The Peninsula Journal of Strategy and Policy

Volume 3, Issue 1 of the PJSP

DOI: https://doi.org/10.70646/PJSP.2026.3107

Journal Article

Advancing Climate Resilience: The Role of Policy Frameworks in Mitigating Environmental and Socioeconomic Impacts under a Narrowing Window of Action

Author

Jonathan Bajoria, Department of Commerce, Gauhati Commerce College, Guwahati, Assam, India, jonathanbajoria123@gmail.com

Abstract

Climate change has emerged as a defining challenge of the twenty-first century, with far-reaching implications for environmental stability, economic systems, social equity, and governance structures. Scientific evidence overwhelmingly attributes contemporary climate change to human activities, particularly fossil fuel dependence and unsustainable land-use practices, while recent assessments indicate that climate impacts are intensifying faster than previously anticipated. Despite growing international recognition and expanding policy frameworks, global responses remain fragmented and insufficient to achieve climate stabilization or equitable development outcomes. This paper examines climate change through an integrated analytical framework that connects scientific risk assessment, climate policy design, governance structures, political economy dynamics, and long-term sustainability pathways. It evaluates the evolution and effectiveness of global and national climate policies, highlights persistent gaps between commitments and implementation, and analyses the roles of governments, international institutions, private sector actors, civil society, and marginalized communities in shaping climate outcomes. Particular attention is given to structural lock-ins, unequal vulnerability, and the chronic underfunding of adaptation in climate-vulnerable regions. The paper argues that the next fifteen years represent a critical and narrowing window for effective climate action. Delayed mitigation and adaptation will

significantly constrain future options, increase costs, and heighten the risk of irreversible environmental and socio-economic damage. The findings underscore the need for coordinated, science-based, and equity-oriented policy interventions to accelerate emissions reductions, strengthen resilience, and support a just and sustainable transition.

Keywords

Climate Change; Global Climate Governance; Climate Policy Frameworks; Political Economy of Climate Action; Sustainability Pathways; Mitigation and Adaptation; Climate Finance; Just Transition; Climate Resilience

1. Introduction

Climate change has moved decisively beyond the margins of environmental discourse and now stands at the centre of public policy, economic planning, and international cooperation. Once framed as a distant or future concern, it is increasingly understood as a systemic risk capable of reshaping ecosystems, destabilizing economies, deepening social inequalities, and placing political systems under strain across the globe (**IPCC, 2023**). Rising global temperatures, intensifying extreme weather events, and widespread ecological degradation have reinforced the urgency of coordinated and transformative action across all levels of governance. At its core, contemporary climate change is the result of human decisions. Heavy reliance on fossilfuels, large-scale deforestation, rapid industrial expansion, and consumption-intensive development models have driven a sharp increase in atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations over the past century (**IEA, 2024**). While industrialized nations remain responsible for the largest share of historical emissions, emerging and developing economies now face complex trade-offs between economic growth, poverty reduction, and climate responsibility. This uneven distribution of emissions and impacts has transformed climate change into not only an environmental problem but also a deeply political and ethical challenge.

The consequences of a warming climate extend well beyond environmental degradation. Climate-related shocks increasingly intersect with poverty, weak infrastructure, and institutional vulnerabilities, producing cascading impacts across sectors and communities. Heatwaves place growing pressure on public health systems, droughts undermine food security, floods damage infrastructure and disrupt supply chains, and sea-level rise threatens

the displacement of coastal populations (**UNDP, 2022; IPCC, 2023**). These risks disproportionately affect low-income populations and climate-vulnerable countries with limited adaptive capacity, reinforcing global inequalities and raising pressing questions of climate justice. In response, governments and international institutions have developed a wide array of policy initiatives aimed at limiting further warming while supporting more sustainable development pathways. The establishment of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the adoption of the Paris Agreement, and the expansion of national climate action plans reflect growing political acknowledgment of the climate crisis. More recently, climate considerations have been integrated into development finance, trade policy, and corporate governance frameworks, signalling a broader shift toward sustainability-oriented decision-making (**World Bank, 2024; OECD, 2023**).

