

Contents



<i>Preface</i>	<i>xxvii</i>
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>xxxi</i>

1. MEETING THE CHALLENGE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL COMMONS **1**

INTRODUCTORY PROBLEM: WHAT ARE THE MOST SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL CHALLENGES FOR HUMANITY? **2**

- I. The Challenge of Global Climate Change and Other Environmental Problems **3**
 - Global Environment Outlook — GEO-6: Summary for Policymakers* **6**

PROBLEM EXERCISE: “LAUDATO SI” AND “THE HERESY TRIAL OF THE REVEREND RICHARD LAMM” **9**

- Encyclical Letter Laudato Si’ of the Holy Father Francis on Care for Our Common Home* **10**
 - The Heresy Trial of the Reverend Richard Lamm* **12**
- II. Challenges to Environmental Cooperation **16**

PROBLEM EXERCISE: THE INFLUENCE OF VALUES AND NORMS **23**

- III. The Emergence of Global Environmental Law **24**
 - A. A Brief Look at the Rise of Environmentalism and Environmental Law Around the World **24**
 - B. Key Developments in Modern Environmental Law **29**
 - Global Environment Outlook — GEO-6: Summary for Policymakers* **33**
 - The Emergence of Global Environmental Law* **34**

PROBLEM EXERCISE: SHARED GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL PRINCIPLES **38**

2. GOVERNANCE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL COMMONS: LAW AND INSTITUTIONS	39
INTRODUCTORY PROBLEM: BEACH LITTER	40
I. Environmental Governance	41
II. International Law, Institutions, and the Environment	44
A. The Characteristics of International Environmental Law	44
1. Constraints Due to Sovereignty and the Nature of Common Pool Resources	45
2. The Unique Character of International Law	45
3. Sources of International Law	46
B. Environmental Treaties	47
1. The Rise of Multilateral Environmental Agreements	47
2. The International Law Governing Environmental Treaties	49
a. Treaty Formation	49
b. The Structure of Modern Environmental Agreements	52
C. Customary International Law	57
PROBLEM EXERCISE: APPLYING PRINCIPLES OF INTERNATIONAL LAW	60
D. General Principles of Law, the Role of “Soft” International Law, and Law-Making for the Environment	60
1. General Principles of Law	61
2. Innovations in IEL — the Role of Soft International Law	62
E. Judicial Decisions and the Teachings of Most Highly Qualified Publicists	63
F. The Relationship Between International and National Environmental Law	63
G. Enforcement of International Law	67
H. International Governance Institutions: The United Nations and the Environment	68
1. General Assembly	68
2. Security Council	68
3. Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC)	69
a. United Nations Environment Programme	69
b. United Nations Development Programme	70
c. United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization	70
d. UN-Habitat	71
e. Food & Agriculture Organization	71
f. International Maritime Organization	71
g. Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues	72

4. UN Secretariat, Department of Economic and Social Affairs	72
a. Division for Sustainable Development	72
b. Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR, formerly UNISDR)	72
5. International Court of Justice	73
III. Regional Systems of Law and Governance: The European Union	74
A. System Structure	76
B. Legislative Framework	78
C. Administrative Regulatory Framework	80
D. The Courts, Access to Justice, and Judicial Review	82
IV. Law and Governance Institutions in National Systems	83
A. The Diversity of Legal Traditions and Governance Structures	83
1. Types of Legal Systems	84
2. Judges, the Legal Profession, and the Rise of Environmental Courts	87
3. Government Structure	89
B. People’s Republic of China	91
1. Structure of Government	91
2. Legislative Framework	92
3. Environmental Bureaucracy and Administrative Regulatory Structure	94
<i>Public Participation in Environmental Enforcement . . . with Chinese Characteristics? A Comparative Assessment of China’s Environmental Complaint System</i>	97
4. The Courts, Judicial Review, and Access to Justice	98
5. Civil Society and Business	99
C. United States of America	100
1. Government Structure	100
2. Legislative Framework	101
3. Administrative Regulatory Structure	104
4. The Courts, Access to Justice, and Judicial Review	106
5. Civil Society and Business	107
V. Indigenous Communities	108
A. Indigenous Governance in Historical Context	109
B. One Example of Contemporary Indigenous Governance — American Indian Tribes	111
C. Indigenous Communities and Customary Law	115
<i>Gongqose v. Minister of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries</i>	116

