

Global trends in climate change litigation: 2025 snapshot

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: Methodological notes

ANNEX 2: References

To accompany the report by Joana Setzer and Catherine Higham available at:
www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/publications-global-trends-in-climate-change-litigation-2025

ANNEX 1. Methodological notes

Data collection

Information about the cases discussed in this report was primarily derived from the two Climate Change Litigation databases maintained by the Sabin Center for Climate Change Law. Data was downloaded from the Center's US and Global databases on 15 May 2025. Both databases have been updated since then. More detail on the data collection methodology can be found on the 'About' page of the Sabin Center's databases.

The databases are the primary source for the large majority of cases identified in this report. In the course of drafting and updating case classifications, we identified some updates to cases and new cases not yet included in the databases. We provided information about these updates to the Sabin Center and it will be subsequently added to the databases.

At the time of release of our 2024 report, the Sabin Center's Global Climate Litigation databases contained more than 900 cases. Since then, close to 150 new cases have been added to the Global dataset. Many of the cases added were filed in years prior to 2023. Readers should, therefore, keep in mind that the figures presented in this 2025 report are likely to be an underestimation of cases from around the world, as cases previously not known to the researchers continue to be identified.

At the time of our data download for this report, the Sabin Center's US Climate Litigation Database contained over 1,960 case bundles. Case bundles refer to multiple individual claims that are combined into a single legal action. In such instances, a case bundle may contain information about more than one complaint when these are filed on the same subject matter and have been consolidated before a court. For example, the 2023 case of *Western States Trucking Association Inc. v. EPA* involves six separate challenges to the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) decision to grant a waiver of Clean Air Act pre-emption, allowing California's Air Resources Board to introduce new emissions standards for heavy-duty vehicles. These challenges are filed by a range of claimants, including trade associations, states and campaign groups. A similar case involving multiple complaints that have since been consolidated is the case of *Center for Biological Diversity v. EPA*, which involves nine separate challenges to new EPA rules on renewable fuel standards, some filed by environmental associations and others by companies, and trade associations or industry bodies. This case is counted once in the overall case count but is also counted in both the climate-aligned and non-climate-aligned categories.

As noted in Part I of the main report, based on the Sabin Center's databases alone, it appears that although the overall body of climate cases continues to grow, the rate of growth may be slowing down. However, it is possible that this apparent decline may simply be caused by a delay in the identification of new cases. As the field of climate change litigation has become more complex, spread across more jurisdictions, and involves cases in different languages, data collection and processing has also become more complex. We know there can be a time lag between cases being filed and their entry into the database: at the time of publication of our 2022 report, for example, there were just over 200 cases recorded for 2021 and now there are more than 300, meaning that around 100 additional cases have been recorded in the intervening three-year period.

To test the theory that data collection is partially driving the apparent decline in new cases, we considered whether substituting case numbers from national databases, which adopt broader definitions of what cases are considered climate cases, and may be easier to keep up-to-date due to a narrower scope, would change the shape of the graph in Figure 1.1. We substituted the numbers of Australian and Brazilian cases in the Global database for those in the national databases maintained by the University of Melbourne and PUC-Rio (see Box A in the Introduction).¹ While this did lead to an overall increase in the number of cases filed each year – in part because the University of Melbourne uses a broader

¹ Figures from the Argentine Observatory of Climate Litigation and the Platform of Climate Litigation for Latin America and the Caribbean were not included as the former actually records fewer cases than the Sabin Center's Global database and the latter does not appear to be substantially more up-to-date.

definition of climate litigation than that employed by the Sabin Center – it did not alter the shape of Figure 1.1 (the total number of climate litigation cases globally over time) very substantially. We interpret these results as suggesting that the apparent slowdown in the rate of new cases being filed may be due to more than just data collection issues.

Alternative explanations for the rate slowing down in the filing of new cases could include:

- **Strategic consolidation:** Many of the cases filed in and around 2021 are still making their way through the courts. We may therefore be seeing a pause in the filing of new cases by some organisations as they concentrate resources on existing litigation. Others may also be waiting to see the outcome of these cases before filing new challenges.
- **Regulatory changes** may reduce the number of cases in a certain area. For example, regulatory attention and a raft of new legislation and guidance on environmental and climate claims from recent years (see Chan et al., 2023) may have contributed to a short-term increase in new climate-washing cases, followed by a drop as companies start to understand the new rules and to react to the litigation.
- **Changes to political landscapes:** The pace of filing in some jurisdictions may change due to changes in the political landscape. For example, the number of ‘systemic’ cases filed in Brazil during the Bolsonaro years has been identified as being far higher than under the current administration (Moreira et al., 2024).

Approach to case classification

When classifying cases for these reports we primarily base our findings on the Sabin Center’s case summaries. In cases where it is challenging to make a determination about a case based on the information available in the summaries, we also review the full case documents in the databases, as well as academic analyses and/or media reports. Some classifications will be assigned based on review by one member of the research team. However, where there is uncertainty about a classification, this case is reviewed and discussed in detail by the authors before a final determination is made.

Classification of strategic cases and strategies in Part II of the main report

Classification of a case as ‘strategic’

Many of the classifications in Part II – for example, determination of whether to classify a case as strategic – are based on subjective assessments. Case assessments may also be made on imperfect or incomplete information, particularly about the parties’ intentions. For example, we may define a case as strategic based on the evidence of the claimants’ behaviour (e.g. issuing press releases about the case) and the claimant type (e.g. a case filed by an NGO or community group with a mission and purpose to protect the environment is likely to form part of a broader advocacy strategy on the part of the NGO). This does not mean that the claimants themselves would necessarily describe the case as strategic.

Classifying a case as strategic or non-strategic also does not imply a judgement of one being better or more impactful than the other. Cases brought to achieve a relief that will apply to an isolated situation without the intention to influence the broader debate (i.e. non-strategic) can be as (or more) important as cases that actively seek the realisation of broader changes in society (i.e. strategic litigation).

Courts will not always have regard for the broader intentions of the parties when determining a case, meaning that cases brought with little or no strategic intent may nonetheless provide opportunities for courts to issue far-reaching judgments on novel legal issues. For example, the case of *Raja Zahoor Ahmed v. Capital Development Authority*, a case that was filed in 1995 and in which no legal issues related to climate change were originally argued, resulted in a judgment from the Pakistan Supreme Court in 2022 that included significant jurisprudence on the importance of integrating climate change considerations into urban planning. On the other hand, in some cases the strategic nature of the case may have positive impacts on the way the court determines the issues, and in others, as in the case of *ClientEarth v. Shell*, it may be weighed against the claimants by the courts (see Setzer and Higham, 2022).