Despite these advances, a significant gap persists between policy commitments and real-world outcomes. Current nationally determined contributions (NDCs) remain collectively insufficient to limit warming to 1.5°C or even well below 2°C (**IPCC, 2023**). Climate policies are frequently characterized by fragmentation, weak enforcement, and poor coordination across sectors and governance levels. Short-term political and economic priorities often continue to outweigh long-term climate objectives, undermining policy credibility and effectiveness. A further challenge lies in the imbalance between mitigation and adaptation efforts. While mitigation has dominated climate discourse and investment flows, adaptation particularly in developing countries remains chronically underfunded. Recent assessments indicate that international public adaptation finance covers only a small fraction of projected needs, leaving vulnerable communities increasingly exposed to climate risks **(UNEP, 2024**). This adaptation finance gap highlights broader structural weaknesses in global climate governance, including inadequate financial mechanisms, limited institutional capacity, and insufficient attention to equity and justice.

Within this context, the concept of global sustainability offers a unifying framework that links environmental protection with economic development and social well-being. Sustainability emphasizes the interdependence of human and natural systems and the need to balance present needs with long-term ecological limits. Addressing climate change through a sustainability lens requires not only technological innovation but also fundamental changes in governance structures, policy design, and societal values (**Rockström et al., 2017; IPCC, 2023**).

The objective of this paper is to provide a comprehensive examination of climate change and global sustainability by integrating scientific evidence, policy frameworks, institutional dynamics, and transition pathways. By synthesizing recent research and policy assessments, the study identifies key structural barriers to effective climate action and highlights opportunities for strengthening climate governance. The paper is organized into five domains. Domain I examines the scientific foundations of climate change and associated global risks. Domain II analyzes the evolution and effectiveness of climate policy frameworks. Domain III explores the roles of key actors and political economy dynamics shaping climate action. Domain IV assesses sustainability pathways and implementation challenges. Domain V focuses on the critical fifteen-year window for action and the limitations of post-2035 recovery. By situating climate change within a broader governance and sustainability framework, this study seeks to contribute to policy-relevant debates on building a more resilient and equitable global future.

Domain I: Scientific Basis of Climate Change and Global Risks

2.1 Anthropogenic Drivers of Climate Change

Over the past decade, advances in climate science have strengthened the conclusion that current climate change is overwhelmingly the result of human activity. The IPCC's Sixth Assessment Report states with very high confidence that anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions are responsible for the observed rise in global temperatures since the mid-twentieth century (**IPCC, 2023**). This conclusion rests on a robust body of evidence drawn from observational records, climate modeling, and attribution studies that clearly distinguish human influence from natural climatic variability.

The dominant source of human-induced warming remains the combustion of fossil fuels coal, oil, and natural gas to meet global energy demand. These fuels continue to underpin electricity generation, transportation systems, industrial activity, and residential energy use. According to the International Energy Agency **(IEA, 2024**), energy-related carbon dioxide emissions reached record levels in recent years, reflecting both persistent fossil fuel dependence and rising global energy consumption. Although renewable energy deployment has accelerated in many regions, particularly in the power sector, it has not yet expanded rapidly enough to displace fossil fuels at the scale required for absolute emissions reductions.

Land-use change represents another major contributor to climate change. Deforestation, forest degradation, and the conversion of natural ecosystems into agricultural or urban land release significant amounts of stored carbon while simultaneously reducing the capacity of ecosystems to absorb future emissions. The agriculture, forestry, and other land use (AFOLU) sector also emits substantial quantities of methane and nitrous oxide through livestock production, rice cultivation, fertilizer use, and soil management practices. These gases have a much higher global warming potential than carbon dioxide over shorter time horizons, intensifying near-term warming and complicating mitigation efforts (IPCC, 2023).

Industrial activity further exacerbates climate change through both energy consumption and process-related emissions. Sectors such as cement, steel, chemicals, and refrigeration produce emissions that are difficult to abate using existing technologies. In many cases, emissions arise directly from chemical reactions inherent to production processes rather than from fuel use alone. The persistence of carbon-intensive industrial infrastructure highlights the structural nature of the climate challenge and underscores the limitations of incremental efficiency gains in the absence of transformative technological and regulatory change. At a deeper level, these sectoral drivers reflect a broader development model characterized by resource-intensive growth, rising consumption, and increasingly complex global supply chains. A growing body of research argues that climate change is not simply a technological failure but a systemic outcome of economic trajectories that prioritize short-term growth over long-term ecological stability (**Rockström et al., 2017; IPCC, 2023**). Addressing climate change therefore requires rethinking how societies produce, consume, and govern resources, rather than relying solely on end-of-pipe technical solutions.