3. CIVIL SOCIETY AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST 123

INTRODUCTORY PROBLEM: LOGGING IN INDONESIA 124

I. The Role of Civil Society in Environmental Governance	125
A. What Is Civil Society?	125

B. What Is Its Significance for Environmental Governance?	126
C. Toward Environmental Democracy: Access to Information, Public Participation, and Access to Justice	127
II. Engaging Civil Society in Environmental Governance	130
A. Environmental Information Disclosure and Pollution Release and Transfer Registries	130
B. Whistleblowers	135
<i>Public Participation in Environmental Enforcement . . . with Chinese Characteristics? A Comparative Assessment of China's Environmental Complaint System</i>	135
C. Government Accountability Through Administrative Review and Litigation	138
<i>182 Families in Beijing v. Planning Committee of Beijing</i>	139
III. Public Interest Litigation	140
A. The Role of Public Interest Litigation	140
<i>Principles of Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Handbook, Citizen Enforcement</i>	140
<i>Narmada Bachao Andolan (Petitioner) v. Union of India</i>	141
<i>Securing Environmental Rights Through Public Interest Litigation in South Asia</i>	142
<i>Rules of Procedure for Environmental Cases</i>	147
B. Limitations on Public Interest Litigation — <i>Locus Standi</i>	151
<i>Advocates Coalition for Development and Environment (ACODE) v. Attorney General</i>	152
<i>Securing Environmental Rights Through Public Interest Litigation in South Asia</i>	154
PROBLEM EXERCISE: DEVELOPING A STRETCH OF UNTOUCHED COAST	156
IV. The Public Trust Doctrine	156
<i>M.C. Mehta v. Kamal Nath</i>	157
<i>Advocates Coalition for Development and Environment (ACODE) v. Attorney General</i>	163
4. CORPORATE ACTORS AND PRIVATE ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE	167
INTRODUCTORY PROBLEM: PRECIOUS METAL MINING	168
I. Corporate Environmental Policies	169
<i>IBM Environmental Policy</i>	170
<i>Excerpt from IBM Corporate Social Responsibility Report 2015</i>	172
PROBLEM EXERCISE: LEVERAGING CORPORATE BRANDS	174
II. Supply Chains and Certification	174
<i>IBM Environmental Evaluations of Suppliers, Key Milestones</i>	175

PROBLEM EXERCISE: UNDERSTANDING THE NATURE OF CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS	179
<i>Reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSFCMA) Oversight Hearing Before the Committee on Natural Resources</i>	180
III. The Global Compact and Company Codes	183
<i>United Nations Global Compact Selected Principles</i>	184
PROBLEM EXERCISE: EXPLORING THE GLOBAL COMPACT	188
<i>British Petroleum: Our Code, Our Responsibility</i>	189
<i>Starbucks: Business Ethics and Compliance: Standards of Business Conduct</i>	189
<i>Hershey Company: Supplier Code of Conduct</i>	190
IV. Shareholder Resolutions and Corporate Restructuring (“B Corporations”)	192
<i>Shareholder Proposal for Tyson Foods</i>	192
PROBLEM EXERCISE: BENEFIT CORPORATIONS	199
<i>Excerpt from IBM Corporate Social Responsibility Report 2015</i>	200
V. Corporate Accountability and Environmental Damage	204
<i>Beanal v. Freeport-McMoran, Inc. (5th Cir.)</i>	205
<i>U.N. Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (2011)</i>	211
PROBLEM EXERCISE: OPERATIONALIZING THE OBLIGATIONS OF TRANSNATIONAL CORPORATIONS REGARDING HUMAN RIGHTS	215
<hr/>	
5. PRIVATE ENVIRONMENTAL LAW AND OTHER HARM-BASED APPROACHES	217
INTRODUCTORY PROBLEM: A ZAMBIAN COPPER MINE	218
I. Private Environmental Law and Liability	220
A. Liability Principles	220
<i>97 Families in Shiliang River Reservoir of Jiangsu Province v. 2 Factories in Linshu County of Shandong Province (Summary)</i>	221
<i>Environmental Tort Litigation in China</i>	221
<i>Vellore Citizens’ Welfare Forum v. Union of India</i>	230
<i>Environmental Liability Directive (ELD): A Short Overview (European Union)</i>	233
B. Remedies	236
<i>Mendoza, Beatriz Silvia and Others v/ the National State and Others Regarding Damages Suffered (Injuries Resulting from the Environmental Contamination of the Matanza-Riachuelo River)</i>	237

