanisms promoted under the banner of climate action do not address the root causes of climate change. Instead, they allow continued fossil fuel extraction, delay structural transformation and create new opportunities for profit and accumulation while further shifting social and ecological burdens onto communities least responsible for the crisis.

The debates surrounding Article 6 are therefore not simply technical discussions concerning carbon accounting or international cooperation. False solutions offer pathways through which governments and corporations can claim climate leadership while avoiding the deeper transformations required to address the crisis. They allow fossil fuel expansion to coexist with climate commitments by creating opportunities for continued extraction while presenting technological innovation and market mechanisms as substitutes for structural change. Most importantly, they preserve existing concentrations of wealth and power by minimising disruption to the economic interests that have benefited from fossil fuel dependence.

This dynamic is particularly visible in debates surrounding “net-zero” commitments. Across multiple sectors, companies continue to announce ambitious climate targets while simultaneously investing in new fossil fuel infrastructure and relying heavily on offsets, carbon removals and future technological interventions to justify continued emissions. Such strategies frequently postpone meaningful action into the future while allowing current patterns of extraction, production and consumption to remain largely unchanged.

Article 6 and the Expansion of Carbon Markets

Article 6 remains one of the most contested components of the Paris Agreement because it institutionalises the possibility of using these faulty market mechanisms and international carbon trading as the bedrock of fulfilling climate commitments. Extensive research shows carbon markets do not meaningfully reduce emissions but create mechanisms that spur harm and delay action. Rather than requiring polluters to directly reduce fossil fuel use or emissions-intensive activities, carbon markets allow emissions to be theoretically displaced geographically while maintaining the appearance of climate action, regardless of whether those reductions actually happen or not.

Investigations into offset schemes have repeatedly exposed concerns regarding additionality, permanence, double counting, inflated baselines and the over-crediting of projects that would likely have occurred regardless of carbon finance. Multiple independent studies have concluded that a significant proportion of carbon credits issued through major voluntary market schemes fail to represent genuine emissions reductions.

By allowing polluters to purchase credits rather than directly reduce emissions, carbon markets delay the structural changes required to phase out fossil fuels. They create

incentives to search for the cheapest available offsets rather than pursue transformative changes within energy, transport, food and industrial systems.

Under many offset schemes, forests, agricultural lands, wetlands, oceans and other ecosystems are transformed into units of carbon storage that can be measured, traded and used to compensate for emissions elsewhere. While often presented as conservation initiatives, such approaches frequently reduce complex ecosystems and social relationships to their carbon value alone.

This process has significant implications for Indigenous Peoples, local communities, smallholder farmers, forest-dependent peoples, and fisherfolk and coastal communities. Communities are often excluded from decision-making processes concerning lands they have stewarded for generations. Forests, grasslands, rivers, oceans, and agricultural landscapes support livelihoods, cultures, biodiversity and systems of knowledge that cannot be reduced to carbon accounting frameworks.

Emerging False Solutions in the Transition Debate

As pressure grows for fossil fuel phase-out, new forms of false solutions continue emerging. Technologies such as carbon capture and storage (CCS), carbon capture utilisation and storage (CCUS), bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS), direct air capture and storage (DACS) and various forms of geoengineering are increasingly promoted as pathways for achieving climate goals while allowing continued fossil fuel use.

The primary concern is not technological innovation itself but the tendency to use speculative future technologies to justify delays in emissions reductions today. Many scenarios promoted by fossil fuel companies and supportive governments rely heavily on large-scale deployment of carbon removal technologies despite significant concerns regarding feasibility, costs, environmental impacts and governance.

Similarly, certain forms of hydrogen development are increasingly being used to extend the lifespan of fossil fuel infrastructure rather than accelerate its phase-out. Any roadmaps for transitioning away from fossil fuels must avoid becoming dependent on speculative technologies that postpone action while creating new opportunities for corporate profit.

Real Solutions for Climate Justice

The critique of false solutions is not a rejection of climate action but a recognition that real solutions already exist and are being advanced by communities and movements across the world. These solutions include the rapid and equitable phase-out of fossil fuels, public investment in renewable energy, community-controlled energy systems, agroecology, agroforestry, food sovereignty, ecosystem restoration, care-centred economies and democratic control over resources. They are rooted not in market expansion but in collective wellbeing, ecological sustainability and social justice.

