

ACLA COURSE STUDY GUIDE

Climate Policy & Governance

Navigate the UNFCCC, Paris Agreement, NDCs, and how African voices shape global climate policy.

Prof. Ngozi Adeyemi · Intermediate

6 modules · 18 lessons · 6 weeks

About This Course	2
Module 1: Foundations of Climate Change Science and Policy	3
1.1 The Science of Climate Change	3
1.2 Mitigation versus Adaptation	4
1.3 Why Climate Change is a Governance Challenge	4
Module 2: International Climate Governance Frameworks	4
2.1 From Rio to Paris: An Evolving Regime	5
2.2 The Paris Agreement: A New Architecture	5
2.3 Institutional Architecture and Decision-Making	6
Module 3: National and Subnational Climate Policy and Governance	6
3.1 Multi-Level Governance	6
3.2 National Policy Instruments and Frameworks Laws	7
3.3 The Role of Subnational and City Governments	7
Module 4: Climate Finance, Carbon Markets and Economic Instruments	7
4.1 Carbon Pricing: Taxes and Emissions Trading	8
4.2 International Climate Finance Architecture	8
4.3 Carbon Markets under Article 6 and Voluntary Markets	9
Module 5: Climate Justice, Equity and Stakeholder Engagement	9
5.1 Dimensions of Climate Justice	10
5.2 Just Transition	10
5.3 Stakeholder Engagement in Climate Governance	11
Module 6: Sectoral Policy, MRV, Compliance and Emerging Trends	11
6.1 Sectoral Climate Policy	12
6.2 Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV)	12
6.3 Compliance, Litigation and Emerging Trends	13
Final Assessment & Certificate	14

About This Course

Climate Policy and Governance is a comprehensive, internationally benchmarked professional course designed to equip learners with a rigorous understanding of how climate change is governed at the global, regional, national, and local levels. The course draws on the frameworks, terminology, and case material used in leading international programmes in environmental policy, public administration, and international relations, and is suitable for self-paced independent study or facilitated cohort-based learning. The course is designed for a broad international audience, including early- and mid-career government officials, civil servants in environment and finance ministries, private-sector sustainability professionals, NGO and civil society practitioners, graduate students in public policy, environmental science, law, and international relations, and any informed citizen seeking a structured, evidence-based understanding of climate governance. The curriculum integrates climate science fundamentals, international law and diplomacy, national and subnational policy design, climate finance and carbon markets, climate justice and stakeholder engagement, and sectoral and compliance mechanisms. Each module combines explanatory text, visual diagrams, a real-world case study with discussion questions, curated video resources, and a formal 15-question multiple-choice assessment. Course Level: Intermediate (introductory concepts are covered, but learners benefit from general familiarity with public policy or environmental issues) Estimated Duration: 30–40 hours (approximately 5–6 hours per module, including case study review and assessment) Delivery Format: Self-paced reading with embedded case studies, diagrams, curated video content, and multiple-choice assessments Prerequisites: None formally required; a general interest in environmental, social, or political affairs is recommended

Course information

Course	Climate Policy & Governance
Instructor	Prof. Ngozi Adeyemi
Level	Intermediate
Structure	6 modules · 18 lessons · 6 weeks
Assessment	Module quizzes (pass mark 60%) and a final test (pass mark 80%). Certificate issued on final success, verifiable at acla.io/verify .

What you will be able to do

1. Explain the scientific, political, and institutional foundations of global climate change governance
2. Critically compare the Kyoto Protocol and Paris Agreement models of international cooperation
3. Analyse the roles of global, regional, national, subnational, and city governments in a multi-level governance system
4. Evaluate the design and effectiveness of carbon pricing instruments, including carbon taxes and emissions trading systems

5. Describe the architecture of international climate finance, including the Green Climate Fund and the Loss and Damage Fund
6. Apply the core principles of climate justice — distributive, procedural, recognitional, and intergenerational — to real policy scenarios
7. Explain the concept and practice of a 'just transition' for workers and communities in high-carbon industries
8. Understand the purpose and mechanics of Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) systems and the Paris Agreement's Enhanced Transparency Framework

How to use this study guide

This guide is the complete companion to the Tapi Learn mobile course. Each chapter corresponds to one course module and reproduces every lesson in full, including the key takeaways. Read a lesson in the app, then revisit the same text here to revise; the structure and headings match the in-app lesson reader. After finishing a module, take the module quiz in the app (60% to pass), and after all modules, the final test (80% to pass) to earn your verified ACLA certificate of completion.

