

# CONTENTS

|                                   |    |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| <i>Foreword</i> .....             | v  |
| <i>List of Contributors</i> ..... | xv |

## Climate Change Litigation in Europe: An Introduction to Regional, Comparative and Sectoral Perspectives

|                                                                              |   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Ivano ALOGNA, Carole BILLIET, Matteo FERMEGLIA<br>and Alina HOLZHAUSEN ..... | 1 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|

|                                                                     |   |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Origin, Aims and Specificity of this Volume .....                | 1 |
| 2. Definition(s) and Development of Climate Change Litigation ..... | 2 |
| 3. Structure and Content .....                                      | 5 |

## PART I. CLIMATE CHANGE LITIGATION IN EUROPE: REGIONAL AND COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES

### Climate Change Litigation in the Courts in Europe

|                                        |    |
|----------------------------------------|----|
| Luc LAVRYSEN and Farah BOUQUELLE ..... | 15 |
|----------------------------------------|----|

|                                                      |    |
|------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1. Introduction .....                                | 15 |
| 2. Developments until 2017 .....                     | 16 |
| 3. Climate Change Litigation from 2018 Onwards ..... | 19 |
| 4. Conclusions .....                                 | 30 |

### Climate Change Litigation before European Regional Courts: An Expert Discussion

|                                       |    |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| Ivano ALOGNA and Carole BILLIET ..... | 33 |
|---------------------------------------|----|

|                                                                                    |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1. Introduction .....                                                              | 33 |
| 2. What Makes a Successful Climate Case? .....                                     | 35 |
| 3. Differences between the CJEU and the ECtHR .....                                | 36 |
| 4. Enforcement of Judgments .....                                                  | 38 |
| 5. Interplay between Regional and Domestic Courts and the Role<br>of Science ..... | 38 |

|                                                       |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 6. Risk of Bringing Climate Cases to Court. ....      | 41 |
| 7. Conclusion: Cross-Fertilisation Among Courts. .... | 42 |

## Climate Change Litigation in Europe: Comparative Perspectives

|                                                                |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Matteo FERMEGLIA and Ivano ALOGNA. ....                        | 45 |
| 1. Introduction. ....                                          | 45 |
| 2. Past Trends in Climate Change Litigation in Europe. ....    | 46 |
| 3. Current Trends in Climate Change Litigation in Europe. .... | 49 |
| 4. Future Trends in Climate Change Litigation in Europe. ....  | 51 |
| 5. Conclusions. ....                                           | 54 |

## PART II. CLIMATE CHANGE LITIGATION IN EUROPE: SECTORAL PERSPECTIVES

### *Human Rights and Climate Change Litigation*

#### The Constitutional Context of Climate Change Litigation: A Comparative Analysis of Germany and Austria

|                                                                       |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Konrad LACHMAYER. ....                                                | 59 |
| 1. The Role of Domestic Constitutional Law. ....                      | 60 |
| 2. Comparing the Constitutional Starting Point. ....                  | 62 |
| 3. The German Climate Change Judgment – A Step Forward. ....          | 64 |
| 4. The Austrian Anti-Climate Change Judgment – A Step Backwards. .... | 68 |
| 5. Comparing Constitutional Particularities. ....                     | 72 |
| 6. Conclusions. ....                                                  | 75 |

#### Taking *People v. Arctic Oil* Seriously: The Potential of Strategic Environmental Assessments and the Principle of Non-Regression in Guiding Energy Policy

|                                                                      |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Suryapratim ROY and Alexandru GOCIU. ....                            | 79 |
| 1. Introduction. ....                                                | 79 |
| 2. Background to the Case: The Norwegian ‘Paradox’. ....             | 82 |
| 3. Jurisprudential Takeaways. ....                                   | 85 |
| 4. Role of SEAs and Rights. ....                                     | 90 |
| 5. Principle of Non-Regression and Progressive Decarbonisation. .... | 91 |
| 6. Conclusion. ....                                                  | 96 |

## Climate Change and Migration: A Socio-Legal Approach to Understanding Europe's Responsibilities Toward Climate Migrants

Jillian SPRENGER ..... 97

1. Introduction ..... 97
2. The Concept of 'Climate Refugee' ..... 99
3. Case Study of Climate Migration in Sri Lanka: Evidence of Human Rights Violations ..... 103
4. Climate Migration, Human Rights and Litigation ..... 105
5. The European Court of Human Rights and the Principle of Non-Refoulement ..... 108
6. Conclusion ..... 112

## Human Rights-Based Climate Litigation and Indigenous Peoples: Comparative Perspectives and New Trends for Climate Justice in Europe

Giada GIACOMINI ..... 115

1. Introduction ..... 115
2. Comparative Perspectives between the European and the Inter-American System on Human Rights ..... 118
3. Indigenous Peoples, Participatory Parity and 'Just Transition Litigation' in Europe ..... 130
4. Conclusions ..... 133