Indigenous Peoples, peasant and farmer movements, fisherfolk communities, workers' organisations, youth movements, feminist movements and frontline communities have long demonstrated that climate action can strengthen resilience, improve livelihoods and support more equitable societies when organised around rights and participation rather than profit. These experiences provide important lessons for the future direction of climate governance.

What COP31 Must Deliver

As Parties continue advancing Article 6 implementation and broader discussions on climate action, Antalya must ensure that market mechanisms do not undermine the integrity of climate commitments or delay the transition away from fossil fuels. The implementation of Article 6 must include robust human rights safeguards, protections for Indigenous Peoples and local communities, strong accountability mechanisms and meaningful participation by affected rights-holders.

At the same time, Parties must reject efforts to use carbon markets, carbon offsets, carbon removals, technofixes and speculative technologies like geonengineering as substitutes for direct emissions reductions and fossil fuel phase-out. Climate action must remain focused on reducing emissions at source, advancing just transition pathways and supporting community-led solutions rooted in equity and self-determination.

COP31 should also advance discussions on conflict-of-interest policies and corporate accountability within the climate regime. The credibility of climate governance depends upon its ability to resist undue influence from actors whose interests are fundamentally incompatible with climate justice. The climate crisis cannot be solved through mechanisms that preserve the systems responsible for creating it and requires confronting those systems directly while advancing solutions capable of transforming them.

Read DCJ's briefing on challenging the inclusion or reinforcing of false solutions in any outcome of the First Conference on Transition away from Fossil Fuels

Mitigation Work Programme

Equity, Development, Justice and the Limits of Burden-Shifting

The climate crisis demands urgent and deep emissions reductions, but climate justice requires that mitigation efforts remain firmly grounded in equity and historical responsibility. Since its establishment, the Mitigation Work Programme (MWP) has become one of the most politically contested areas of the UNFCCC, with growing concerns that discussions are increasingly treating mitigation as a technical exercise rather than a question of justice, development, and differentiated responsibilities. Emissions reductions are treated as a universal technical challenge rather than a political question shaped by profoundly unequal histories of development, responsibility and capacity. This will lead to creation of pathways through which countries that contributed least to climate breakdown are subjected to

increasing pressure to act while those most responsible continue to evade their obligations regarding finance, technology transfer and capacity building support.

A key challenge at Antalya is the continued push by developed countries, most responsible for the ongoing climate crisis, to use the MWP to increase pressure on developing countries to enhance mitigation ambition while failing to deliver new, additional, and adequate finance, technology transfer, and capacity-building support. Developing countries continue to stress that mitigation must be informed by the principle of Common but Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities (CBDR-RC), the right to development, and the provision of means of implementation. Countries with greater historical responsibility and greater financial and technological resources must undertake deeper and faster emissions reductions while also providing support for climate action elsewhere.

Climate finance under Article 9.1 remains a prerequisite for equitable mitigation, yet financial commitment from the developed countries continues to fall short.

Technically, negotiations remain focused on the scope and purpose of the MWP, including whether it should remain a non-prescriptive platform for sharing experiences and identifying opportunities, or evolve into a mechanism that imposes stringent mitigation targets on developing countries without providing them with commensurate means of implementation support from developed countries. MWP discussions too often see developed countries' calling to focus heavily on mitigation ambition while ignoring the delivery of their obligations to provide means of implementation like finance and technology.

The ability of countries to pursue low-carbon development pathways depends heavily on access to finance, technology, institutional capacity and policy space. Without these provisions, calls for increased ambition is just pushing the Global South to do more with less.

It is high time that developed countries stepped up and delivered on their own calls for raising mitigation ambition and implementing concrete measures that ensure they contribute their fair share of efforts for addressing the climate crisis the world faces today. Instead of continuing to finance fossil fuel production, including from public funds, developed countries must take urgent measures to halt their reliance on fossil fuels. Otherwise, in their calls for increasing mitigation ambition, developed countries continue to expand the gap between expectations placed upon developing countries and the support made available to enable climate action.