Module 1: Foundations of Climate Change Science and Policy

Climate change refers to long-term shifts in temperatures and weather patterns, primarily driven since the mid-20th century by human activities, especially the burning of fossil...

3 lessons · 6m

1.1 The Science of Climate Change

Climate change refers to long-term shifts in temperatures and weather patterns, primarily driven since the mid-20th century by human activities, especially the burning of fossil fuels. The enhanced greenhouse effect occurs when concentrations of greenhouse gases (GHGs) such as carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), and fluorinated gases accumulate in the atmosphere, trapping outgoing infrared radiation and warming the planet. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is the leading international body for assessing climate science. It does not conduct original research but synthesises peer-reviewed literature into Assessment Reports that inform global negotiations. Its Sixth Assessment Report confirmed that human influence has unequivocally warmed the atmosphere, ocean, and land.

1.2 Mitigation versus Adaptation

Climate policy responses are generally grouped into two complementary categories. Mitigation refers to efforts to reduce or prevent the emission of greenhouse gases, for example through renewable energy deployment, energy efficiency, and reforestation. Adaptation refers to adjustments in natural or human systems in response to actual or expected climate impacts, such as building sea walls, developing drought-resistant crops, or early-warning systems. A third, increasingly prominent concept is loss and damage, which addresses the unavoidable impacts of climate change that exceed the limits of adaptation, such as permanent loss of territory to sea-level rise or the disappearance of glaciers relied upon for water supply.

1.3 Why Climate Change is a Governance Challenge

Climate change is often described as a 'super wicked problem' because it combines four features: time is running out, those who cause the problem also seek to solve it, there is no central authority capable of enforcing solutions, and policies discount the future irrationally. These features explain why climate governance requires cooperation across multiple levels (global, regional, national, local) and sectors (energy, agriculture, transport, finance), and why designing effective, equitable, and durable policy is difficult. The climate policy cycle offers a useful analytical framework for understanding how climate policy is made and revised: problem identification, agenda-setting, policy formulation, decision and adoption, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, and revision. The Paris Agreement formalises this cycle globally through its five-year 'ratchet mechanism' of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). Figure 1.1: The Climate Policy Cycle Figure 1.2: The Enhanced Greenhouse Effect Case Study 1: The IPCC and the Science-Policy Interface Established in 1988 by the World Meteorological Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme, the IPCC has produced six major assessment cycles. Its Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C (2018) was pivotal in shifting global political ambition, providing the scientific justification for the Paris Agreement's more ambitious temperature goal and catalysing the wave of national 'net-zero by 2050' commitments that followed. The report demonstrated how a scientific body without regulatory power can nonetheless reshape the political agenda by clearly communicating the risks of exceeding 1.5°C versus 2°C of warming, including irreversible tipping points such as coral reef die-off and ice sheet destabilisation. This case illustrates the science-policy interface: scientific consensus does not automatically produce policy action, but it narrows the space for political denial and creates focal points ('1.5°C', 'net zero') around which coalitions of state and non-state actors can mobilise. Discussion Questions: Learn More: Recommended Video Resources Module 1 Quiz Module 1 Quiz — Answer Key

Module 2: International Climate Governance Frameworks

The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), adopted at the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, established the objective of stabilising GHG concentrations at a level...