C. Access to Justice	239
<i>Dow Chemical Company v. Castro Alfaro</i>	240
II. Private Nuisance, Trespass, and Public Nuisance	245
A. Private Nuisance and Trespass	245
PROBLEM EXERCISE: BACKYARD CHICKEN	247
<i>M.K.O. Abiola v. Felix O. Ijoma</i>	247
B. Public Nuisance	248
<i>Barr v. Biffa Waste Services</i>	249
<i>Complaint in City of Richmond v. Chevron</i>	253
III. State Responsibility	256
<i>Certain Activities Carried Out by Nicaragua in the Border Area;</i> <i>Compensation Owed by the Republic of Nicaragua to the</i> <i>Republic of Costa Rica</i>	258
PROBLEM EXERCISE: TRANSBOUNDARY HARM	262
<hr/>	
6. ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLIANCE	265
INTRODUCTORY PROBLEM: REMEDIES FOR POLLUTION PERMIT VIOLATIONS	266
I. The Role of Enforcement and Deterrence	269
II. Noncriminal Enforcement Processes: Administrative and Civil Judicial Enforcement	275
A. The Basics of Noncriminal Enforcement Processes	275
<i>The Administrative Judge and the Environmental Law: Statement</i> <i>on Behalf of the Federal Administrative Court of Germany</i>	276
B. Compliance Monitoring	286
<i>Principles of Environmental Compliance and Enforcement</i> <i>Handbook — Creating Value Through Compliance</i>	286
C. Specialized Environmental Courts	291
<i>Environment Court of New Zealand</i>	291
<i>Vardhaman Kaushik v. Union of India</i>	294
III. Judicial Remedies	299
PROBLEM EXERCISE: REMEDIES	300
A. Penalties	301
<i>Idaho Conservation League v. Atlanta Gold Corporation</i>	303
B. Injunctive Relief	309
C. Natural Resource Damages	311
<i>“Erika” Decision — French Republic on Behalf of the French People</i>	313
D. Nontraditional Remedies	315
IV. Criminal Enforcement	318
A. What Are Environmental Crimes?	322

B. Mens Rea	326
<i>United States of America v. Joey Santillan</i>	327
<i>United States v. Weitzenhoff</i>	330
C. Prosecutorial Discretion	332
<i>Memorandum: The Exercise of Investigative Discretion</i>	333
<i>The Supreme People's Court and the Supreme People's Procuratorate's Interpretation of Several Issues Concerning the Application of Laws in Environmental Pollution Related Crimes</i>	334
<i>Clean Air Act</i>	337
D. Special Issues: Monitoring, Reporting, and Corporate Officials	337
<i>The Supreme People's Court and the Supreme People's Procuratorate's Interpretation of Several Issues Concerning the Application of Laws in Environmental Pollution Related Crimes</i>	338
E. The Effectiveness of Criminal Enforcement Processes	341
<i>Gek Sing v. Public Prosecutor</i>	341
V. Compliance with International Environmental Law Obligations	349
PROBLEM EXERCISE: TREATY NONCOMPLIANCE	349

7. HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE ENVIRONMENT 361

INTRODUCTORY PROBLEM: OIL RESERVES IN THE ORIENTE	362
I. Human Rights and the Environment—Articulation of Substantive Rights	364
<i>Social and Economic Rights Action Center (SERAC) v. Nigeria</i>	365
<i>Draft Principles on Human Rights and the Environment</i>	370
<i>Framework Principles on Human Rights and the Environment</i>	373
II. Human Rights Vulnerable to Environmental Harm	375
<i>Report of the Independent Expert on the Issue of Human Rights Obligations Relating to the Enjoyment of a Safe, Clean, Healthy and Sustainable Environment</i>	375
<i>Shelia Zia v. WAPDA</i>	377
<i>López Ostra v. Spain</i>	380
III. Independent Human Right to a Healthy Environment	385
<i>Report of the Independent Expert on the Issue of Human Rights Obligations Relating to the Enjoyment of a Safe, Clean, Healthy and Sustainable Environment</i>	386
<i>Montana Environmental Information Center v. Department of Environmental Quality</i>	389
<i>Inter-American Court of Human Rights, Environment and Human Rights — Advisory Opinion OC-23/17 of November 15, 2017</i>	393
<i>Resolution 64/292: The Human Right to Water and Sanitation</i>	395
IV. Procedural Rights	396
<i>Report of the Independent Expert on the Issue of Human Rights Obligations Relating to the Enjoyment of a Safe, Clean, Healthy and Sustainable Environment</i>	396

<p><i>Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention)</i></p> <p><i>Judgment, “On the Compliance of the Cabinet of Ministers August 8, 2001 Decree No. 401 on the Location of the Hazardous Waste Incineration Facility in Olaine” [with a Number of Latvian Constitutional and Statutory Environmental Laws]</i></p> <p><i>Aarhus Convention Compliance Committee Report: Slovakia (Mochovce Nuclear Power Plant)</i></p> <p>V. Indigenous Peoples</p> <p><i>African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights v. Republic of Kenya</i></p> <p><i>Bleakley v. Environmental Risk Management Authority</i></p>	<p>398</p> <p>404</p> <p>409</p> <p>414</p> <p>415</p> <p>426</p>
PROBLEM EXERCISE: NATIVE HAWAIIANS AND THE MAUNA KEA TMT	434
<hr/>	
8. RIGHTS OF NATURE	437
INTRODUCTORY PROBLEM: MOTHER NATURE’S LAWSUIT AGAINST BP FOR THE 2010 DEEPWATER HORIZON OIL SPILL	437
<p><i>British Petroleum Oil Spill in the Gulf of Mexico</i></p> <p><i>Final Verdict, in Honor of José Tendetza</i></p> <p>I. The Legislative Creation of Rights of Nature</p> <p><i>Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador</i></p> <p>II. The Rights of (Nonhuman) Animals</p> <p><i>Tilikum v. Seaworld</i></p> <p>III. The Rights of Earth</p> <p><i>Universal Declaration of Rights of Mother Earth</i></p> <p><i>Whanganui Iwi (Whanganui River) Deed of Settlement</i></p> <p><i>Te Awa Tupua (Whanganui River Claims Settlement) Act (2017)</i></p> <p>IV. The Future of the Rights of Nature</p>	<p>438</p> <p>440</p> <p>443</p> <p>444</p> <p>447</p> <p>448</p> <p>452</p> <p>453</p> <p>457</p> <p>459</p> <p>461</p>
PROBLEM EXERCISE: ROAD PROPOSAL THROUGH INDIGENOUS TERRITORY AND NATIONAL PARK ISIBORO SECURE (SPANISH ACRONYM “TIPNIS”)	462
<p><i>Decision on the Case of TIPNIS (Indigenous Territory and National Park Isiboro Secure)</i></p>	<p>463</p>
<hr/>	
9. MANAGING FOR SUSTAINABILITY	465
INTRODUCTORY PROBLEM: THE CHALLENGE OF THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS	466