2.2 Sectoral Emissions Patterns and Structural Lock-In

Analyzing emissions by sector is critical for identifying mitigation priorities and assessing the feasibility of global climate targets. Available emissions data indicate that energy-related sectors power generation, transport, industry, and buildings account for approximately three-quarters of total global greenhouse gas emissions (**Our World in Data, 2024; IPCC,**

2023). Among these, electricity and heat generation remain the single largest source of emissions worldwide.

In many regions, power systems continue to rely heavily on coal and natural gas, particularly in rapidly growing economies where electricity demand is increasing sharply. While solar and wind capacity has expanded substantially, fossil fuels still supply a dominant share of global electricity. Power plants are typically designed to operate for several decades, meaning that once constructed, they lock in emissions unless retired early or retrofitted with low-carbon technologies. This infrastructure lock-in presents a major challenge for timely decarbonization. Transport is another significant emissions source, driven primarily by road transport dependent on petroleum-based fuels. Despite technological advances in electric vehicles and improvements in fuel efficiency, the global vehicle fleet remains overwhelmingly fossil fuel-based. Aviation and shipping pose additional difficulties due to limited availability of scalable low-carbon alternatives. The rebound in transport emissions following the COVID-19 pandemic illustrates the deep structural dependence of mobility systems on carbon-intensive energy sources (**IEA, 2024**).

Industrial emissions arise from both energy use and process emissions linked to production chemistry, particularly in cement manufacturing. These emissions are among the most difficult to eliminate and often require either breakthrough technologies, such as carbon capture and storage, or fundamental changes in material use and construction practices. Emissions from buildings, while lower in direct terms, become significant when indirect emissions from electricity consumption are considered.

The persistence of high emissions across sectors is reinforced by long-lived infrastructure, institutional inertia, and economic dependencies. Investments in fossil fuel extraction, pipelines, refineries, power plants, and transport networks create vested interests that resist rapid change. IPCC assessments warn that existing and planned fossil fuel infrastructure, if operated as intended, would emit enough carbon dioxide to exceed remaining carbon budgets compatible with limiting warming to 1.5°C (**IPCC, 2023**). This finding implies that climate

policy must address not only future investments but also the managed decline of existing high-emissions assets.

2.3 Climate Impacts and Cascading Global Risks

The impacts of climate change are already being experienced across all regions and are intensifying as global temperatures continue to rise. These impacts manifest through both gradual processes such as sea-level rise and shifting precipitation patterns and acute events, including heatwaves, floods, cyclones, and wildfires. The IPCC (2023) notes that many observed impacts are occurring sooner and with greater intensity than projected in earlier assessments, suggesting that climate risks are materializing faster than anticipated.

Heatwaves have emerged as one of the deadliest climate-related hazards, affecting human health, labor productivity, and urban livability. Prolonged periods of extreme heat increase mortality rates, overwhelm health systems, and reduce agricultural yields, particularly in regions with limited access to cooling infrastructure. Changes in precipitation patterns have also intensified both droughts and floods, disrupting water availability, food production, and energy systems. Beyond direct physical impacts, climate change is driving widespread ecological disruption. Rising temperatures, ocean acidification, and habitat loss threaten biodiversity and weaken the ecosystem services on which human societies depend. Coral reef degradation, forest dieback, and declining pollinator populations have cascading consequences for fisheries, food security, and carbon sequestration capacity. These ecological losses further reduce the resilience of natural systems to future climate stressors.

Crucially, climate impacts do not occur in isolation. They interact with socio-economic conditions to produce compound and cascading risks. Climate-induced crop failures can amplify food price volatility, deepen poverty, and contribute to social instability. Flood damage to infrastructure can disrupt supply chains, financial systems, and access to essential services. The United Nations Development Programme (**UNDP, 2022**) describes climate change as a “risk multiplier” that intensifies existing vulnerabilities and governance challenges. These dynamics highlight the interconnected nature of climate risks and the limitations of narrowly defined adaptation strategies. Effective responses must account for interactions across sectors, regions, and social groups rather than treating climate hazards as isolated events.