At Antalya, climate justice movements are calling for:

- Reaffirmation that the MWP must remain firmly grounded in equity and CBDR-RC.
- Developed countries take the lead in mitigation ambition and actions. Given their historical responsibilities and highly inadequate action so far, we would like to see COP31 deliver a message on mitigation that ensures that developed countries step up to do their fair share of efforts.
- Many developing countries are already doing more than their fair shares, according to the Civil Society Equity Review, and the extent of their ability to undertake

mitigation is closely linked to the delivery of means of implementation by developed countries.
- Recognition that mitigation ambition cannot be separated from provisioning of public finance (as opposed to investment), technology transfer and development, and capacity-building support.
- Protection of developing countries' policy space and right to sustainable development.
- Greater focus on increasing provisioning of means of implementation from developed to developing countries.
- Greater focus on systemic transformation, including food sovereignty, agroecology, and sustainable consumption patterns, rather than narrow techno-fixes.
- Rejection of any efforts to use the MWP to impose new mitigation targets on countries least responsible for the climate crisis.
- Mitigation measures by first movers for fair phase out with production reductions
- No false solutions should be promoted in MWP discussions. False solutions do nothing to reduce emissions and instead divert crucial resources away from proven mitigation solutions.

Adaptation and the Global Goal on Adaptation

Defending Rights-Based, People-Centred Adaptation

For many communities across the Global South, adaptation is no longer a future challenge. It is a present reality. Rising temperatures, prolonged droughts, increasingly severe storms, sea-level rise, biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation are already transforming livelihoods, food systems, water availability and public health. Across regions, communities are adapting to climate impacts that are occurring at a faster and at a much greater intensity than anticipated. These realities underscore a fundamental truth that climate justice movements have highlighted for decades: mitigation failures have consequences, and adaptation has become a matter of survival. At the same time adaptation raises fundamental questions about justice, power and responsibility. Who is most vulnerable to climate impacts? What conditions produce vulnerability? Whose knowledge informs adaptation responses? And who controls the resources required to adapt?

Climate vulnerability is not simply the product of exposure to the impacts of the climate crisis. It is shaped by historical and contemporary inequalities, including colonial legacies, land dispossession, poverty, discrimination, debt burdens and unequal access to resources and political power. As a result, adaptation must be understood as part of a broader struggle to address the structural conditions that make communities vulnerable in the first place.

This understanding is particularly important for the Global South, where climate impacts frequently intersect with long-standing inequalities rooted in colonialism, extraction and uneven development. Indigenous Peoples, smallholder farmers, forest dwellers and workers,

fisherfolk and coastal communities, pastoralists, informal workers, youth, women and marginalised communities often face heightened risks because of historical patterns of exclusion and dispossession. Climate change amplifies these vulnerabilities, but it does not create them in isolation.

A climate justice approach to adaptation therefore requires moving beyond narrow conceptions of resilience. Adaptation must strengthen rights, expand access to resources, support community self-determination and address the structural drivers of vulnerability. The effectiveness of the Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA) will depend on whether it remains grounded in the realities of communities confronting climate impacts rather than becoming increasingly detached through technocratic approaches that prioritise measurement over action.

The Global Goal on Adaptation After COP30

Progress made in recent years, including work on indicators, targets and frameworks associated with the GGA, reflects growing recognition of the need to better understand adaptation needs and track implementation. These discussions have generated opportunities to improve transparency and support more effective planning. Climate justice movements have repeatedly warned that adaptation cannot be reduced to a collection of indicators, metrics and reporting frameworks. While measurement may contribute to accountability, it cannot substitute for implementation. It is important to ensure that discussions on indicators and monitoring remain connected to means of implementation. Without adequate finance, technology transfer and capacity-building support, adaptation frameworks will essentially become exercises in documenting vulnerability rather than reducing it.

Whose Knowledge Counts?

Adaptation debates frequently raise questions about expertise and authority. Climate governance has historically privileged forms of knowledge generated through scientific institutions, international organisations and technical processes with the assumption that expertise resides exclusively within formal institutions.

Across the world, Indigenous Peoples, smallholder farmers and pastoralists, fisherfolk and coastal communities, local communities, youth and women possess extensive knowledge regarding ecosystems, land and forest, biodiversity, rivers and oceans and climate resilient knowledge. These knowledge systems have often evolved over generations and are deeply rooted in relationships with particular territories and ecosystems. They provide critical insights into adaptation pathways that may not be captured through conventional scientific approaches alone.

