

Evaluating Strategic Litigation as a Tool for Climate Change Mitigation

A photograph of four wind turbines in a field of yellow flowers at sunset. The sun is low on the horizon, creating a warm orange and yellow glow. The turbines are silhouetted against the sky. The field of flowers is in the foreground, and the sky is clear.

Prof. Jacqueline Peel and Dr Anita Foerster, University of
Melbourne

Presentation to Global Evidence & Implementation Summit
Melbourne, 22-24 October, 2018

Evaluating Strategic Climate Litigation

- Grantee: ClientEarth
- Grantor: Children's Investment Fund Foundation (CIFF)
 - new strategy to fund litigation
- Evaluation Team:
 - Prof. Jacqueline Peel, Melbourne Law School
 - Prof. Hari Osofsky, Penn State Law
 - Dr Anita Foerster, Melbourne Law School



What is strategic climate litigation?

- Strategic litigation = use of litigation (usually in combination with other legal and non-legal methods) to seek legal and social change
- Strategic *public* climate litigation aims to influence public policy or policy decisions with climate change implications
- Strategic *private* climate litigation cases launched with the explicit aspiration to influence corporate behaviour and strategies in relation to climate change
- (Ganguly 2018)



CIFF Climate Program

Phase I, 2014-2017

LITIGATION

- 3-year grant to ClientEarth for program of strategic climate litigation in Europe
- 3 workstreams:
 - **Air Quality** - To drive cities and countries to improve air quality by complying with European air quality regulations, as a means to achieve co-benefits for climate change mitigation
 - **Company and Financial** - To motivate behavioural change by companies, investors, and other financial actors to disclose and manage climate-related business risks
 - **European Energy and Coal** - To accelerate the phase out of coal power in Europe and put the continent on track for the transition to a clean, flexible, and competitive energy system

POLICY

- ECF grant for promoting European climate leadership and pathway to 80-95% emissions reduction
- Focused on improving existing regulation and advocating for new, more stringent standards

ENGAGEMENT

- CDP grant to drive corporate emissions reductions
- Focused on compiling evidence base to strengthen investor engagement with companies

Accelerate low carbon transition to keep global warming <1.5°C

Scope of Evaluation

- Recognition that litigation has long timelines and impacts take time to manifest fully
- OECD DAC criteria as organizing frame:
 - relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability
- Evaluation also focused on *strategic* questions around value of litigation tool



<https://www.greenbiz.com/article/are-countries-legally-required-protect-citizens-climate-change>

Theory of Change

Activities and outputs that seek to:

- Establish legal compliance risk
- Create credible litigation threat
- Enforce law through litigation



Potential outcomes:

- Change business culture: climate change = material financial risk
- Improve compliance with EU environmental & competition law to reduce coal/ increase clean energy
- Ensure compliance with EU air quality legislation with climate co-benefits (decarbonization of transport and heating sectors)
- Shift public/political attitudes in favour of stronger climate laws



Overall impacts of:

- Reducing GHG emissions and climate change mitigation
- Implementation of EU law consistent with 2°C or lower pathway

Assumptions

Internal:

- Clear and coherent strategy
- Efficient management
- Synergies and co-benefits maximized
- Good communication channels used
- Grant substantive and well-targeted

External:

- Effective partners
- Receptive courts
- Timely judgments
- Constructive engagement with litigation by other stakeholders

Mixed Methodology



- Desktop research – global climate law and litigation
- Document review – quarterly progress reports and updates, internal M&E (*activities, outputs, outcomes*)
- Two phases of semi-structured interviews:
 - Inception: Internal (*objectives, expectations, likely challenges*)
 - End Point: Internal, Partner, External (*causal links – activities, outputs, outcomes, impact*)
- Media/comms analysis (*visibility > impact of litigation*)
- Qualitative analysis of interview & other data

Challenges

- Establishing causal links – indirect effects, intervening factors, long timeframes
- Accounting for breadth of activities & understanding relationships between them
- What is success?
 - Winning cases?
 - Establishing precedent?
 - Profile vs incremental change



Implications – program design

- Value of Theory of Change
- Combine showpony & workhorse cases
- Funding approach
 - support and time for foundational work as well as media and communications activities.
- Flexibility to adapt strategy in response to opportunities, changing circumstances, learnings
- Longer-term funding to give initiatives sufficient time to mature.

Implications - evaluation

- Quantification difficult, often inappropriate
- Holistic evaluation useful
- Longer-term evaluation approaches allow clearer assessment of impact
- Explore emerging iterative and adaptive approaches to evaluation for programmes that involve complex and evolving interventions



Next Phase...

- 2018-2021 - new funding commitment – consolidation and expansion of legal interventions and geographies
- Evaluation will build on Phase I – longitudinal approach
- Plus - more adaptive, iterative method + strategic input
- Regular strategy testing sessions to consider:
 - changes in external environment, shifts in interests or relationships among key stakeholders, progress made or obstacles encountered
 - opportunities to transform learning from implementation into immediate actions and course correction

Q&A