I. Sustainable Development	468
<i>Stockholm Declaration on the Human Environment</i>	469
<i>Rio Declaration on Environment and Development</i>	471
<i>Review of Implementation of the Rio Principles</i>	473
<i>Millennium Development Goals Report 2015</i>	474
<i>Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project (Hungary v. Slovakia)</i> <i>(Separate Opinion of Vice-President Weeramantry)</i>	477
A. Sustainable Development in Context and Practice	481
<i>Rural Litigation and Entitlement Kendra Dehradun v. State of</i> <i>Uttar Pradesh</i>	481
<i>M.C. Mehta (Badkhal and Surajkund Lakes Matter) v.</i> <i>Union of India and Others</i>	484
B. Operationalizing Sustainable Development — An Overview	488
PROBLEM EXERCISE: ADJUDICATING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND SHRIMP AQUACULTURE	492
II. The Principles of Precaution and Prevention	494
A. The Precautionary Principle	494
<i>International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-Biotech</i> <i>Applications v. Greenpeace Southeast Asia</i>	496
B. The Principle of Prevention	501
III. The Principle of Due Diligence	502
<i>Responsibilities and Obligations of States Sponsoring Persons with</i> <i>Respect to Activities in the Area (Nodules Case), Advisory Opinion</i>	504
IV. Intergenerational Equity, Polluter Pays, and Public Participation	512
A. Intergenerational Equity	512
<i>Minors Oposa v. Factoran</i>	514
B. Polluter Pays	516
<i>Vellore Citizens' Welfare Forum v. Union of India</i>	517
C. Public Participation and Access to Information	519
PROBLEM EXERCISE: ADAPTIVE PLANNING FOR INTERNATIONALLY SHARED RESOURCES USING ENVIRONMENTAL PRINCIPLES	519
<hr/>	
10. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT	521
INTRODUCTORY PROBLEM: THE NU RIVER DAMS IN CHINA	522
I. EIA in Environmental Governance and Sustainable Development	524
<i>Rodgers Muema Nzioka v. Tiomin Kenya Ltd</i>	525
II. Is an EIA Required? Screening Projects for Potentially Significant Impacts	532
A. Screening	532

<i>Advocates Coalition for Development and Environment (ACODE)</i>	
<i>v. Attorney General</i>	533
<i>Boxus et al. v. Région Wallonne</i>	537
B. Preliminary Assessment	538
<i>Ocean Advocates v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</i>	539
C. Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)	541
<i>Walton v. Scottish Ministers</i>	542
D. The Role of Mitigation	545
PROBLEM EXERCISE: IS AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED?	547
III. What Goes into an EIA: Scoping of the Relevant Actions, Impacts, and Alternatives	547
A. Scoping the Relevant Actions	548
<i>Ecologistas en Accion-CODA v. Ayuntamiento de Madrid</i>	549
B. Types of Impacts	550
<i>Minister for the Environment and Heritage v. Queensland Conservation Council Inc.</i>	551
<i>Jamii Bora Charitable Trust v. Director General National Environment Management Authority</i>	554
<i>EarthLife Africa Johannesburg v. Minister of Environmental Affairs</i>	557
C. Alternatives Analysis	561
<i>Save Historic Newmarket Ltd & Ors v. Forest Heath District Council & Ors</i>	561
D. Adequacy of the EIA: When Is the EIA Sufficiently Complete?	562
<i>Mundy v. Central Environmental Authority</i>	563
PROBLEM EXERCISE: THE LARGE HADRON COLLIDER AND EARTH-SWALLOWING BLACK HOLES	566
IV. Stakeholder Consultation and Accountability	567
A. The Why and the How	567
<i>The Northern Jamaica Conservation Association et al. v. Natural Resources Conservation Authority et al.</i>	569
B. Consultation with Indigenous Communities	571
<i>Taku River Tlingit First Nation v. British Columbia (Project Assessment Director)</i>	571
C. Postproject Approval Monitoring and Remedies	573
<i>Sarstoon-Temash Institute for Indigenous Management (SATIIM) v. Forest Department, Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment</i>	575
D. Standing to Challenge EIA Studies	578
V. EIA in International Settings	581
A. Extraterritoriality	581
<i>Environmental Defense Fund v. Massey</i>	582
B. EIA in International Tribunals — Transboundary Impacts	587
<i>Pulp Mills on the River Uruguay (Argentina v. Uruguay)</i>	588