One group of cases that present a particular challenge when we are assessing whether a case is strategic or not is cases brought or initiated by prosecutors, regulatory bodies and enforcement agencies. Typically, such cases are not classified as strategic since in bringing the case the body is usually just performing its legally mandated function. However, we are aware of certain exceptions to this rule, where relevant bodies have:

- Made public statements indicating that a group of cases is intended to send a strong message about the application of a particular area of law to climate change issues; and/or
- Worked with other actors in the legal ecosystem to develop novel arguments and methodologies with the explicit aim of addressing specific elements of climate change.

In these circumstances, we have classified the cases as strategic. Examples include:

- According to a report on the topic published in August 2024, the Australian Securities and Investments Commission (ASIC) has identified “sustainable finance and acting to reduce harm from greenwashing misconduct” as strategic priorities since 2022 (ASIC, 2024). ASIC has made a significant number of interventions to advance this priority, including issuing civil proceedings against several regulated entities. Many, though not all, of these interventions raise climate change-related issues. Where relevant ASIC interventions appear in the data reviewed for these reports, we have therefore classified them as strategic.
- In 2023, the UK’s Advertising Standard Authority (ASA) issued proceedings against the energy company Equinor after Equinor placed misleading advertising in the *Economist* magazine. Unlike previous ASA cases in the database which appear to have been initiated after complaints from the public and civil society, these proceedings appear to have originated with the ASA itself. We have nonetheless classified the case as strategic because it received quite wide media coverage at the time and the ASA’s Chief Executive used it as an example in an interview with the *Financial Times* in which he talked about the regulator’s broader role in addressing greenwashing claims (Bryan, 2024).

Classification of strategy types

Given that our identification of different strategy types in this report is sometimes based on only partial information about a case, it is possible that some cases may employ additional strategies that we have not identified here. We have confined our review to three strategies per case, but determining which strategy takes precedence is a subjective question and our assessment may differ from the deeper understanding afforded to the parties by their access to more privileged information. Nonetheless, we feel that the classification of cases by strategy can offer a helpful insight into similarities between climate cases, particularly given that differences in legal cultures may require different litigants to employ a variety of legal grounds to achieve the same ends.

It is important to note that not every case identified as strategic can necessarily be integrated into our existing case types. The typology itself is kept under review and new case strategies are added as necessary. For example, in our 2024 report, we included the new category of ‘transition risk’ cases.

In this report, data on the strategies employed in cases filed in 2024 is compared with historic data since 2015. This data was classified over a period of many years and different approaches to classification have been applied to the Sabin Center’s Global and US databases.

For the Global database, we have conducted a fully comprehensive review of all cases. An assessment of case strategies has been conducted for every case filed since 2015, regardless of when this case was added to the database.

Since the US dataset is considerably larger and US cases have not been evaluated in depth in all previous reports, we have adopted an alternative approach to providing historical comparison data for the US. This approach has varied between case categories:

- For government framework cases, the historic data is derived from the dataset used for a previous report on this subset of cases, which included US cases (Higham et al., 2022). This dataset has been updated based on a thorough review of cases filed from 2022 onwards.

- For cases that typically only involve corporate defendants, historic data has been derived from a review of a dataset of corporate cases filed since 2015 developed and regularly updated by the authors. This is used to identify corporate framework cases, transition risk cases, climate-washing cases and polluter pays cases.
- For turning-off-the-taps cases, failure-to-adapt cases, and integrating climate considerations cases, which can involve both cases against corporate actors and cases against government actors, a dataset of historical comparison cases was developed for this report, using the case categorisation in the Sabin Center's database and search and filter options:
 - To identify failure-to-adapt cases filed between 2015 and 2023, we first developed a dataset including all cases with the word 'adaptation' in any part of their classification in the Sabin Center's database. This dataset included 94 cases. Each case was then reviewed to determine whether it fell within the definition of failure-to-adapt. The original review was completed in May 2024 for the 2024 report. For this edition of the report, that review has been supplemented with a review of all new cases filed in 2023 and 2024, which was completed in May 2025.
 - For turning-off-the-taps cases, historical comparison cases were identified by searching key terms such as 'public finance', 'bank' and 'export finance'. We also conducted a manual review of all cases in the Securities and Financial Regulation Archives in the Sabin Center's database. Few cases seeking to force financial decision-makers to incorporate climate into decision-making were identified in the data from 2015–2023, although several cases challenging the relevance of climate to such decision-making were identified. A series of cases involving import–export finance institutions was also identified, but these all predated 2015. This original review was also completed in May 2024 for the 2024 report. As with failure-to-adapt cases, that review has been supplemented with a review of all new cases filed in 2023 and 2024 for this report. That review was completed in May 2025.
 - Integrating climate considerations is by far the most common strategy in the global data and we believe this holds true for the US data as well. However, a full review of every US case is not possible with the resources available, so this strategy type has only been assigned for cases from 2023 and 2024 and corporate cases.

Classification of outcomes

When reviewing our classification of outcomes, readers should note that we classify outcomes at several different stages within a given case:

- The first stage at which a case may be classified as having a given outcome (as opposed to being classed as 'open') is when there is a positive ruling on a procedural issue such as permission to proceed, standing or justiciability, even if the case has not proceeded to trial. This is particularly likely to happen in a case where the issues presented are of a novel nature, or where the case runs counter to a procedural decision taken in a previous case.
- The second stage is when there is an initial ruling on the case from a court of first instance.
- The third (and sometimes fourth or fifth) stage is when the outcomes of any appeals become known. This means that the status of a case may change from 'favourable' or 'unfavourable' throughout the course of the proceedings as different decisions are issued.

In some instances, cases that may have been classified as having negative outcomes for the parties may nonetheless advance an issue of fact or law that may have positive impacts on subsequent litigation. For example, in the case of *Sacchi et al. v. Argentina*, the case has been classified as having an unfavourable outcome because it was dismissed by the Committee on the Rights of the Child. However, it could be argued that the case has in fact had positive outcomes because it has helped clarify several issues of international law. This reflects the overall limitations of imposing a quantitative assessment of outcomes on complex legal cases.