2.4 Unequal Vulnerability and Climate Justice

One of the defining characteristics of climate change is the mismatch between responsibility for emissions and exposure to impacts. High-income countries have historically contributed the majority of cumulative greenhouse gas emissions, while many low- and middle-income countries face the most severe climate risks. These countries are often located in climate-sensitive regions, depend heavily on agriculture and natural resources, and possess limited financial and institutional capacity to adapt. This imbalance raises fundamental questions of climate justice. Vulnerable communities frequently lack access to resources necessary for effective adaptation, including resilient infrastructure, early warning systems, and social protection mechanisms. Indigenous peoples and marginalized groups are particularly exposed due to historical exclusion from decision-making processes and insecure land tenure.

Climate justice has gained increasing prominence in international policy debates, emphasizing the ethical responsibility of wealthier nations to support mitigation and adaptation efforts in developing countries. The principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, enshrined in the UNFCCC, reflects this recognition. However, translating this principle into adequate and effective support remains a persistent challenge.

2.5 The Adaptation Finance Gap and Systemic Constraints

Adaptation is an essential component of climate response, given that some degree of warming is now unavoidable. Measures such as climate-resilient infrastructure, improved water management, climate-smart agriculture, and disaster risk reduction are critical for reducing vulnerability and safeguarding livelihoods. Despite this importance, adaptation remains significantly underfunded compared to mitigation.

Recent estimates by the United Nations Environment Programme (**UNEP, 2024**) suggest that adaptation needs in developing countries could reach between USD 310 and 365 billion annually by 2035. By contrast, tracked international public adaptation finance amounted to approximately USD 26 billion in 2023. This stark gap highlights the scale of underinvestment and its implications for vulnerable regions.

Several factors contribute to this shortfall. Adaptation projects often produce public goods and non-market benefits that attract limited private investment. Measuring adaptation outcomes is complex, complicating project evaluation and accountability. Additionally, many vulnerable countries face high borrowing costs and constrained fiscal space, limiting their ability to finance adaptation domestically.

The adaptation finance gap reflects not only a funding deficit but also deeper governance failures. Weak international financial mechanisms, insufficient prioritization of adaptation, and limited integration of climate risk into development planning continue to undermine resilience-building efforts. If left unaddressed, these constraints will exacerbate vulnerability and threaten broader sustainability goals.

2.6 Implications of Scientific Evidence for Policy and Sustainability

The scientific evidence reviewed in this domain carries clear implications for climate policy and global sustainability. **First**, the dominance of energy-related emissions underscores the need for rapid and comprehensive transformation of energy systems. Incremental improvements are unlikely to be sufficient without structural change.

Second, infrastructure lock-in highlights the importance of timing. Delayed action increases the risk of stranded assets, higher transition costs, and irreversible climate impacts. Policy frameworks must therefore address both future investments and the managed phase-out of existing high-emissions infrastructure.

Third, the scale and complexity of climate impacts demand integrated and forward-looking adaptation strategies. Effective responses require coordination across sectors and governance levels, informed by scientific evidence and local knowledge.

Finally, the adaptation finance gap exposes deep inequities within global climate governance. Achieving sustainability will require not only technological innovation but also reforms to financial systems, institutional capacity, and international cooperation. The challenge lies not in the absence of knowledge but in translating that knowledge into effective and equitable policy action.

Domain II: Climate Policies and Global Governance Frameworks

3.1 Evolution of Global Climate Governance

Global efforts to govern climate change have evolved gradually in response to growing scientific certainty, rising political awareness, and the recognition that climate change is a shared global challenge that cannot be addressed by individual states acting alone. Initial international responses focused largely on acknowledging the problem and establishing guiding principles, which culminated in the adoption of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 1992. The UNFCCC marked a critical turning point by framing climate change as a common concern of humanity and introducing the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, which acknowledged differences in historical emissions and national capacities.

Over time, the global climate governance system expanded in both scope and complexity. Early attempts to impose binding emission limits, most notably through the Kyoto Protocol, faced limitations due to narrow participation and uneven compliance. These shortcomings revealed the difficulty of enforcing rigid obligations in a highly diverse international system. In response, subsequent governance arrangements sought to balance ambition with flexibility, leading to the adoption of the Paris Agreement in 2015. Unlike earlier approaches, the Paris framework emphasized broad participation and national ownership over uniform, top-down targets. In recent years, global climate governance has shifted from a phase dominated by negotiations to one increasingly focused on implementation. International discussions now place greater emphasis on aligning policies, tracking progress, and translating commitments into tangible outcomes at national and subnational levels. This transition reflects a growing understanding that governance effectiveness depends not only on formal agreements but also on domestic institutions, political incentives, and administrative capacity (**Falkner, 2023**).