C. International Development Banks and Development Aid Donors	591
<i>The World Bank Environmental and Social Framework</i>	592
D. International Treaties	597
PROBLEM EXERCISE: TRANSBOUNDARY EIA	599
<hr/>	
11. AIR POLLUTION	601
INTRODUCTORY PROBLEM: THE PEACE ARCH AND AIR POLLUTION	602
I. The Nature of Air Pollution — A Primer	603
RESEARCH EXERCISE: HOW CLEAN IS YOUR AIR?	608
PROBLEM EXERCISE: EQUITY AND AIR POLLUTION	608
II. Transboundary Air Pollution	610
<i>Transboundary Haze Pollution Act 2014 (Singapore)</i>	617
III. Domestic Public Interest Litigation Addressing Air Pollution	623
<i>M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (Taj Trapezium Case)</i>	624
<i>M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (Vehicular Pollution Case: Enforcement of Bus Natural Gas Regulations)</i>	631
IV. Air Pollution and Fundamental Rights	636
<i>Marangopolos Foundation for Human Rights (MFHR) v. Greece</i>	637
V. Domestic Challenges of Creating and Implementing Air Pollution–Reduction Policies	645
<i>R (on the Application of ClientEarth) (Appellant) v. The Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Respondent)</i>	646
<i>Kentucky Resources Council, Inc. v. United States Environmental Protection Agency</i>	650
VI. Accountability and Evolving Air Policies	655
<i>Indictment in United States v. Richard Dorenkamp and Others</i>	656
What Next for Air Pollution Policy?	658
<hr/>	
12. WATER	661
INTRODUCTORY PROBLEM: A CHEMICAL SPILL ON A CHINESE RIVER	662
I. Introduction: The Challenge of Water Resource Management	663
II. A History of Water Resource Management	665
<i>Missouri v. Illinois</i>	668
III. Water Pollution Control Legislation	674
IV. Judicial Intervention to Control and Remediate Water Pollution	675
<i>M.C. Mehta (Kanpur Tanneries) v. Union of India</i>	676

1. The Human Dimension	732
2. Economies of Waste	732
3. Redirecting Waste Production — A Planetary Salvage Operation	735
B. Sustainability and Environmental Justice	736
II. Effective Management of Waste	738
A. Reuse of Products and the Definition of Waste	738
<i>Environment Agency v. Thorn International UK Ltd.</i>	739
B. Waste-to-Energy Recovery Operations	745
<i>Commission v. Luxembourg</i>	746
C. Source Reduction	749
<i>All India Plastic Industries Association v. National Capital Territory of Delhi</i>	751
D. Recycling	756
<i>Bonesteel v. City of Seattle</i>	756
III. Land and Sea Disposal	761
A. Landfills	761
<i>Öneryıldız v. Turkey</i>	764
B. Dumping at Sea	776
<i>Nanoose Conversion Campaign v. Minister of Environment</i>	778
IV. Hazardous Waste and the Basel Convention	779
<i>Corby Group v. Corby District Council</i>	780
<i>Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal</i>	782
<i>Criminal Case Against Trafigura Beheer B.V.</i>	787
V. Radioactive Waste and Space Waste	792
A. Radioactive Waste	792
B. Space Waste	794
PROBLEM EXERCISE: DESIGN A WASTE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	796

14. WILDLIFE AND PROTECTED AREAS **797**

INTRODUCTORY PROBLEM: IVORY HEIRLOOMS	798
I. Background on Biodiversity	800
A. International Response — Identifying the Problems	802
<i>Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA)</i>	802
B. International Response — Securing National Commitments	806
<i>Living Beyond Our Means: Natural Assets and Human Well-Being</i>	809
II. Protecting Endangered Species from Unregulated Trade	811
<i>Preamble to Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora</i>	811
<i>Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, Articles I, III-V, and VII</i>	812