Analysis on supreme courts and equivalent apex courts

When reviewing the analysis of cases that reached apex courts – such as supreme and constitutional courts – readers should note that each jurisdiction has its own hierarchy of courts, which may entail different apex courts for different areas of law. For example, some jurisdictions distinguish between constitutional, civil and administrative apex courts, while federal jurisdictions like the US may allow state supreme courts to act as the apex court on matters of state law that do not have a federal law component. While the majority of federal jurisdictions, such as Canada and Germany, also have circumstances in which a state supreme court was considered an apex court, one exception to this rule which is worth highlighting is Brazil, where, due to the extreme unlikelihood of a state supreme court being solely capable of acting as the final apex court, only cases that have had their outcomes considered by the Brazilian federal supreme courts (the STF and STJ) were classified as being considered by an apex court.

When classifying a case as part of the apex court analysis, the focus was on determining whether the apex court had provided an outcome for the case in question. This does not necessarily equate to full determination of a case on the merits. Cases that have been evaluated by the apex court on procedural aspects (e.g. requests from lower courts to confirm whether a case can proceed to trial on the merits), and cases in circumstances where the /apex court denied certiorari (in the case of the federal US Supreme Court) or otherwise refused to hear the full case on its merits were also included, as the relevant apex court in question still broadly considered the case and provided some form of outcome.

Further sub-classifications of the apex court data focused on the cases filed and/or determined from 2015 onwards. These cases were first classified according to the typical analysis of a case (strategic v. non-strategic, climate aligned v. non-climate-aligned, what strategy was deployed in a strategic case, and so on), as well as according to their geographical distribution. Then, additional classifications were also added to determine (a) whether a case had been accepted or refused admissibility by the supreme/apex court; (b) whether the case pertained to a procedural matter or a substantive question or both; (c) whether the case was directly filed before the supreme/apex court; (d) whether a case contained or involved rights-based claims; and (e) whether the relevant decision was made on procedural or substantive grounds or both.

ANNEX 2. References

- Affolder N and Dzah G (2024) The transnational exchange of law through climate change litigation in Sindico F, McKenzie K, Wegener L, Medici G (eds). *Research Handbook on Climate Change Litigation*, Edward Elgar Publishing.
www.elgaronline.com/edcollchap/book/9781800889781/book-part-9781800889781-17.xml
- Arcuri A, Tienhaara K and Pellegrini L (2024) Investment law v. supply-side climate policies: insights from Rockhopper v. Italy and Lone Pine v. Canada, *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, 24(1), pp. 193–216.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10784-023-09622-w>
- Australian Securities and Investments Commission [ASIC] (2024) ASIC’s interventions on greenwashing misconduct: 2023–2024. Report 791.
<https://download.asic.gov.au/media/lbygvudn/rep791-published-23-august-2024.pdf>
- Averchenkova A et al. (2024) *Impacts of climate framework laws: Lessons from Germany, Ireland and New Zealand*. Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment and Centre for Climate Change.
<https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/publication/impacts-of-climate-framework-laws/>
- Bañuelos JAC and Tigre MA (2025a) The ICJ’s Advisory Opinion on Climate Change: Key Takeaways from the 2024 Hearing (Part 2), *Climate Law Blog*, 11 March.
<https://blogs.law.columbia.edu/climatechange/2025/03/11/the-icjs-advisory-opinion-on-climate-change-key-takeaways-from-the-2024-hearings-part-2/>
- Bañuelos JAC and Tigre MA (2025b) The ICJ’s Advisory Opinion on Climate Change: Key Takeaways from the 2024 Hearing (Part 3), *Climate Law Blog*, 12 March.
<https://blogs.law.columbia.edu/climatechange/2025/03/12/the-icjs-advisory-opinion-on-climate-change-key-takeaways-from-the-2024-hearing-part-3/>
- Bañuelos JAC and Tigre MA (2025c) The ICJ’s Advisory Opinion on Climate Change: Key Takeaways from the 2024 Hearings (Part 1), *Climate Law Blog*, 10 March.
<https://blogs.law.columbia.edu/climatechange/2025/03/10/the-icjs-advisory-opinion-on-climate-change-key-takeaways-from-the-2024-hearings-part-1/>
- Barnes G and McDonald J (2021) Bushfire recovery through class action litigation, *University of Tasmania Law Review*, 40(1).
<https://www5.austlii.edu.au/au/journals/UTasLawRw/2021/2.pdf>
- Benjamin L et al. (2022) *CSSN Research Report 2022:1: Climate-Washing Litigation: Legal Liability for Misleading Climate Communications*. Institute at Brown for Environment and Society.
<https://cssn.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/CSSN-Research-Report-2022-1-Climate-Washing-Litigation-Legal-Liability-for-Misleading-Climate-Communications.pdf>
- Berglund O et al. (2024) *Criminalisation and Repression of Climate and Environmental Protests*. University of Bristol
- Bétaille J and Chapron G (2025) KlimaSeniorinnen case: Climate change legal scholarship needs empiricism, not hype, *PLOS Climate*, 4(3), p. e0000589.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pclm.0000589>
- Bouwer K and Setzer J (2020) *Climate litigation as climate activism: what works?* British Academy. <https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/publications/knowledge-frontiers-cop26-briefings-climate-litigation-climate-activism-what-works/>
- Bradeen E, Chan T and Higham C (2023) *Philippines Climate Accountability Bill: loss and damage in domestic legislation*, Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the

Environment, 18 December. <https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/news/philippines-climate-accountability-bill-loss-and-damage-in-domestic-legislation/>

Bradeen E, Higham C and Setzer J (2025) *Ruminating on litigation's role in bridging the policy gap on animal agriculture and its emissions*, Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment. <https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/news/ruminating-on-litigations-role-in-bridging-the-policy-gap-on-animal-agriculture-and-its-emissions/>

Bray D and Poston TM (2024) The Methane Majors: Climate Change and Animal Agriculture in U.S. Courts, *Columbia Journal of Environmental Law*, 49(S), pp. 145–248. <https://doi.org/10.52214/cjel.v49iS.12548>

Brickhill J (2021) *Strategic litigation in South Africa: understanding and evaluating impact*. University of Oxford. <https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:e7be10e6-c511-40b1-8126-df3b3b229b5b>

British Institute of International and Comparative Law [BIICL] (2025) Global Perspectives on Corporate Climate Legal Tactics. Webpage. <https://www.biicl.org/projects/global-perspectives-on-corporate-climate-legal-tactics>