## *State Responsibility and Climate Change Litigation*

### From Rights-Based Claims to Climate Justice: An Uneasy Path – Limits and Prospects to Align Climate Litigation to Justice in Europe

Carlotta GAROFALO ..... 137

1. Introduction ..... 138
2. Defining a National Reduction Pathway: What Ethical Considerations? ..... 140
3. Climate Policies' Ambition and Fairness in Climate Litigation between Legal Creativity and Uncertainty ..... 144
4. Limits of Rights-Based Litigation in Defining Fair and Ambitious Climate Policies ..... 148
5. Legal Pathways to Overcome the Limits of Rights-Based Litigation ..... 153
6. Conclusion ..... 158

|                                                                                                                                               |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>State Obligations to Reduce Carbon Emissions: Using their ‘Carbon Reduction Potential’ Instead of Territorial Emissions as a Yardstick</b> |     |
| Jannis KRÜßMANN .....                                                                                                                         | 161 |
| 1. Introduction .....                                                                                                                         | 161 |
| 2. State’s National Responsibilities According to the Hoge Raad and BVerfG .....                                                              | 162 |
| 3. Royal Dutch Shell’s Carbon Emissions and Reduction Obligations .....                                                                       | 166 |
| 4. Applying the Yardstick for Companies to States: Creating a ‘Carbon Reduction Potential’ .....                                              | 168 |
| 5. Conclusion: ‘Carbon Reduction Potential’ Instead of Territorial Emissions as a Yardstick. ....                                             | 172 |
| <br><b>Climate Change as a Constitutional Topic: Environmental Constitutionalism in the Netherlands and the EU</b>                            |     |
| Marijn VAN DER SLUIS .....                                                                                                                    | 175 |
| 1. Introduction .....                                                                                                                         | 175 |
| 2. The <i>Urgenda</i> Judgment. ....                                                                                                          | 176 |
| 3. The European Green Deal .....                                                                                                              | 182 |
| 4. Negative and Positive Environmental Constitutionalism .....                                                                                | 188 |
| 5. Conclusion. ....                                                                                                                           | 191 |
| <br><b>Shifting Principles of Climate Cooperation: A Court Ruling on Intergenerational Justice as Inspiration for the UN Climate Regime</b>   |     |
| Susann HANDKE .....                                                                                                                           | 193 |
| 1. Introduction .....                                                                                                                         | 193 |
| 2. Considering National Jurisprudence as a Reality Check for the UN Climate Regime. ....                                                      | 195 |
| 3. The German Constitutional Court’s Decision .....                                                                                           | 200 |
| 4. The Premise of Development in the UN Climate Regime .....                                                                                  | 202 |
| 5. Conversing about Intergenerational Justice .....                                                                                           | 205 |
| 6. A Future-Minded Framework for International Climate Cooperation .....                                                                      | 209 |
| 7. Concluding Remarks .....                                                                                                                   | 213 |
| <br><b>Strategic Climate Litigation in Poland: In Search of a Proper Socio-Legal Communication before Courts</b>                              |     |
| Alan ŻUKOWSKI .....                                                                                                                           | 215 |
| 1. Introduction .....                                                                                                                         | 215 |
| 2. Strategic Climate Litigation in Poland .....                                                                                               | 216 |

|                                                                                            |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 3. Significant Problems with Strategic Climate Litigation in Poland . . . . .              | 221 |
| 4. A Narrative Approach: Between Social Communication and Legal<br>Argumentation . . . . . | 227 |
| 5. Conclusion . . . . .                                                                    | 231 |

### *International Trade and Investment Protection and Climate Change Litigation*

#### **Procedural Improvements Aiming at Investment Arbitration's Greater Social Acceptability**

|                                                           |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Patrick THIEFFRY . . . . .                                | 235 |
| 1. Introduction . . . . .                                 | 235 |
| 2. ISDS's Need for Greater Social Acceptability . . . . . | 238 |
| 3. ISDS Procedural Reform Trends . . . . .                | 240 |
| 4. Conclusion . . . . .                                   | 244 |

### *Procedural Rights and Climate Change Litigation*

#### **Closed Doors in Luxembourg? Climate Change Litigation before the CJEU in a 'Complete System of Remedies'**

|                               |     |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Joschka SCHLAKE . . . . .     | 247 |
| 1. Introduction . . . . .     | 247 |
| 2. Direct Actions . . . . .   | 248 |
| 3. Indirect Actions . . . . . | 257 |
| 4. Conclusion . . . . .       | 264 |