3 lessons · 6m

2.1 From Rio to Paris: An Evolving Regime

The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), adopted at the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, established the objective of stabilising GHG concentrations at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system. It introduced the principle of Common but Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities (CBDR-RC), recognising that developed countries bear greater historical responsibility for emissions and have greater capacity to act. The Kyoto Protocol (1997) operationalised this principle through legally binding emissions-reduction targets for developed countries (Annex I Parties) only, using flexibility mechanisms such as the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), Joint Implementation, and International Emissions Trading. Kyoto's top-down, binary (developed/developing) structure proved politically difficult to sustain, particularly after the United States did not ratify it and Canada withdrew in 2011.

2.2 The Paris Agreement: A New Architecture

The Paris Agreement (2015) replaced Kyoto's top-down bifurcated model with a hybrid 'bottom-up' architecture in which all Parties, developed and developing, submit Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). It sets a long-term temperature goal of holding warming well below 2°C, pursuing efforts to limit it to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels, and establishes a global goal on adaptation and a framework for finance, technology transfer, and capacity-building. Central to Paris is the principle of progression and the five-year ratchet cycle, whereby each successive NDC must represent a progression beyond the previous one, informed by the outcomes of the Global Stocktake, a periodic collective assessment of progress towards the Agreement's goals, the first of which concluded in 2023 at COP28 in Dubai with an explicit call to 'transition away from fossil fuels'.

2.3 Institutional Architecture and Decision-Making

The Conference of the Parties (COP) is the supreme decision-making body of the UNFCCC, meeting annually to review implementation and negotiate new rules. It is supported by two permanent subsidiary bodies, the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) — and by constituted bodies such as the Adaptation Committee, the Standing Committee on Finance, and the Compliance Committee established under the Paris Agreement's Article 15. Decisions under the UNFCCC are generally taken by consensus, which grants effective veto power to any single Party and has historically slowed the pace of agreement but also builds broad legitimacy and ownership among the near-universal 198 Parties. Figure 2.1: Milestones in International Climate Governance Figure 2.2: UNFCCC Institutional Architecture Case Study 2: From Kyoto's Rigidity to Paris's Flexibility The Kyoto Protocol's binary division of countries into Annex I (developed, with binding targets) and non-Annex I (developing, no targets) reflected the political realities of 1997 but became increasingly untenable as emissions from major developing economies such as China and India grew rapidly through the 2000s. The United States' refusal to ratify Kyoto, citing the exemption of major developing-country emitters, weakened the regime's coverage from the outset — at its peak Kyoto's binding targets covered under 15% of global emissions. The Paris Agreement's architects responded by designing a system where universality took priority over uniformity: every Party would participate through self-determined NDCs reflecting 'differentiated' national circumstances, rather than a treaty-imposed target. This shift traded strong legal bindingness for near-universal participation, betting that transparency, peer pressure, and the five-year ratchet would drive ambition upward over time in a way that a narrower but stricter treaty could not. Discussion Questions: Learn More: Recommended Video Resources Module 2 Quiz Module 2 Quiz — Answer Key

Module 3: National and Subnational Climate Policy and Governance

Climate governance operates simultaneously at global, regional, national, subnational, and local scales, a phenomenon scholars term 'multi-level governance'. No single level has...

3 lessons · 6m

3.1 Multi-Level Governance

Climate governance operates simultaneously at global, regional, national, subnational, and local scales, a phenomenon scholars term 'multi-level governance'. No single level has full authority: international agreements set overarching goals and rules, but implementation depends heavily on national legislation, subnational regulation (e.g. US states, Indian states, German Länder), and city-level action, particularly given that over half the world's population lives in urban areas responsible for the majority of energy-related emissions. This multi-level structure can create both opportunities (policy experimentation, mutual learning, competitive ambition among cities and states) and challenges (fragmentation, jurisdictional conflict, inconsistent carbon pricing across borders).

3.2 National Policy Instruments and Frameworks Laws

National governments deploy a mix of regulatory instruments (fuel efficiency standards, building codes, renewable portfolio standards, coal-plant phase-out mandates), economic instruments (carbon taxes, subsidies, feed-in tariffs, emissions trading), voluntary and informational instruments (energy labelling, corporate disclosure requirements), and planning and institutional instruments (national climate strategies, dedicated ministries or agencies, cross-government coordination bodies). An increasing number of countries have adopted 'framework' climate laws that enshrine long-term targets (often net-zero by a set date) in domestic legislation and establish independent expert advisory bodies to monitor progress — the UK's Climate Change Act 2008 and its Climate Change Committee is the most frequently cited model, subsequently adapted in countries including Kenya, Denmark, New Zealand, and France.