Bryan K (2024) UK advertising watchdog turns to AI to help police 'dodgy' green claims. *Financial Times*, 8 February. <https://www.ft.com/content/d257eed5-a9ea-4e49-b5ab-663ba9618636>

Burger M and Wentz J (2017) Downstream and Upstream Greenhouse Gas Emissions: The Proper Scope of NEPA Review, *Harv. Envtl. L. Rev.*, 41, p. 109. https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/sabin_climate_change/100/

Burri T (2024) *The ICJ's Advisory Opinion on Climate Change: A Data Analysis of Participants' Written Submissions (full data update)*. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5054120>

Buszman Z (2024) Beyond the Courtroom: The Evolution of Rights-Based Climate Litigation from Uganda to Held and its Policy Impact, *Studia Iuridica*, 102. <https://studiaiuridica.pl/article/544853/en>

Calderón MD (2024) 'Rights-based Climate Litigation in Colombia: An Assessment of Claims, Remedies, and Implementation', *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 16(1), pp. 273–284. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jhuman/huad067>

Callahan CW and Mankin JS (2025) Carbon majors and the scientific case for climate liability, *Nature*, 640(8060), pp. 893–901. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-025-08751-3>

CCTV News (2024) 最高法：十年来全国法院共审结各类环境资源一审案件 190.2 万件. Webpage. https://content-static.cctvnews.cctv.com/snow-book/index.html?item_id=1778081249653352191&toc_style_id=feeds_default&share_to=copy_url&track_id=0f7ac073-5883-4b1c-b871-d8a93b878474

Chan T et al. (forthcoming) Exploring justice in climate-washing litigation: insights from the Global South and carbon markets, in Douglas Kysar and Ernest Lim (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Climate Change and Private Law* (Oxford University Press, 2026)

Chen MB and Li Z (2023) Courts Without Separation of Powers: The Case of Judicial Suggestions in China, *Harvard International Law Journal*, 64(1). <https://journals.law.harvard.edu/ilj/2023/09/courts-without-separation-of-powers-the-case-of-judicial-suggestions-in-china/>

ClientEarth (2024) *Greenwashing of BlackRock investment funds: Complaint submitted to the Autorité des Marchés Financiers*. <https://www.clientearth.org/media/0tuj2bit/clientearth-complaint-to-the-amf-english.pdf>

- ClientEarth (2025) *We're taking action against investment company BlackRock for greenwashing*
<https://www.clientearth.org/latest/news/clientearth-taking-action-against-blackrock-for-greenwashing/>
- Cummings SL (2017) *Movement Lawyering*. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network.
<https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3067562>
- De Boer D and Jiang B (2023) China's Supreme People's Court Issues Guidance on Climate Cases, *China Council for International Cooperation on Environment and Development*, 3 March.
<https://cciced.eco/climate-governance/chinas-supreme-peoples-court-issues-guidance-on-climate-cases/>
- Deutsche Umwelthilfe [DUH] (2025) *Konzern One-Dyas will Gasförderung mit Klage erzwingen: Deutsche Umwelthilfe fordert Landesregierung Niedersachsen auf, dem Druck standzuhalten*. Press release, 16 January.
<https://www.duh.de/presse/pressemitteilungen/pressemitteilung/konzern-one-dyas-will-gasfoerderung-mit-klage-erzwingen-deutsche-umwelthilfe-fordert-landesregierung/>
- Dietz S et al. (n.d.) *Translating climate science into legal standards: lessons from the Milieudefensie v. Shell case*. Unpublished manuscript, draft on file with authors
- Dilger E et al. (2024) *Emerging climate litigation impacts on the banking industry*.
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4957970&download=yes
- Dubash NK, Ghosh S and Valiathan Pillai A (2024) Court on climate right and how India can enforce it, *The Hindu*, 30 June. <https://www.thehindu.com/opinion/lead/court-on-climate-right-and-how-india-can-enforce-it/article68352441.ece>
- Dulak T and Gnabo JY (2024) *Climate Litigation and Financial Markets: A Disciplinary Effect?* Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4735089>
- Dutta (2024) How a Critically Endangered Bird Helped Further the Cause of Climate Justice in India, *The Wire*, 12 April. <https://thewire.in/environment/how-a-critically-endangered-bird-helped-further-the-cause-of-climate-justice-in-india>
- Eckes C (2023) The Autonomy of the EU Legal Order: The Case of the Energy Charter Treaty, *European Papers - A Journal on Law and Integration*, 2023 8(3), pp. 1465–1494.
<https://doi.org/10.15166/2499-8249/725>
- Eckes C and Paiement P (2025) *Silencing Greenpeace*. Verfassungsblog.
<https://verfassungsblog.de/greenpeace-slapp-energy-transfer/>
- Eilstrup-Sangiovanni M (2019) Competition and strategic differentiation among transnational advocacy groups. *Interest Groups & Advocacy*, 8(3), European University Institute.
<https://hdl.handle.net/1814/64508>
- Eisenson M et al. (2024) *Opposition to Renewable Energy Facilities in the United States: June 2024 Edition*, Sabin Center for Climate Change Law.
https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/sabin_climate_change/226
- Elderson F (2024) *"Failing to plan is planning to fail" – why transition planning is essential for banks*, European Central Bank, 23 January.
<https://www.bankingsupervision.europa.eu/press/blog/2024/html/ssm.blog240123~5471c5f63e.en.html>
- European Banking Authority [EBA] (2025) *Final Report. Guidelines on the management of environmental, social and governance (ESG) risks*.
<https://www.eba.europa.eu/sites/default/files/2025-01/fb22982a-d69d-42cc-9d62-1023497ad58a/Final%20Guidelines%20on%20the%20management%20of%20ESG%20risks.pdf>