#### **Harnessing Public Participation in the EU Taxonomy Regulation Delegated Acts: Mobilising Sustainable Investments and Mobilising People**

|                                                                                          |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Dorien COPPENS . . . . .                                                                 | 267 |
| 1. Introduction . . . . .                                                                | 267 |
| 2. Aarhus Convention and Taxonomy Delegated Acts: Kindred Spirits? . . . .               | 269 |
| 3. Public Participation: Experiences under the First Taxonomy<br>Delegated Act . . . . . | 276 |
| 4. Re-Evaluating Public Participation . . . . .                                          | 281 |
| 5. Conclusion . . . . .                                                                  | 284 |

#### **Project Review, Fossil Infrastructure and Climate Change: The Flemish Petrol Station Case as an Unexpected Breakthrough?**

|                                                                   |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Hendrik SCHOUKENS . . . . .                                       | 287 |
| 1. Introduction . . . . .                                         | 287 |
| 2. The Flemish Petrol Station Case: A Detailed Analysis . . . . . | 291 |

|                                                                                          |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 3. Wider Lessons: Legal Grounds for Project Review Based on Climate Considerations ..... | 295 |
| 4. Conclusion .....                                                                      | 306 |

### Collective Redress and Climate Change Litigation in the EU:

#### A Promising Future or More of the Same?

|                                                                                                                          |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Rhonson SALIM .....                                                                                                      | 309 |
| 1. Introduction .....                                                                                                    | 309 |
| 2. Collective Redress and Climate Change: The Netherlands .....                                                          | 311 |
| 3. Access to Justice and Collective Redress .....                                                                        | 314 |
| 4. Changes to Consumer Collective Redress After Directive 2020/1828: Representative Actions, Standing and Remedies ..... | 315 |
| 5. Procedural Reforms and Possibilities for Climate Change Litigation .....                                              | 317 |
| 6. Selected State Practice on Collective Redress: Poland .....                                                           | 323 |
| 7. Potential Reforms in Poland? .....                                                                                    | 324 |
| 8. Conclusion .....                                                                                                      | 326 |

### Climate Change Class Actions in Europe? The Italian Perspective

|                                                                     |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Ander MAGLICA .....                                                 | 327 |
| 1. Introduction .....                                               | 327 |
| 2. Barriers to Climate Change Litigation .....                      | 328 |
| 3. The Class Action Model .....                                     | 334 |
| 4. Class Actions and Climate Change: A Comparative Assessment ..... | 338 |
| 5. Future Challenges in Italy .....                                 | 343 |
| 6. Conclusion .....                                                 | 345 |

### *Corporate Responsibility and Climate Change Litigation*

#### From State to Corporate Liability in Climate Litigation: How Can Urgenda-Type Cases Inform the Responsibility of Private Companies to Mitigate Climate Change?

|                                                                                                                                                |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Maria Antonia TIGRE .....                                                                                                                      | 349 |
| 1. Introduction .....                                                                                                                          | 349 |
| 2. Systemic Mitigation Cases .....                                                                                                             | 352 |
| 3. Private Climate Litigation with the Goal of Reducing GHG Emissions .....                                                                    | 354 |
| 4. Holding Private Companies Accountable for Climate Change: Reliance on Systemic Mitigation Cases and Replicating <i>Milieudefensie</i> ..... | 362 |
| 5. Conclusion .....                                                                                                                            | 366 |

|                                                                                                                                                                             |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>The Liability of Financial Institutions for Climate Change: Legal Mechanisms and Principles for Assessing the Financial Industry's Responsibility for Global Warming</b> |     |
| Marta ZAMORSKA .....                                                                                                                                                        | 367 |
| 1. Introduction .....                                                                                                                                                       | 368 |
| 2. Climate Change Obligations that are Currently Applicable to Financial Institutions.....                                                                                  | 369 |
| 3. Scrutiny of the Activity of Financial Institutions under the 'Polluter Pays' Principle.....                                                                              | 373 |
| 4. Public Nuisance Litigation to Redress Environmental Concerns .....                                                                                                       | 378 |
| 5. Fiduciary Duties of Financial Institutions' Directors and Boards to Consider Climate Change.....                                                                         | 380 |
| 6. Conclusion and Outlook .....                                                                                                                                             | 386 |
| <br><b>PART III. CLIMATE CHANGE LITIGATION IN EUROPE: THE WAY FORWARD</b>                                                                                                   |     |
| <br><b>Conclusion: Climate Change Litigation in Europe – The Way Forward</b>                                                                                                |     |
| Carole BILLIET, Alina HOLZHAUSEN, Matteo FERMEGLIA and Ivano ALOGNA .....                                                                                                   | 391 |
| 1. Summary of Parts I and II of this Edited Volume .....                                                                                                                    | 391 |
| 2. Findings of the Closing Panel Discussion .....                                                                                                                           | 396 |
| 3. Concluding Remarks .....                                                                                                                                                 | 399 |
| <br><i>Index</i> .....                                                                                                                                                      | 401 |