3.2 The Paris Agreement and Nationally Determined Contributions

The Paris Agreement remains the cornerstone of the contemporary international climate regime. Its defining feature is the use of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), through which countries voluntarily outline their mitigation and adaptation goals. This bottom-up structure was designed to encourage near-universal participation while respecting national circumstances and development priorities. Rather than imposing uniform

obligations, the agreement relies on iterative cycles of commitment, review, and enhancement.

Since 2020, many countries have revised or strengthened their NDCs, expanded coverage across sectors, and articulated long-term strategies aimed at achieving net-zero emissions. As of 2024, more than 140 countries have announced net-zero targets, collectively representing the vast majority of global emissions (**UNFCCC, 2024**). These developments indicate increasing political recognition of climate risks and the need for structural change. Despite these advances, a significant gap persists between stated commitments and the level of ambition required to meet the Paris temperature goals. Aggregated NDCs remain inconsistent with limiting warming to 1.5°C and are projected to result in substantially higher levels of warming by the end of the century. This shortfall highlights the limitations of voluntary pledges when they are not supported by robust accountability mechanisms. At the domestic level, implementation is often constrained by policy inconsistencies, regulatory fragmentation, and political resistance. In many cases, climate pledges coexist with continued support for fossil fuel production and consumption, undermining credibility and slowing progress.

3.3 National Climate Policy Instruments

At the national level, governments employ a range of policy instruments to reduce emissions, enhance resilience, and steer investment toward sustainable activities. These instruments typically include regulatory measures, market-based mechanisms, fiscal tools, and information-based approaches. Regulatory policies such as emissions standards, renewable energy mandates, and efficiency requirements provide clear rules that can shape behavior when effectively enforced. In several countries, such measures have played a decisive role in accelerating renewable energy deployment and improving energy performance.

Market-based instruments, particularly carbon pricing, have gained increasing attention. Carbon taxes and emissions trading systems aim to incorporate the social cost of emissions into economic decision-making. By 2024, carbon pricing initiatives had been implemented in over 70 jurisdictions, covering a significant share of global emissions (**World Bank, 2024**). Evidence suggests that well-designed pricing mechanisms can reduce emissions while generating revenue that can be redirected toward climate action or social protection. Fiscal policies also exert substantial influence on climate outcomes. Public investment, tax

incentives, and subsidies have helped lower the cost of clean technologies and encourage innovation. However, continued fossil fuel subsidies remain a major obstacle. These subsidies distort markets, discourage low-carbon alternatives, and weaken policy coherence. Information-based instruments, including climate risk disclosures and sustainability reporting, seek to improve transparency and influence decision-making by consumers, investors, and firms. Increasingly, such measures are viewed as essential for aligning financial systems with climate objectives.

3.4 International Climate Finance Architecture

Climate finance is a critical component of global climate governance, particularly in addressing disparities between developed and developing countries. International financial mechanisms aim to support mitigation and adaptation efforts while advancing sustainable development goals. Key channels include multilateral funds such as the Green Climate Fund and Global Environment Facility, as well as multilateral development banks and bilateral assistance programs.

Despite repeated commitments by developed countries to mobilize substantial climate finance, actual flows remain inadequate relative to assessed needs. Moreover, a large share of available finance has been directed toward mitigation rather than adaptation, reflecting investor preferences and challenges in measuring adaptation outcomes (**OECD, 2023**). This imbalance leaves vulnerable countries exposed to escalating climate risks. Recent policy debates have emphasized the need for systemic reform of the international financial architecture. Proposals include expanding concessional lending, lowering borrowing costs for vulnerable countries, and better leveraging private capital through risk-sharing instruments. Aligning all financial flows with climate objectives, as articulated in the Paris Agreement, has emerged as an important guiding principle. However, fragmentation among funding channels and limited institutional capacity continue to constrain effectiveness.