- European Central Bank [ECB] (2021) *The state of climate and environmental risk management in the banking sector. Report on the supervisory review of banks' approaches to manage climate and environmental risks.* <https://www.bankingsupervision.europa.eu/ecb/pub/pdf/ssm.202111guideonclimaterelatedandenvironmentalrisks~4b25454055.en.pdf>
- Fantozzi FP and Udell J (2024) Shifting the Mitigation Burden: Outcomes and Implementation Opportunities of the Landmark South Korean Climate Case, *British Institute of International and Comparative Law*, 11 December. <https://www.biicl.org/blog/97/shifting-the-mitigation-burden-outcomes-and-implementation-opportunities-of-the-landmark-south-korean-climate-case>
- Fantozzi FP, Mead S and Maxwell L (2023) Government accountability: the role of systemic climate litigation in the fight for a more sustainable future, in *Migrazioni e diritti al tempo dell'antropocene*. Editoriale Scientifica. https://editorialescientifica.it/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/Open-access_AAVV_Migrazioni-e-diritti-al-tempo-dellantropocene.pdf
- Ferguson EC (2024) Held v State of Montana: A Constitutional Rights Turn in Climate Change Litigation?, *Journal of Environmental Law*, 36(3), pp. 453–460. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jel/eqae017>
- Field C and Hanawalt C (2024) The Anti-ESG Movement Has Not Fared Well in Court, but Critical Decisions Are Pending, *Climate Law Blog*, 25 October. <https://blogs.law.columbia.edu/climatechange/2024/10/25/the-anti-esg-movement-has-not-fared-well-in-court-but-critical-decisions-are-pending/>
- Field TL (2024) Towards a Risk-Thematic Approach for African Climate Litigation, in K. Bouwer et al. (eds) *Climate Litigation and Justice in Africa*. Bristol University Press. <https://bristoluniversitypressdigital.com/edcollchap-oa/book/9781529228977/ch002.xml>
- Fisher E (2025) Telling Meaningful Stories About Climate Change and Public Law, *Journal of Environmental Law*, 37(1), pp. 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jel/eqae028>
- Förster S, Henrich S and Schäffer K (2024) *German Federal Court of Justice, Judgment of 27 June 2024, case no. I ZR 98/23 Green Claims under the German Unfair Competition Act*. Blog post, 28 June. Clyde & Co. <https://www.clydeco.com/en/insights/2024/06/german-federal-court-of-justice-judgment-of-27-jun>
- Foster CE (2024) Due Regard for Future Generations? The No Harm Rule and Sovereignty in the Advisory Opinions on Climate Change, *Transnational Environmental Law*, 13(3), pp. 588–609. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2047102524000207>
- Gallagher Research Centre (n.d.) *Climate Litigation White Paper*. Unpublished manuscript, draft on file with authors
- Gehring M and Cordonier Segger MC (2025) *Climate Justice through International Courts and Tribunals: Advisory Opinions in the International Tribunal on the Law of the Sea (ITLOS), the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACtHR) and the International Court of Justice (ICJ)*. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5137762>
- Gerrard M (2024) Environmental Law in Trump's Second Term, *N.Y.L.J.*, 12 November. https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/faculty_scholarship/4578
- Gerrard M and MacDougald J (2013) An Introduction to Climate Change Liability Litigation and a View to the Future, *Conn. Ins. L. J.*, 20, p. 153
- Gerrard M and McTiernan E (2018) Patterns of Climate Change Litigation During Trump Era, *N.Y.L.J.*, 8 March, 259(45) https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/faculty_scholarship/3060

- Gill NG and Ramachandran G (2021) Sustainability transformations, environmental rule of law and the Indian judiciary: Connecting the dots through climate change litigation, *Environmental Law Review*, 23(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614529211031203>.
- Gostlow G et al. (n.d) *Climate Litigation as a Financial Risk: Evidence from a Global Survey with Equity Investors*. Unpublished manuscript, draft on file with authors
- Gupta J (2024) Climate judgement reveals nuanced interplay between biodiversity and renewable energy, *Mongabay-India*, 30 April. <https://india.mongabay.com/2024/04/commentary-climate-judgement-reveals-nuanced-interplay-between-biodiversity-and-renewable-energy/>
- Hamilton R (2024) The “Year of Climate” in International Courts, *Legal Planet*, 2 April. <https://legal-planet.org/2024/04/02/the-year-of-climate-in-international-courts/>
- Higham C et al. (2023) *Climate change law in Europe: What do new EU climate laws mean for the courts?* Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment and Centre for Climate Change Economics and Policy. <https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Climate-change-law-in-Europe-what-do-new-EU-climate-laws-mean-for-the-courts.pdf>
- Higham C, Setzer J and Bradeen E (2022) *Challenging government responses to climate change through framework litigation*. London: Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment and Centre for Climate Change. <https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/Challenging-government-responses-to-climate-change-through-framework-litigation-final.pdf>
- Hilson C (2010) Climate change litigation: an explanatory approach (or bringing grievance back in), in F. Fracchia and M. Occhiena (eds) *Editoriale Scientifica*, Naples. pp. 421–436. <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/16703/>
- Hilson C (2024) *Into Reverse Gear: Shell v Milieudefensie and the Non-Regression Principle*. Blog post, 15 November. Verfassungsblog <https://doi.org/10.59704/0e73924d873c531c>
- Hilson C and Geden O (2024) Climate or carbon neutrality? Which one must states aim for under Article 8 ECHR?, *EJIL: Talk!*, 29 April. <https://www.ejiltalk.org/climate-or-carbon-neutrality-which-one-must-states-aim-for-under-article-8-echr/>
- Hughes L (2019) The Rocky Hill decision: a watershed for climate change action?, *Journal of Energy & Natural Resources Law*, 37(3), pp. 341–351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02646811.2019.1600272>
- IPCC (2022) *Climate Change 2022 Mitigation of Climate Change: Summary for Policymakers*, https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg3/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGIII_SummaryForPolicymakers.pdf
- Iyengar S (2023) Human rights and climate wrongs: Mapping the landscape of rights-based climate litigation, *Review of European, Comparative & International Environmental Law*, 32(2), pp. 299–309. <https://doi.org/10.1111/reel.12498>
- Jackson E (2024) The Energy Charter Treaty: Letting the sun set on sunset clauses, *Review of European, Comparative & International Environmental Law*, 33(3), pp. 619–632. <https://doi.org/10.1111/reel.12583>
- Jackson E (2025) A Duty on Public Bodies to Prioritize Climate Action? Coolglass Windfarm Limited v. An Bord Pleanála, *Climate Law Blog*, 24 January. <https://blogs.law.columbia.edu/climatechange/2025/01/24/a-duty-on-public-bodies-to-prioritize-climate-action-coolglass-windfarm-limited-v-an-bord-pleanala/>