The challenge confronting adaptation governance is therefore not choosing between scientific and local knowledge but creating frameworks that recognise the value of multiple forms of expertise. Climate justice requires moving beyond hierarchical models in which

communities are treated as passive recipients of technical knowledge and instead recognising them as active producers of knowledge and solutions.

This principle is particularly important within the GGA process. Adaptation indicators, methodologies and planning frameworks must be developed through meaningful participation by rights-holders and frontline communities. Adaptation cannot be imposed from above and must be shaped by those who are living the impacts of the climate crisis at the frontline.

Preventing Maladaptation

As adaptation efforts expand, so too does the risk of maladaptation—actions that may reduce vulnerability in the short term while creating new risks, reinforcing inequalities or shifting harms onto others.

Maladaptation often emerges when adaptation is treated primarily as an engineering or investment challenge rather than a question of justice. Large-scale infrastructure projects, land-use changes, resource management interventions and private-sector adaptation initiatives may be promoted as climate solutions while simultaneously displacing communities, undermining livelihoods, or restricting access to resources.

Examples of maladaptation can be found in projects that prioritise commercial interests over community needs, reinforce existing inequalities or create new forms of dependency. In some cases, adaptation initiatives have contributed to land concentration, privatisation of resources and increased vulnerability among marginalised groups. Instead adaptation should strengthen community agency rather than weaken it. Projects that undermine self-determination, erode rights or deepen inequalities cannot be considered successful adaptation regardless of their technical achievements.

Food Sovereignty, Territorial Rights and Community Resilience

The ability of communities to adapt to climate change is closely linked to access to land, water, biodiversity and other resources necessary for sustaining livelihoods and ecosystems. Territorial rights therefore play a central role in adaptation. This relationship is particularly visible within food systems. Smallholder farmers, Indigenous Peoples, fisherfolk and pastoralists continue to provide food for millions of people while simultaneously confronting some of the most severe climate impacts. Their ability to adapt depends not only on access to climate information or technological innovations but also on direct access to finance, securing rights to land and territories, healthy ecosystems and control over productive resources.

Climate justice movements have long argued that food sovereignty, agroecology, and agroforestry represent some of the most effective adaptation strategies available. These approaches strengthen biodiversity, improve soil health, support local economies and reduce dependence on external inputs while enhancing resilience to climate crisis. Unlike many top-down adaptation initiatives, they build upon local knowledge and community leadership.

The GGA and broader adaptation discussions should therefore recognise food sovereignty, agroecology, agroforestry, and territorial rights as central pillars of adaptation rather than treating them as peripheral concerns. Adaptation that fails to address questions of land, food and resource governance will struggle to address the underlying drivers of vulnerability.

Adaptation, Transformation and the Future of Climate Governance

The climate crisis is often framed as a challenge requiring societies to adapt to changing environmental conditions. While adaptation undoubtedly involves responding to climate impacts, climate justice movements have increasingly argued that adaptation must also involve transforming the systems that generate vulnerability. Adaptation should create opportunities to strengthen public services, expand social protection, enhance democratic participation, recognise Indigenous governance systems and support more equitable forms of development. Adaptation approaches need to centre rights, participation and structural change rather than technocratic approaches disconnected from lived realities.

What COP31 Must Deliver

As Parties continue advancing work under the Global Goal on Adaptation, COP31 must ensure that adaptation remains firmly grounded in justice, equity and means of implementation. Discussions on indicators and monitoring frameworks should support accountability while avoiding the reduction of adaptation to technical measurement exercises. Progress on adaptation governance must be accompanied by substantial increases in public, grant-based adaptation finance and stronger commitments regarding technology transfer and capacity-building.

COP31 should also strengthen recognition of Indigenous knowledge, community-led adaptation, food sovereignty, agroecology, agroforestry, and territorial rights as essential dimensions of resilience. Adaptation governance must create meaningful opportunities for participation by rights-holders and frontline communities while ensuring that adaptation efforts do not contribute to maladaptation, displacement or new forms of inequality.