3.3 The Role of Subnational and City Governments

Subnational and city governments are often described as 'first movers' in climate governance, sometimes acting ahead of, or in the absence of, ambitious national policy. California's cap-and-trade programme and vehicle emissions standards have historically shaped US national policy debates; transnational municipal networks such as C40 Cities and ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability enable cities to share best practice, set collective targets, and coordinate on issues such as building retrofits, public transport electrification, and urban heat resilience. However, subnational climate action faces persistent challenges of limited fiscal and legal authority, dependency on national frameworks for major infrastructure and energy policy, and the risk of policy reversal when political control changes. Figure 3.1: Multi-Level Climate Governance Figure 3.2: The National Climate Policy Instrument Mix Case Study 3: The UK Climate Change Act and the 'Independent Watchdog' Model The UK Climate Change Act 2008 was the world's first legally binding long-term national climate change target framework, initially mandating an 80% emissions reduction by 2050 (later strengthened to net-zero in 2019). Its distinguishing innovation was the creation of the Climate Change Committee (CCC), an independent statutory body of experts tasked with recommending legally binding five-year 'carbon budgets' to Parliament and publicly reporting annually on whether the government is on track. This depoliticised the technical process of setting a decarbonisation pathway while keeping ultimate accountability with elected officials, who must publicly explain any departure from the CCC's advice. The model has since been adapted, with variations, by Denmark's Klimarådet, Kenya's Climate Change Council, and France's Haut Conseil pour le Climat, illustrating how an institutional design choice — pairing a legislated target with an independent advisory body — can travel across very different political and economic contexts while still requiring adaptation to local institutional capacity and legal traditions. Discussion Questions: Learn More: Recommended Video Resources Module 3 Quiz Module 3 Quiz — Answer Key

Module 4: Climate Finance, Carbon Markets and Economic Instruments

Carbon pricing internalises the social cost of GHG emissions into market decisions. A carbon tax sets a fixed price per tonne of CO₂-equivalent, giving businesses price certainty...

3 lessons · 6m

4.1 Carbon Pricing: Taxes and Emissions Trading

Carbon pricing internalises the social cost of GHG emissions into market decisions. A carbon tax sets a fixed price per tonne of CO₂-equivalent, giving businesses price certainty but uncertain emissions outcomes; examples include Sweden's carbon tax (among the world's highest per tonne) and South Africa's carbon tax. An Emissions Trading System (ETS), or cap-and-trade scheme, sets a fixed cap on total emissions and allows the market to determine the price of tradable allowances, giving quantity certainty but price volatility; the EU ETS, launched in 2005, remains the world's largest carbon market, and China launched the world's largest ETS by covered emissions in 2021, focused initially on the power sector. As of the mid-2020s, over 70 carbon pricing instruments operate worldwide (a mix of taxes and ETSs), covering roughly a quarter of global GHG emissions, though prices vary enormously — from a few dollars to over €80 per tonne in the EU ETS — undermining the theoretical goal of a harmonised global carbon price.

4.2 International Climate Finance Architecture

Developed countries committed under the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement to mobilise climate finance to support developing countries' mitigation and adaptation efforts, historically framed around a goal of USD 100 billion per year (agreed at COP15/16, notionally met in 2022 according to OECD figures, though contested), superseded at COP29 (2024) by a new collective quantified goal. Key channels include bilateral aid, multilateral development banks (World Bank, African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank), and dedicated climate funds such as the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and Global Environment Facility (GEF). COP27 (2022) established a dedicated Loss and Damage Fund to help vulnerable countries address unavoidable climate impacts, operationalised at COP28 with initial pledges, representing a long-sought demand of developing countries and small island states dating back decades of negotiations.