- Jamwal K (2024) A moment for just transition litigation to take wing, *The Hindu*, 8 August. <https://www.thehindu.com/opinion/lead/a-moment-for-just-transition-litigation-to-take-wing/article68502315.ece>
- Jiang X, Kim S and Lu S (2025) Limited accountability and awareness of corporate emissions target outcomes, *Nature Climate Change*, 15(3), pp. 279–286. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-024-02236-3>
- Jodoin S and Wewerinke-Singh M (2025) *Legal Mobilization in a Global Context: The Transnational Practices and Diffusion of Rights-Based Climate Litigation*. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network. <https://doi.org/10.1017/lsr.2024.54>
- Kaminski I (2024a) “A human face on an abstract problem”: ICJ forced to listen to climate victims, *The Guardian*, 11 December. <https://www.theguardian.com/law/2024/dec/11/international-court-of-justice-icj-forced-to-listen-to-climate-victims>
- Kaminski I (2024b) “A very bureaucratic approach to the most existential threat of the century”: Neubauer and the German climate case three years on, *The Wave*, 2 October. <https://www.the-wave.net/neubauer-german-climate-case-three-years-on/>
- Keuschnigg I et al. (n.d.) *Integrating Scope 3 emissions into corporate climate litigation: Evolution, challenges, and judicial responses*. Unpublished manuscript, draft on file with authors
- Klerk BE (2025) The ITLOS advisory opinion on climate change: Revisiting the relationship between the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and the Paris Agreement, *Review of European, Comparative & International Environmental Law*, 34(1), pp. 181–193. <https://doi.org/10.1111/reel.12588>
- Koistinen N (n.d.) *Litigating the climate transition in the EU: mapping climate-relevant litigation before the Court of Justice of the European Union*. Unpublished manuscript, draft on file with authors
- Koistinen N, Higham C and Setzer J (2025) *Will polluters pay? Evidentiary hearings in the case of Lliuya v. RWE in the wider European context*. Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment. <https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/news/will-polluters-pay-evidentiary-hearings-in-the-case-of-lliuya-v-rwe-in-the-wider-european-context/>
- Kolaric S (2024) The impact of climate litigation and activism on stock prices: the case of oil and gas majors, *Review of Managerial Science*, 18(11), pp. 3141–3172
- Kovács A et al. (2024) Beyond courts: Does strategic litigation affect climate change policy support?, *International Review of Law and Economics*, 79, p. 106213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irl.2024.106213>
- Lecavalier E et al. (2025) *Oxford Climate Policy Monitor 2024 Annual Review*. Oxford Climate Policy Hub. <https://ca1-cpm.edcdn.com/downloads/Annual-CPM-Report-2024.pdf?v=1740063705>
- Legg M (2021) The Rise and Regulation of Litigation Funding in Australian Class Actions, *Erasmus Law Review*. <https://www.boomportal.nl/tijdschrift/ELR/ELR-D-21-00027>
- Leingang R and Lakhani N (2025) Greenpeace must pay at least \$660m over Dakota pipeline protests, says jury, *The Guardian*, 19 March. <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/mar/19/greenpeace-lawsuit-energy-transfer-dakota-pipeline>
- Lin J and Peel J (2024) *Litigating Climate Change in the Global South*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press. <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/litigating-climate-change-in-the-global-south-9780192843890?cc=gb&lang=en&>

- Lisi G and Fantozzi FP (2024) *Implementation cannot wait: civil society calls on the European Commission to tackle national energy and climate shortcomings*, GreenDeal-NET, 26 November. <https://www.greendealnet.eu/civil-society-calls-European-Commission-to-tackle-national-energy-climate-shortcomings>
- Lockman M (2023) *Modelling Climate Litigation Risk for (Re)Insurers*. Sabin Center for Climate Change Law. https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/sabin_climate_change/201
- Long LN and Hamilton T (2019) The Climate Necessity Defense: Proof and Judicial Error in Climate Protest Cases, *Stanford Environmental Law Journal*, 38(57). https://law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/K_Long.pdf
- Manko R (2024) *Strategic lawsuits against public participation (SLAPPs)*. European Parliamentary Research Service. European Parliament. [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2022/733668/EPRS_BRI\(2022\)733668_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2022/733668/EPRS_BRI(2022)733668_EN.pdf)
- Markell DL and Ruhl JB (2010) *An Empirical Survey of Climate Change Litigation in the United States*. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1585341>
- Mayer B (2023) The Contribution of Urgenda to the Mitigation of Climate Change, *Journal of Environmental Law*, 35(2), pp. 167–184. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jel/eqac016>
- Medici Colombo G (2024) La litigación climática sobre proyectos ¿Hacia un punto de inflexión en el control judicial. *Editorial Tirant Lo Blanch*. <https://editorial.tirant.com/es/libro/la-litigacion-climatica-sobre-proyectos-hacia-un-punto-de-inflexion-en-el-control-judicial-gaston-medici-colombo-9788411974608>
- Merner D et al. (2025) *Decades of Deceit*. Union of Concerned Scientists. <https://www.ucs.org/sites/default/files/2025-05/Decades-of-Deceit-report-f.pdf>
- Moreira D et al. (2024) Rights-Based Climate Litigation in Brazil: An Assessment of Constitutional Cases Before the Brazilian Supreme Court, *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 16(1), pp. 47–70. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jhuman/huad023>
- Naik A and Kumar P (2025) Endangered Birds, Renewable Energy, and India's New Constitutional Climate Right, *Journal of Environmental Law*, 37(1), pp. 159–167. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jel/eqaf003>
- Nemeth AO and Metz-Lerman J (2025) *Loss and Damage Litigation Against Carbon Majors*. New York: Climate Law Accelerator (CLX) NYU School of Law
- Network for Greening the Financial System [NGFS] (2023) *Climate-related litigation: recent trends and developments*. https://www.ngfs.net/sites/default/files/medias/documents/ngfs_report-on-climate-related-litigation-recent-trends-and-developments.pdf
- Newell P and Daley F (2024) Supply-side climate policy: A new frontier in climate governance, *WIREs Climate Change*, 15(6), p. e909. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.909>
- Ning X and Yang C (2025) The judicial dimension of climate governance: The role of the International Court of Justice, *Review of European, Comparative & International Environmental Law*, 34(1), pp. 194–209. <https://doi.org/10.1111/reel.12608>
- Nolan A (2024) Children and future generations rights before the courts: The vexed question of definitions. *Transnational Environmental Law*, 13(3), pp.522-546
- Noorda AY (2024) When balance sheets pollute: Litigating the climate change-related human rights impacts of financial institutions, *E-Publica*, 11(2). <https://e-publica.pt/article/122071->