Adaptation needs to be about creating the conditions under which communities can continue to live with dignity, exercise self-determination and shape their own futures in a rapidly deteriorating world due to the climate crisis.

Trade and Climate: WTO Dialogues with UNFCCC

After decades of brewing tensions bubbled over to a burst of climate-related unilateral trade measures (UTMs), COP30 mandated a series of direct dialogues between UNFCCC and the World Trade Organization (WTO) to address differences between rules of trade and climate.

WTO's 1994 core principles of free trade and overlapping agreements governing global exchange of goods and services in many ways undermine economic justice and ecological sustainability. Yet when UNFCCC was first signed in Rio in 1992, countries explicitly agreed

to refrain from using UTMs, even though today Global North nations now impose carbon tariffs and other restrictive measures on imports from Global South countries, pointing to exporters' less stringent rules on greenhouse gas emissions that are undercutting their domestic industries, such as steel, aluminum, iron and cement.

WTO Dialogues with UNFCCC need to address new ways of resolving these differences on the proliferation of UTMs. One way would of course be by the Global North's delivering the finance and technology they've already agreed to provide under 1992 UNFCCC and the 2015 Paris Agreement, which would support Global South transitions to less polluting production methods.

DCJ also wants to see broader discussion to address inherent contradictions between the trade and climate regimes, including intellectual property rights hindering the transfer of technology, the expansion of export in emissions intensive industries, and the direct undermining of climate measures as being too "trade restrictive". WTO also allows almost no participation from civil society and even now excludes its critics from its so-called public forums in Geneva, so trade policy negotiations need to improve their inclusion of and accountability to the public.

Belem Technology Implementation Programme

One of the achievements of climate justice movements has been the establishment of both the Finance Mechanism and the Technology Mechanism under the Paris Agreement, creating new institutions other than the World Bank for channeling support from Global North to Global South. Yet much work remains to find enough funding for making these international instruments operate at the scale and speed of today's climate crisis.

The "Tech Mech's" Climate Technology Center and Network, housed at the UN Environment Program, diligently responds to requests for technical assistance and advice from developing countries, yet has an annual budget of only $10 million, when much more money is needed to rollout renewables apace with accelerating climate impacts.

COP30 mandated a new "Belem Technology Implementation Programme" that now must elaborate an operational plan for amplifying and accelerating implementation of technology transfer by increasing support for countries' National Designated Entities (NDEs), by project preparation assistance, matchmaking with providers of finance and technology, follow-up support after technical assistance, and support for pilot and demonstration activities.

DCJ also demands that developing country proposals, championed by the Africa Group, to relax WTO's rules on Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) by waiving them for climate-friendly technologies as royalty payments drain developing country budgets. Developed countries committed in UNFCCC and the PA to facilitate the transfer of technology yet they hide behind WTO rules by resisting calls for new flexibilities in IPRs.

Roadmap on Forests

Forests are central to meeting the 1.5°C goal of the Paris Agreement, yet current national climate commitments fall far short of what is needed. Despite countries agreeing to halt and reverse deforestation and forest degradation by 2030, a 'Forest Gap' of 20 million hectares of forest loss can be expected by 2030 based on current pledges submitted to the UNFCCC – far from zero. The roadmap is expected to be released shortly before COP31 and will be featured at several events in Antalya. A critical question is how, and if, the roadmap is taken forward to ensure action on the ground, and not just more empty commitments.

Both the forest and fossil fuel roadmaps are initiatives of the COP30 Presidency of Brazil, and were received with lot of scepticism by many developing countries who rejected the expansion of the UNFCCC agenda into new areas without first seeing more implementation of existing commitments, particularly on delivering climate finance. Thus, the roadmaps are not on the official agenda of COP31.