COSTA RICAN CASE STUDY: SHARK CONSERVATION	817
<i>2010 Memorandum of Understanding on Shark Conservation (Amended in 2016)</i>	819
<i>Fatwā on Protection of Endangered Species to Maintain the Balanced Ecosystems</i>	822
III. International Trade Law Constraints on National Species Protection	824
<i>United States — Import Prohibition of Certain Shrimp and Shrimp Products</i>	831
PROBLEM EXERCISE: THE MEA VERSUS WTO RUMBLE	841
IV. Criminal Law and Wildlife Protection	842
<i>Lacey Act</i>	842
<i>United States v. Zhifei Li, Joint Factual Statement</i>	843
<i>United States v. Bengis</i>	849
V. Whaling	853
<i>International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling & Protocol</i>	857
<i>Whaling in the Antarctic (Australia v. Japan: New Zealand Intervening)</i>	861
VI. Protected Areas	869
A. A Primer on Protected Areas	869
PROBLEM EXERCISE: PROTECTED AREAS	871
<i>Environmental Defence Society Inc. v. The New Zealand King Salmon Co. Ltd.</i>	872
B. Protected Area Management Case Study: Panna Tiger Reserve	878
PROBLEM EXERCISE: DRAFTING A TRANSBOUNDARY PROTECTED AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN	881
C. Protected Areas and Community Rights	881
<i>Survival International Charitable Trust v. The World Wide Fund for Nature “Specific Instance”</i>	884
<hr/>	
15. GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE	891
INTRODUCTORY PROBLEM: SEA-LEVEL RISE AND CLIMATE REFUGEES	892
I. A Primer on Climate Change	893
A. The Basic Science	893
B. The Complexities of the Climate System	895
C. Why Worry? The Potential Effects of Climate Change	898
II. International Law Governing Climate Change	902
A. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change	902
<i>United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change</i>	904

B. The 1997 Kyoto Protocol	910
<i>Kyoto Protocol (1997)</i>	911
C. The 2015 Paris Agreement	916
PROBLEM EXERCISE: CLIMATE CHANGE AND YOUR COMMUNITY	922
III. Regulatory Approaches in National and Subnational Systems	923
A. Direct Regulation of Greenhouse Gases	923
<i>Massachusetts v. EPA, Summary of Opinion</i>	924
<i>Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006</i>	925
B. Taxes and Subsidies	929
<i>Environmental Protection Tax Law</i>	929
C. Cities and Municipal Codes	931
<i>Council of the District of Columbia “Green Building Act of 2006”</i>	931
D. Environmental Planning and Impact Assessment	935
<i>Gloucester Resources Limited v. Minister for Planning</i>	935
E. Institutional Arrangements	943
<i>Climate Change Authority Act 2011</i>	943
<i>Cooperation Agreement Supporting a National Climate Commission</i>	945
<i>Public Law No. 18-34</i>	945
<i>Climate Change Act 2008-C27</i>	946
IV. Holding Governments Accountable in the Courts	947
A. The Public Trust Doctrine	948
<i>Chernaik v. Brown</i>	948
<i>Juliana v. United States</i>	950
B. Human Rights–Based Claims	955
<i>Urgenda Foundation v. The State of the Netherlands</i>	956
<i>Asghar Leghari v. Federation of Pakistan</i>	964
C. Statutory and Constitutional Claims	966
V. Corporate Accountability	969
<i>Abraham v. Commonwealth Bank of Australia</i>	971
<i>People of the State of California, Acting by and Through the San Francisco City Attorney v. BP, Chevron, Conoco Phillips, Exxon Mobil Corporation, Royal Dutch Shell, and Does 1-10, Complaint</i>	974
<i>City of Oakland and the People of the State of California v. BP, Chevron, Conoco Phillips, Exxon Mobil, Royal Dutch Shell, and Does 1-10</i>	978
<i>Petition Before the Philippines Commission on Human Rights</i>	982
VI. Climate Change Refugees	987
<i>Appeal of AF (Kiribati)</i>	987
VII. Changing the Status Quo	996
TABLE OF CASES	999
INDEX	1007