3.5 Accountability, Transparency, and Governance Effectiveness

Transparency and accountability are central to the effectiveness of climate governance. The Paris Agreement's Enhanced Transparency Framework requires countries to regularly report emissions data, policy actions, and progress toward their commitments. These reporting mechanisms are intended to foster trust, encourage peer learning, and enable collective

assessment through global stocktakes. While transparency has improved, significant challenges remain. Data quality and comparability vary widely across countries, and many developing states face technical and institutional constraints in reporting. Moreover, transparency alone does not guarantee compliance, particularly in the absence of enforcement mechanisms. At the national level, governance effectiveness depends heavily on institutional coordination, stakeholder participation, and political leadership. Policies that are integrated across ministries and aligned with development priorities tend to be more durable and effective than fragmented initiatives.

3.6 Structural Limitations of Current Frameworks

Despite notable progress, existing climate governance arrangements face persistent structural limitations. The voluntary nature of international commitments restricts enforceability and allows governments to prioritize short-term political or economic objectives. Fragmentation across sectors and governance levels undermines coherence, while unequal access to finance and technology constrains implementation in lower-income countries.

Geopolitical tensions further complicate collective action. Concerns related to energy security, strategic competition, and economic resilience can conflict with cooperative climate objectives. These dynamics highlight that climate governance is not purely technical but deeply political, shaped by power relations and competing interests.

3.7 Implications for Global Sustainability

The analysis of climate policies and governance frameworks underscores that achieving global sustainability requires more than incremental reform. It demands coordinated, multi-level governance capable of aligning scientific evidence, political incentives, and economic structures. Strengthening climate governance involves raising ambition, improving policy coherence, reforming financial systems, and embedding equity considerations throughout decision-making processes.

As subsequent sections explore, the effectiveness of climate policies ultimately depends on the actors and institutions responsible for their design and implementation. Understanding the political economy shaping climate action is therefore essential for identifying realistic and durable pathways toward a sustainable and resilient future.

Domain III: Parties, Institutions, and the Political Economy of Climate Action

4.1 Climate Action as a Political Economy Challenge

Although climate change is firmly grounded in scientific evidence and addressed through policy frameworks, the pace and effectiveness of climate action are ultimately shaped by political and economic realities. Climate policies inevitably redistribute costs and benefits across sectors, regions, and social groups, making them deeply political in nature. Decisions regarding emissions reductions, adaptation priorities, and climate finance allocation are influenced not only by environmental considerations but also by power relations, institutional capacity, and competing economic interests.

Political economy perspectives emphasize that climate policies do not operate in a neutral environment. Instead, they interact with existing development models, labor markets, industrial structures, and governance systems. As a result, even technically sound and scientifically justified policies may face resistance, dilution, or delay during implementation. Understanding climate action therefore requires examining the roles and interactions of key actors, including national governments, international institutions, private sector entities, civil society organizations, and communities most affected by climate impacts (**Newell, 2021**).

4.2 National Governments and Domestic Political Constraints

National governments play a central role in translating international climate commitments into domestic policies, laws, and investments. Their capacity to do so, however, is shaped by political systems, economic dependencies, and social priorities. In many countries, climate objectives compete with short-term concerns such as employment, economic growth, energy affordability, and electoral pressures.

In economies that rely heavily on fossil fuels, climate mitigation policies often pose direct challenges to powerful industries and associated labor groups. Measures such as carbon pricing, subsidy reform, or coal phase-outs can provoke political opposition if they are perceived to threaten livelihoods or increase living costs. These tensions have been evident in public resistance to fuel price reforms and emissions regulations in several regions (**IEA, 2024**). Even where governments express strong climate ambition, policy coherence remains a persistent challenge. Ministries responsible for energy, industry, transport, and finance may pursue objectives that conflict with climate goals, resulting in fragmented governance. Limited administrative capacity, weak enforcement mechanisms, and regulatory uncertainty further undermine implementation, particularly in developing countries. Sustained political

leadership and institutional continuity are therefore critical for maintaining momentum. Conversely, policy reversals following changes in government can erode credibility and delay progress, highlighting the vulnerability of climate action to domestic political cycles.

4.3 International Institutions and Multilateral Governance

International institutions play a vital role in shaping climate norms, coordinating collective action, and mobilizing financial and technical support. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) remains the primary forum for global climate negotiations, while the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) provides authoritative scientific assessments that inform policy decisions.