Three interconnected pillars are needed for an effective forest roadmap:

1. Addressing the hidden crisis of forest degradation - which is expanding at twice the rate of deforestation yet systematically underreported due to inconsistent definitions and accounting rules. Industrial logging in boreal and temperate forests is a major driver of forest degradation, reducing average carbon stocks by around 50%, yet gross emissions from logging are obscured by carbon accounting rules that net out losses against sequestration in regrowing forests. Countries like Canada, Australia and the United States continue to avoid reporting degradation or associated emissions, while tropical forest countries are held to far higher standards of transparency — an inequity the Forest Roadmap must address.
2. Fair and sustainable land governance - Indigenous Peoples, local communities and Afro-descendant Peoples customarily manage more than half of the world's forests, yet hold legally recognised rights to only around 17% of global forest area. Securing collective land tenure is not merely a rights obligation but a climate imperative, given the strong evidence that community-managed lands have lower rates of deforestation. The Forest Roadmap must move beyond state-centred approaches and create meaningful spaces for non-state actors — particularly forest communities — to participate in the design and implementation of forest policy, with free, prior and informed consent as a non-negotiable foundation.
3. Confronting the structural economic drivers of deforestation and forest degradation: Sovereign debt pressures, austerity conditionalities, regressive trade rules and harmful subsidies push governments — especially in the Global South — toward extractive industries as a means of maintaining financial stability, directly fuelling forest loss. Decades of voluntary and market-based approaches have consistently failed to address ongoing extractivism. Solutions such as debt relief with built-in ecological protections; progressive reform of international tax cooperation through the UN Framework Convention; alignment of agricultural trade rules with food sovereignty and forest protection goals; and the phasing out of public subsidies to

industrial agriculture and biomass energy are needed. Without engaging these structural dimensions, the roadmap risks repeating the failures of preceding initiatives.

Read the submission on Submission to the COP 30 Presidency Roadmap on Halting and Reversing Deforestation and Forest Degradation by 2030 here and here.

Cross-Cutting Climate Justice Principles

Democracy, Rights, Accountability and System Change

The multiple crises confronting humanity today are deeply interconnected. The climate crisis is unfolding alongside escalating militarisation, widening inequality, democratic backsliding, shrinking civic space, rising authoritarianism and growing concentrations of corporate power. Communities across the Global South are simultaneously confronting climate impacts, debt burdens, economic instability, conflict, and authoritarianism, right wing fascism, and attacks on human rights and human rights and environmental defenders. These crises do not operate independently of one another. They emerge from political and economic systems that prioritise extraction, exploitation, corporate profit and greed, and imperialism over peoples rights, collective wellbeing, and ecological and climate justice.

The climate crisis therefore cannot be understood solely as an environmental challenge. Nor can it be resolved through narrow technical approaches that leave underlying systems of power intact. Climate justice movements have consistently argued that climate governance must be rooted in broader struggles for human rights, democracy, self-determination and social transformation, and system change.

The positions advanced throughout this paper are grounded in a set of interconnected principles rooted in climate justice and social justice that cut across all areas of climate policy and governance. These principles are not supplementary to climate action. They are essential conditions for achieving meaningful and lasting system change.

Defending Civic Space and Climate Democracy

Meaningful climate action requires meaningful participation.

Yet across many parts of the world, communities, social movements, journalists, environmental defenders, trade unionists, Indigenous leaders and human rights advocates face growing restrictions on their ability to organise, advocate and challenge powerful interests. Criminalisation of protest, surveillance, judicial harassment and attacks on environmental defenders continue to undermine democratic participation precisely at a moment when public engagement is most needed.



These dynamics are also reflected within international climate governance. Despite repeated commitments to inclusivity and participation, significant barriers continue to limit the ability of grassroots organisations and Global South constituencies to engage effectively in climate negotiations. Financial barriers, visa restrictions, language barriers and unequal access to resources frequently shape who is able to participate and whose voices are heard.

Climate justice movements have consistently argued that climate democracy requires more than formal opportunities for participation. It requires creating conditions under which affected communities can meaningfully influence decisions that shape their lives and futures. The legitimacy of climate governance depends not only on the outcomes adopted by Parties but also on the extent to which those outcomes are shaped by the people most affected by the climate crisis.

Protecting civic space is therefore not a procedural issue. It is a prerequisite for climate justice.

Big Polluter Influence and Corporate Capture and Conflicts of Interest

The continued influence of fossil fuel and other polluter interests within climate governance remains one of the most significant obstacles to meaningful climate action. The continued promotion of false solutions cannot be separated from the influence of fossil fuel interests within climate governance.