- Nordlander L (2024) The road (not) taken: implications of health-focused arguments for rights-based climate change litigation in Europe, *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 29(3), pp. 495–516. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2024.2418480>
- Nosek G and Higham C (2024) Chapter 8: Climate activism and criminal litigation: whose case is it anyway?, in F. Sindico et al. (eds) *Research Handbook on Climate Change Litigation*. <https://www.elgaronline.com/edcollchap/book/9781800889781/book-part-9781800889781-14.xml>
- Okoth EMA and Odaga MO (2021) Leveraging Existing Approaches and Tools to Secure Climate Justice in Africa, *Carbon & Climate Law Review*, 15(2), pp. 129–138. <https://doi.org/10.21552/cclr/2021/2/4>
- Pedersen OW and Sulyok K (2024) Future Generations Litigation and Transformative Changes in Environmental Governance, *Transnational Environmental Law*, 13(3), pp. 464–474. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2047102524000281>
- Peel J and Lin J (2019) Transnational Climate Litigation: The Contribution of the Global South, *American Journal of International Law*, 113(4), pp. 679–726. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ajil.2019.48>
- Peel J and Markey-Towler R (2022) Recipe for Success?: Lessons for Strategic Climate Litigation from the Sharma, Neubauer, and Shell Cases, *German Law Journal*, 22(8). <https://findanexpert.unimelb.edu.au/scholarlywork/1628588-recipe-for-success%3F--lessons-for-strategic-climate-litigation-from-the-sharma--neubauer--and-shell-cases>
- Peel J and Osofsky HM (2015) *Climate Change Litigation: Regulatory Pathways to Cleaner Energy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Cambridge Studies in International and Comparative Law). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139565851>
- Peel J and Osofsky HM (2018) A Rights Turn in Climate Change Litigation?, *Transnational Environmental Law*, 7(1), pp. 37–67. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2047102517000292>
- Peel J and Osofsky HM (2020) Climate Change Litigation, *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 16, pp. 21–38. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-022420-122936>
- Peel J, Palmer A and Markey-Towler R (2022) *Review of literature on impacts of climate litigation*. Children’s Investment Fund Foundation. http://www.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0008/4238450/Impact-lit-review-report_CIFF_Final_27052022.pdf
- Preston BJ and Butler K (2024) ‘Investor–state dispute settlement in natural resources, energy and environmental cases, *Journal of Energy & Natural Resources Law*. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02646811.2024.2385850>
- Pucker KP (2024) Companies Are Scaling Back Sustainability Pledges. Here’s What They Should Do Instead, *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2024/08/companies-are-scaling-back-sustainability-pledges-heres-what-they-should-do-instead>
- Qian J, Sun K and Chang YC (2024) The impact of the ITLOS climate change advisory opinion on the development of international law, *Marine Policy*, 170, p. 106406. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2024.106406>
- Rajamani L (2024) Interpreting the Paris Agreement in its Normative Environment, *Current Legal Problems*, 77(1), pp. 167–200. <https://doi.org/10.1093/clp/cuae011>

- Rajavuori M, Savaresi A and van Asselt H (2023) Mandatory due diligence laws and climate change litigation: Bridging the corporate climate accountability gap?, *Regulation & Governance*, 17(4), pp. 944–953. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12518>
- Rea CM, Merten NE and Rife CJ (2024) Outcomes and policy focus of environmental litigation in the United States, *Nature Sustainability*, 7(11), pp. 1469–1480. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-024-01456-x>
- Sastry PR, Verner E and Marques Ibanez D (2024) *Business as Usual: Bank Net Zero Commitments, Lending, and Engagement*. National Bureau of Economic Research (Working Paper Series). <https://doi.org/10.3386/w32402>.
- Sato M et al. (2024) Impacts of climate litigation on firm value, *Nature Sustainability*, 7(11), pp. 1461–1468. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-024-01455-y>
- Savaresi A (2025) Verein KlimaSeniorinnen Schweiz and Others v Switzerland: Making climate change litigation history, *Review of European, Comparative & International Environmental Law*, 34(1), pp. 279–287. <https://doi.org/10.1111/reel.12612>
- Savaresi A et al. (2024) Conceptualizing just transition litigation, *Nature Sustainability*, 7(11), pp. 1379–1384. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-024-01439-y>
- Schönhage NL et al. (2024) Can the court bridge the gap? Public perception of economic vs. generational inequalities in climate change mitigation policies, *Environmental Research Letters*, 19(10), p. 104047. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ad6916>
- Segal M (2025) Trump, 24 States Sue New York, Vermont Over Laws Charging Fossil Fuel Companies for Climate Change, *ESG Today*, 7 May. <https://www.esgtoday.com/trump-24-states-sue-new-york-and-vermont-over-laws-charging-fossil-fuel-companies-for-climate-change/>
- Setzer J and Higham C (2022) *Global trends in climate change litigation: 2022 snapshot*. Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment and Centre for Climate Change, London School of Economics and Political Science. <https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/publication/global-trends-in-climate-change-litigation-2022/>
- Setzer J and Higham C (2024) *Global trends in climate change litigation: 2024 snapshot*. Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment and Centre for Climate Change, London School of Economics and Political Science. <https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/Global-trends-in-climate-change-litigation-2024-snapshot.pdf>
- Silverman Roati K (2021) *U.S. Climate Litigation in the Age of Trump: Full Term*, Sabin Center for Climate Change Law, Columbia Law School. https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/sabin_climate_change/35
- Sindico F (2025) *Climate Change and the Peripheries of International Law*, University of Strathclyde, 31 March. <https://www.strath.ac.uk/humanities/lawschool/blog/climatechangeandtheperipheriesofinternationallaw/>
- Sindico F and Mbengue MM (eds.) (2021) *Comparative Climate Change Litigation: Beyond the Usual Suspects*. Cham: Springer International Publishing (Ius Comparatum - Global Studies in Comparative Law). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46882-8>
- Slevin I et al. (2025) Beyond dark money: Information subsidies and complex networks of opposition to offshore wind on the U.S. East Coast, *Energy Research & Social Science*, 119, p. 103829. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2024.103829>