4.3 Carbon Markets under Article 6 and Voluntary Markets

Article 6 of the Paris Agreement establishes mechanisms for voluntary cooperation between Parties, including Article 6.2 (bilateral cooperative approaches generating Internationally Transferred Mitigation Outcomes, ITMOs) and Article 6.4 (a centralised UN crediting mechanism succeeding the Kyoto-era Clean Development Mechanism). These are distinct from the voluntary carbon market, in which companies purchase carbon credits from independent standards (e.g. Verra, Gold Standard) to claim offsetting of their own emissions, often for corporate net-zero or carbon-neutral marketing claims. Persistent integrity challenges affect carbon markets: additionality (would the emission reduction have occurred anyway without the credit revenue?), permanence (particularly for nature-based credits vulnerable to reversal through fire or deforestation), and double counting (ensuring the same emission reduction is not claimed by both the host country and the credit buyer), issues that have prompted significant media scrutiny and reform efforts within voluntary market standards. Figure 4.1: Carbon Pricing Mechanisms Figure 4.2: Simplified Climate Finance Architecture Case Study 4: The EU Emissions Trading System — Learning from Early Failures Launched in 2005, the EU ETS is the world's oldest and largest carbon market, covering power generation, industry, and (increasingly) aviation and shipping. Its first phase (2005–2007) suffered from a well-documented oversupply of free allowances, based on inflated emissions estimates submitted by member states, which caused the carbon price to collapse to near zero by the end of the phase, providing almost no incentive to reduce emissions. The EU responded with successive reforms: centralising the cap-setting process at EU level rather than relying on member-state estimates, introducing auctioning rather than free allocation for most allowances, and creating a Market Stability Reserve in 2019 to automatically adjust allowance supply and prevent chronic oversupply. By the early 2020s the carbon price had risen to sustained levels above €80 per tonne, and the EU extended the system with a Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) to address 'carbon leakage', the risk that industries relocate to jurisdictions with laxer carbon rules. The EU ETS case demonstrates that carbon market design is iterative: initial mistakes in cap-setting and allocation can undermine credibility, but institutional learning and structural reform can restore an instrument's effectiveness over time. Discussion Questions: Learn More: Recommended Video Resources Module 4 Quiz Module 4 Quiz — Answer Key

Module 5: Climate Justice, Equity and Stakeholder Engagement

Climate justice recognises that the causes and consequences of climate change, and the burdens of responding to it, are unevenly distributed across and within societies. Scholars...

3 lessons · 6m

5.1 Dimensions of Climate Justice

Climate justice recognises that the causes and consequences of climate change, and the burdens of responding to it, are unevenly distributed across and within societies. Scholars typically identify at least three interlinked dimensions: distributive justice (who bears the costs and benefits of climate impacts and climate action), procedural justice (who has genuine voice and influence in decision-making processes), and recognitional justice (whose identities, knowledge systems, and rights are acknowledged and respected). A fourth, intergenerational justice, concerns the obligations of present generations to those not yet born who will inherit the consequences of today's decisions. These dimensions matter practically: a carbon tax that disproportionately burdens low-income households without compensating measures may achieve emissions reductions while violating distributive justice; a renewable energy project sited on Indigenous land without free, prior and informed consent may reduce emissions while violating procedural and recognitional justice.

5.2 Just Transition

The concept of a 'just transition', originating in the labour movement, has become central to climate policy discourse. It holds that the shift away from fossil fuel-dependent economies must actively protect and support workers and communities whose livelihoods depend on high-carbon industries — through retraining, social protection, economic diversification, and genuine consultation — rather than treating job losses as an acceptable externality of decarbonisation. The Paris Agreement's preamble explicitly references the 'imperatives of a just transition of the workforce', and several countries (South Africa's Just Energy Transition Partnership, Germany's coal phase-out Kohlekommission) have developed formal just transition frameworks combining phase-out timelines with structural economic support for affected regions.