Research by civil society organisations, including the Kick Big Polluters Out coalition, has repeatedly documented the extensive presence of fossil fuel interests within climate negotiations. Over successive COPs, representatives linked to fossil fuel corporations, trade associations and affiliated interests have participated in climate processes in significant numbers, often exceeding the representation of many climate-vulnerable countries and frontline constituencies.

This influence matters because the interests of the fossil fuel industry are fundamentally incompatible with the rapid and equitable phase-out of fossil fuels required to limit warming. Market-based mechanisms, offsetting schemes and technological approaches that promise future emissions reductions while allowing continued extraction offer pathways through which fossil fuel interests can maintain legitimacy and delay regulation. The prevalence of false solutions within climate governance therefore reflects broader questions of power and access. Mechanisms that permit continued emissions while generating new financial opportunities are often politically attractive precisely because they minimise disruption to incumbent industries. They enable governments and corporations to avoid confronting the economic and political implications of a genuine transition away from fossil fuels.

For climate justice movements, addressing false solutions and climate action delays therefore requires addressing corporate capture. This includes advancing robust conflict-of-interest policies within the UNFCCC and ensuring that actors whose business models depend upon continued fossil fuel expansion and other emissions-intensive products do not shape the rules governing climate action.

For decades, corporations responsible for driving climate breakdown have enjoyed privileged access to decision-making processes while communities experiencing climate impacts continue to struggle for recognition and resources. Fossil fuel companies, financial institutions and associated industries have repeatedly used their political influence to weaken regulation, delay action and promote false solutions that allow existing business models to continue largely unchanged.

This influence is not limited to fossil fuel extraction itself. It extends across climate finance, carbon markets, critical minerals, infrastructure development and emerging technologies. Corporate actors increasingly shape narratives regarding what forms of climate action are considered feasible, desirable and economically rational.

Climate justice movements have therefore long advocated for an Accountability Framework that includes robust conflict-of-interest policies within the UNFCCC that protect climate policymaking from undue influence and reset the system so it works for people and the planet. The UNFCCC must also end the ability of emissions-intensive industries or those enabling these industries to bankroll or sponsor climate action, or oversee the climate talks in leadership positions.Institutions responsible for responding to the climate crisis cannot effectively fulfil their mandates while allowing actors whose profits depend upon continued climate destruction to shape policy outcomes. Addressing corporate capture is not about excluding particular viewpoints from political debate. It is about recognising the incompatibility between the public interest and business models that depend upon continued environmental harm.

The credibility of the climate regime increasingly depends upon its willingness to confront this challenge.

Indigenous Sovereignty, Territorial Rights and Traditional Knowledge Systems

Indigenous Peoples have long been among the strongest defenders of ecosystems, biodiversity and climate justice. Across the world, Indigenous territories continue to protect forests, watersheds, grasslands, oceans, and other ecosystems critical to climate stability despite persistent threats from extraction, exploitation, destruction, dispossession and violence.

Indigenous Peoples are not merely stakeholders within climate governance but rights-holders whose sovereignty, governance systems and knowledge traditions must be respected and protected. Climate policies that undermine Indigenous rights cannot be considered just regardless of their stated environmental objectives.

At the same time, Indigenous knowledge systems offer critical insights into adaptation, resilience, ecological stewardship and sustainable relationships with nature. Climate governance must move beyond tokenistic recognition and create meaningful opportunities for Indigenous leadership and decision-making across all areas of climate policy.

Protecting territorial rights, ensuring free, prior and informed consent and recognising Indigenous self-determination are therefore central components of climate justice.

Feminist Climate Justice and the Politics of Care

The climate crisis is deeply shaped by gendered inequalities. Women, particularly in the Global South, often face disproportionate climate impacts while simultaneously carrying significant responsibilities for care, food production, water collection and community wellbeing. Yet climate policies in general frequently overlook these realities and fail to recognise the central role of care in sustaining societies and ecosystems.

Feminist climate justice challenges approaches that reduce climate action to questions of technology, infrastructure and markets. Instead, it emphasises relationships, interdependence, collective wellbeing and the social reproduction necessary to sustain life. It asks how climate policies can strengthen care systems, expand rights and redistribute resources rather than simply facilitating economic growth.