- Smoleńska A, Chan T, Poensgen I and Higham C (2025) *Banks and climate litigation risk: navigating the low-carbon transition*. London: Centre for Economic Transition Expertise, London School of Economics and Political Science. <https://cetex.org/publications/banks-and-climate-litigation-risk-navigating-the-low-carbon-transition/>
- Solana J (2020) Climate change litigation as financial risk, *Green Finance*, 2(4), pp. 344–372. <https://doi.org/10.3934/GF.2020019>
- Statistics Netherlands [CBS] (2022) Urgenda reduction target for GHG emissions achieved in 2020. Webpage. <https://www.cbs.nl/en-gb/news/2022/06/urgenda-reduction-target-for-ghg-emissions-achieved-in-2020>.
- Statistics Netherlands [CBS] (2023) Greenhouse gas emissions 9 percent lower in 2022. Webpage. <https://www.cbs.nl/en-gb/news/2023/11/greenhouse-gas-emissions-9-percent-lower-in-2022>.
- Suedi Y (2025) *Africa's Turn: The African Court's Advisory Opinion on Climate Change*. Blog post, 22 May. EJIL:Talk! Blog of the European Journal of International Law. <https://www.ejiltalk.org/africas-turn-the-african-courts-advisory-opinion-on-climate-change/>
- Sulistiawati LY (2024) Climate change related litigation in Indonesia, *Communications Earth & Environment*, 5(1), pp. 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-024-01684-1>
- Supreme People's Court of the People's Republic of China [SPC] (2020) 中国环境资源审判 (2019年) Webpage. <http://wej.court.gov.cn/news/view-36.html>
- Supreme People's Court of the People's Republic of China [SPC] (2023) 司法积极稳妥推进碳达峰碳中和典型案例. Webpage. https://www.mee.gov.cn/home/ztbd/2022/sthjpf/sthjshpcdxal/202303/t20230301_1017965.shtml
- Supreme People's Procuratorate of the People's Republic of China [SPP] (2023a) 检察机关服务保障碳达峰碳中和典型案例. Webpage. https://www.spp.gov.cn/spp/xwfbh/wsfbh/202306/t20230605_616289.shtml
- Supreme People's Procuratorate of the People's Republic of China [SPP] (2023b) 最高检发布依法服务保障金融高质量发展意见. Webpage. https://www.spp.gov.cn/spp/zd gz/202312/t20231228_638614.shtml
- Supreme People's Procuratorate of the People's Republic of China [SPP] (2024) 检察公益诉讼制度十年发展历程回眸. Webpage. https://www.spp.gov.cn/spp/zd gz/202412/t20241220_676857.shtml
- Thin S (2025a) Playing Fast and Loose with Article 31(3) (c) VCLT: Lessons on Systemic Integration from the ITLOS Climate Change Opinion, *Netherlands International Law Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40802-025-00274-y>
- Thin S (2025b) The Benefits of an Open-Door Policy, *International Community Law Review*, 27. <https://doi.org/10.1163/18719732-bja10139>
- Tigre M et al. (2023) *Just Transition Litigation in Latin America: An Initial Categorization of Climate Litigation Cases Amid the Energy Transition*, Sabin Center for Climate Change Law. https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/sabin_climate_change/197
- Tigre MA and Rocha A (2025) A Landmark Climate Ruling from Europe: The EFTA Court Declares Scope 3 Emissions Must Be Assessed Before Oil Project Approvals, *Climate Law Blog*, 23 May. <https://blogs.law.columbia.edu/climatechange/2025/05/23/a-landmark-climate-ruling->

from-europe-the-efta-court-declares-scope-3-emissions-must-be-assessed-before-oil-project-approvals/

- Tigre MA and Samuel SA (2025) *Africa's Advisory Opinion Request: Taking Climate Justice to the Continent's Highest Court*, Sabin Center Climate Law Blog, 7 May. <https://blogs.law.columbia.edu/climatechange/2025/05/07/africas-advisory-opinion-request-taking-climate-justice-to-the-continents-highest-court/>
- Tigre MA and Setzer J (2023) Human Rights and Climate Change for Climate Litigation in Brazil and Beyond: An Analysis of the Climate Fund Decision', *Georgetown Journal of International Law*, 21 September. <https://www.law.georgetown.edu/international-law-journal/blog/human-rights-and-climate-change-for-climate-litigation-in-brazil-and-beyond-an-analysis-of-the-climate-fund-decision/>
- Turner A (2025) New Executive Order Tees Up Challenges to State and Local Climate Laws, *Climate Law Blog*, 9 April. <https://blogs.law.columbia.edu/climatechange/2025/04/08/new-executive-order-tees-up-challenges-to-state-and-local-climate-laws/>
- University of Melbourne (2025) Australian and Pacific Climate Change Litigation. Database. <https://law.app.unimelb.edu.au/climate-change/>
- Van Berkel D et al. (2025) *Quantifying a 1.5°C Fair Share Carbon Budget: Human Rights Obligations on Climate Change after KlimaSeniorinnen*. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5265958>
- Viñuales JE (2024) Comparing Environmental Law Systems, *International & Comparative Law Quarterly*, 73(1), pp. 247–258. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020589323000453>
- Voeten E (2024) Do Domestic Climate Rulings Make Climate Commitments More Credible? Evidence from Stock Market Returns, *The Journal of Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.1086/732952>
- Voigt C (2023) The power of the Paris Agreement in international climate litigation, *Review of European, Comparative & International Environmental Law*, 32(2), pp. 237–249. <https://doi.org/10.1111/reel.12514>
- Wetzer T, Stuart-Smith R and Dibley A (2024) Climate risk assessments must engage with the law, *Science*, 383(6679), pp. 152–154. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adj0598>
- Wewerinke-Singh M and Mead S (2025) *The Cambridge Handbook on Climate Litigation*. Cambridge University Press
- Wewerinke-Singh M and Ramsay ASF (2024) Echoes Through Time: Transforming Climate Litigation Narratives on Future Generations, *Transnational Environmental Law*, 13(3), pp. 547–568. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2047102524000177>
- Xinhua News Agency (2024) 2014 年至 2023 年全国法院审结各类环境资源一审案件 190.2 万件. Webpage. <http://www.news.cn/legal/20240815/b5abd7c396ae48d1872147c17c7d80bb/c.html>
- Young M et al. (2024) *ITLOS' Climate Opinion: What's its significance?* University of Melbourne
- Zhao Y, Lyu S and Wang Z (2019) Prospects for Climate Change Litigation in China, *Transnational Environmental Law*, 8(2), pp. 349–377. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2047102519000116>
- Zhu M (2023) *Climate Litigation in a "Developmental State": The Case of China*. <https://doi.org/10.1163/24686042-12340105>