5.3 Stakeholder Engagement in Climate Governance

Effective and legitimate climate governance depends on engaging a wide range of non-state actors: civil society organisations and NGOs (advocacy, monitoring, service delivery), the private sector (both as emitters and as a source of investment and innovation), academia and scientific bodies, youth movements (which have gained significant political visibility through initiatives such as the Conference of Youth and formal Youth constituencies at UNFCCC negotiations), and the media (shaping public understanding and political salience). Indigenous peoples and local communities occupy a distinctive position: they steward an estimated significant share of the world's remaining biodiversity and forest carbon despite representing a small fraction of the global population, yet have historically been marginalised from formal decision-making. The UNFCCC's Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform (LCIPP), established in 2015, seeks to formalise their participation and integrate Indigenous and traditional knowledge into policy design. Figure 5.1: Climate Policy Stakeholders Figure 5.2: The Four Dimensions of Climate Justice Case Study 5: South Africa's Just Energy Transition Partnership South Africa relies heavily on coal for electricity generation and employment, particularly in the province of Mpumalanga, where coal mining and coal-fired power stations are the dominant source of local jobs. In 2021, South Africa entered into a Just Energy Transition Partnership (JETP) with a group of developed-country partners, an early example of a bilateral financing arrangement explicitly structured to support both decarbonisation of the power sector and a managed, equitable transition for affected workers and communities. The partnership combines concessional loans, grants, and guarantees to support the retirement of coal plants ahead of their originally planned end-of-life, alongside dedicated funding streams intended for skills retraining, small business development, and economic diversification in coal-dependent municipalities. Implementation has faced significant challenges, including disputes over whether the finance offered is sufficient and on favourable enough terms (grants versus loans that add to sovereign debt), delays in disbursement, and criticism from South African labour unions and civil society that affected communities have not been sufficiently consulted in detailed planning. The case illustrates both the promise of the just transition model — pairing decarbonisation finance with explicit social protection commitments — and the practical difficulty of translating high-level partnership agreements into locally legitimate, adequately resourced, and genuinely participatory outcomes on the ground. Discussion Questions: Learn More: Recommended Video Resources Module 5 Quiz Module 5 Quiz — Answer Key

Module 6: Sectoral Policy, MRV, Compliance and Emerging Trends

Because emissions sources vary greatly by sector, effective climate policy requires tailored instruments. In the energy sector, policies include renewable portfolio standards,...

3 lessons · 7m

6.1 Sectoral Climate Policy

Because emissions sources vary greatly by sector, effective climate policy requires tailored instruments. In the energy sector, policies include renewable portfolio standards, feed-in tariffs, and coal phase-out schedules. In industry, policies include energy efficiency standards, carbon pricing, and support for breakthrough technologies such as green hydrogen and carbon capture. In transport, policies include vehicle emissions standards, electric vehicle incentives, and public transit investment. In the AFOLU sector (agriculture, forestry and other land use), policies include forest protection programmes such as REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation), sustainable agriculture incentives, and land-use planning. Buildings policy typically centres on efficiency codes and retrofit incentives, while waste-sector policy addresses methane capture from landfills and circular economy measures. Because these sectors are governed by different ministries, regulatory traditions, and interest groups, effective climate governance requires strong cross-government coordination mechanisms.

6.2 Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV)

MRV systems are the backbone of climate accountability, enabling governments, international bodies, and the public to track whether stated commitments are being met. At the national level, MRV typically involves compiling GHG inventories from activity data (e.g. fuel combustion volumes) and emission factors, following IPCC guidelines. The Paris Agreement's Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF), which became operational with Biennial Transparency Reports due from 2024, applies common reporting requirements to all Parties (with flexibility for developing countries with capacity constraints), replacing the previous, less consistent, dual system under which developed and developing countries reported on different schedules and formats. Independent Technical Expert Review teams assess submitted reports for consistency and completeness, feeding into the Global Stocktake, which in turn is meant to inform the next round of NDCs closing the accountability loop of the Paris ratchet mechanism.