This perspective is increasingly important as climate negotiations move beyond questions of emissions reductions and towards broader discussions regarding transition, resilience and system change. A just transition must be organised not only around new energy systems but around new social priorities. The politics of care therefore offers a powerful alternative to economic models based on extraction, exploitation and accumulation.

International Solidarity, Multilateralism and UNFCCC Reform

The climate crisis exposes the limitations of a global order characterised by unequal power relations, geopolitical competition and selective approaches to international cooperation. While governments frequently invoke the language of partnership and solidarity, climate negotiations continue to reflect deep inequalities in wealth, influence and access to resources.

For climate justice movements, international solidarity is not a rhetorical aspiration. It is a practical necessity. The scale of the climate crisis requires forms of cooperation capable of addressing historical injustices while supporting equitable and sustainable futures. Such cooperation must be grounded in accountability, reparative justice and respect for the sovereignty and self-determination of peoples and nations.

This requires defending and transforming multilateralism simultaneously. Climate justice movements continue to support multilateral cooperation because global challenges require collective responses. At the same time, existing institutions must become more democratic, more accountable and more responsive to the needs of communities rather than powerful states and corporate actors. The future of climate governance depends not only on stronger commitments but on stronger forms of internationalism rooted in justice, equity, international solidarity, rather than pursuit of domination by few. DCJ and its members will continue to join the global call for a comprehensive UNFCCC reform that includes restoring power and equity, ending the trade show and corporate capture, moving away from accountability free

blackbox negotiations, respecting and protecting human rights, and aligning and strengthening international climate governance.

What COP31 Must Deliver

As Parties gather at COP31 they must recognise that progress across all negotiating tracks depends upon the political principles outlined above. Climate finance, adaptation, loss and damage, just transition, fossil fuel phase-out and mitigation ambition cannot be separated from questions of rights, democracy, participation, self-determination, and accountability.

COP31 should strengthen protections for civic space, advance discussions on conflicts of interest within the UNFCCC, support meaningful participation by rights-holders and reaffirm commitments to human rights, Indigenous sovereignty, gender justice and CBDR-RC across all negotiating processes. It should resist efforts to narrow climate governance to technical questions while ignoring the broader political conditions that determine whether climate action advances justice or reproduces inequality.

The climate crisis is ultimately a crisis of power as much as a crisis of emissions. Addressing it requires not only transforming energy systems and economic structures but also expanding democracy, strengthening solidarity and ensuring that those most affected by climate change are able to shape the decisions that determine their futures. These principles must remain at the heart of climate action at COP31 and beyond.

Conclusion

Climate Justice in an Age of Crisis

Climate justice movements have long understood that real change rarely emerges from political will alone. It is won through collective struggle, international solidarity and the persistent efforts of people who refuse to accept that exploitation, inequality and ecological destruction are inevitable. The progress achieved within the climate regime has always been the result of such struggles, and the advances still required will depend upon them as well.

As Parties gather at COP31, the choice before them is increasingly clear. They can continue pursuing pathways that manage the symptoms of crisis while preserving the structures that created it. Or they can embrace the transformative changes necessary to build a world rooted in justice, equity, self-determination and ecological balance.

For the Global Campaign to Demand Climate Justice, the path forward is unequivocal. The task before the international community is not simply to negotiate climate action but to advance climate justice and the urgency of the moment demands nothing less of the governments and those in power.

****



The Global Campaign to Demand Climate Justice (DCJ) is a membership-driven network of more than 200 climate justice and human rights organisations, grassroots movements, and communities, largely from the Global South, working to advance climate justice and system change. DCJ and its members work to challenge corporate capture and false solutions in global climate policy and advocate for peoples led real solutions rooted in principles of historical responsibility, equity, and justice. This position paper is developed in consultation with DCJ members to articulate a clear climate justice perspective on key agenda items and issues at SB64. It can be used by DCJ members, climate justice and social movements, civil society actors, and allied negotiators to strengthen coordinated messaging around strong climate justice and global south positions and demands during UNFCCC negotiations.

Note: this position paper does not reflect positions of the entire DCJ network but is developed in close consultation with DCJ membership.

This publication is the sole responsibility of the publisher. The positions expressed herein do not reflect the views of the funding agency. The publication is distributed free of charge and may not be used for electoral campaigning purposes.