6.3 Compliance, Litigation and Emerging Trends

Unlike Kyoto, the Paris Agreement's Article 15 compliance mechanism is explicitly 'facilitative' rather than punitive, reflecting the trade-off made in favour of universal participation. In the absence of strong treaty enforcement, climate litigation has emerged as an increasingly significant governance tool: cases such as *Urgenda Foundation v. State of the Netherlands* (2019), in which the Dutch Supreme Court ordered the government to strengthen its emissions targets on human-rights grounds, and the 2024 European Court of Human Rights ruling in *KlimaSeniorinnen v. Switzerland*, have established that inadequate climate action can constitute a violation of human rights obligations in some jurisdictions, creating new legal pressure on governments independent of the UNFCCC process. Looking forward, climate governance is being shaped by several emerging trends: the growing integration of adaptation and loss-and-damage governance alongside mitigation; the rise of trade-linked climate measures such as carbon border adjustments; the increasing role of subnational and non-state actors in an 'orchestration' model of governance; advances in satellite-based independent emissions monitoring; and ongoing debate over how to govern emerging technologies such as carbon dioxide removal and solar radiation management. Figure 6.1: The MRV Cycle Figure 6.2: Global GHG Emissions by Sector (illustrative) Case Study 6: *Urgenda Foundation v. State of the Netherlands* In 2015, the Dutch environmental organisation Urgenda Foundation, together with hundreds of co-plaintiffs, sued the Dutch government, arguing that its planned emissions reduction target was insufficient to meet the country's fair contribution to preventing dangerous climate change, and that this insufficiency violated the government's duty of care under Dutch tort law and its human rights obligations under the European Convention on Human Rights. In 2019, the Dutch Supreme Court upheld lower court rulings in favour of Urgenda, ordering the government to reduce emissions by at least 25% below 1990 levels by the end of 2020 — a landmark decision because it was the first time a court had ordered a national government to strengthen its climate policy on human rights grounds, establishing that states have an enforceable positive obligation to protect citizens from the foreseeable dangers of climate change. The ruling catalysed a wave of subsequent climate litigation across multiple jurisdictions, including cases against both governments and corporations (such as *Milieudefensie v. Royal Dutch Shell*, 2021), and was echoed and extended by the European Court of Human Rights' 2024 ruling in the *KlimaSeniorinnen* case brought by a group of older Swiss women, which found that Switzerland's inadequate climate policy violated the right to respect for private and family life under the European Convention on Human Rights. Together these cases illustrate how, in the absence of strong binding enforcement at the international treaty level, domestic and regional courts have become an increasingly important — if geographically uneven — accountability mechanism in the global climate governance landscape. Discussion Questions: Learn More: Recommended Video Resources Module 6 Quiz Module 6 Quiz — Answer Key This cumulative Final Examination draws on content from all six modules of the course. It consists of 15 multiple-choice questions. A minimum score of 80% (12 out of 15 correct answers) is required to earn the Certificate of Completion. Final Examination — Answer Key Scoring Guide Learners who achieve a score of 80% or higher (12 out of 15 correct answers) on the Final Examination are eligible to receive the Certificate of Completion for Climate Policy and Governance. The certificate template below may be issued by the training provider or institution delivering this course, with fields completed as appropriate. Certification Requirements Summary End of Course Congratulations on completing the Climate Policy and Governance course. Climate governance is a rapidly evolving field, learners are encouraged to stay current by following UNFCCC COP outcomes, IPCC releases, and leading climate policy research institutions.

Final Assessment & Certificate

The final test draws on questions from every module. The pass mark is 80%. When you pass, Tapi Learn issues a certificate of completion bearing your name, the course title, your final score, a unique certificate number and the signature of the CEO of the Pan African Network for Climate Action (PANFCA). Each certificate carries a verification URL (acla.io/verify/<number>) so employers and partners can confirm its authenticity. You can download the certificate as a PDF directly from the app at any time, and your progress and certificates are backed up to the cloud under your email address.

The Africa Climate Leadership Academy (ACLA) is a pan-African education initiative of the Pan African Network for Climate Action. All Tapi Learn courses are free. Learn more at <https://acla.io> and get the app at <https://acla.io/tapi-learn>.