Beyond the UN system, multilateral development banks and international financial institutions exert significant influence through lending practices, investment priorities, and policy guidance. In recent years, many of these institutions have pledged to increase climate-related finance and align their portfolios with the goals of the Paris Agreement. However, progress has been uneven, and continued support for fossil fuel-related projects has raised concerns about credibility and policy consistency (**Oxfam, 2023**).

Questions of legitimacy and representation also persist. Developing countries often argue that decision-making power within global financial institutions is disproportionately concentrated in advanced economies, limiting responsiveness to the needs of climate-vulnerable states. Calls for institutional reform and greater inclusivity reflect broader debates about equity, justice, and fairness in global climate governance.

4.4 The Role of the Private Sector and Financial Actors

The private sector plays a dual role in the climate transition. On one hand, businesses are major contributors to greenhouse gas emissions; on the other, they control capital, technology, and innovation pathways that are essential for decarbonization. Corporate investment decisions, supply chain practices, and political lobbying significantly influence climate outcomes.

In recent years, many companies have announced net-zero targets, adopted sustainability reporting practices, and begun assessing climate-related financial risks. Financial institutions such as banks, insurers, and asset managers have also emerged as powerful actors by

determining where capital flows across the economy. Initiatives like the Glasgow Financial Alliance for Net Zero aim to align private finance with climate goals by encouraging voluntary commitments. However, concerns persist regarding the credibility of these commitments. Voluntary pledges are often criticized for weak accountability, inconsistent methodologies, and the risk of greenwashing (**UNEP FI, 2023**). Market forces alone are unlikely to drive the rapid and equitable transitions required. Clear regulatory frameworks, mandatory disclosure requirements, and supportive public policies are necessary to steer private investment toward genuine emissions reductions. Without appropriate safeguards, private-sector-led transitions may also reinforce existing inequalities, particularly if climate finance bypasses high-risk regions or marginalized communities.

4.5 Civil Society, Social Movements, and Knowledge Actors

Civil society organizations, research institutions, and social movements play an essential role in shaping climate discourse and holding decision-makers accountable. Environmental NGOs have long contributed to agenda-setting, policy advocacy, and monitoring of government and corporate behavior.

In recent years, grassroots movements and youth-led climate activism have gained prominence, reframing climate change as an issue of intergenerational justice and human rights. These movements have broadened public engagement and increased political pressure for stronger climate action. Climate litigation has also expanded, with courts increasingly recognizing government obligations to protect citizens from climate-related risks (Setzer & Higham, 2022). Scientific and policy research institutions contribute by generating evidence, evaluating policy effectiveness, and countering misinformation. Their credibility and independence are critical for informed decision-making. However, in some contexts, the politicization of climate science has undermined public trust and delayed policy responses, illustrating the challenges of translating knowledge into action.

4.6 Indigenous Peoples and Marginalized Communities

Indigenous peoples and marginalized communities are often among the most exposed to climate impacts while contributing the least to global emissions. Many of these groups depend directly on climate-sensitive ecosystems and face structural barriers such as insecure land tenure, limited access to finance, and exclusion from formal decision-making processes.

At the same time, indigenous knowledge systems and traditional land management practices offer valuable insights for sustainable resource use and climate adaptation. Recognizing this, recent policy frameworks increasingly emphasize inclusive governance and the protection of indigenous rights. However, meaningful participation requires more than formal recognition. It depends on addressing historical inequalities, ensuring access to resources, and granting genuine decision-making authority. Climate action that fails to integrate justice considerations risks exacerbating social tensions and undermining long-term sustainability. Inclusive approaches not only enhance equity but also improve the effectiveness and legitimacy of climate interventions.

4.7 Power Asymmetries and Structural Barriers

A defining feature of the political economy of climate action is the persistence of power imbalances across countries and sectors. Wealthier nations possess greater financial, technological, and institutional capacity to respond to climate change, while poorer countries face disproportionate risks with limited resources. These asymmetries shape negotiation outcomes, access to finance, and implementation capacity. Within countries, concentrated economic interests particularly in fossil fuel industries often exert significant influence over policy processes. Lobbying, media influence, and political financing can delay or weaken climate legislation. Addressing these barriers requires transparency, accountability, and governance reforms that prioritize long-term public interests over short-term economic gains.

4.8 Implications for Advancing Climate Action

The analysis of political economy dynamics reveals that the primary obstacles to climate action are not technological limitations but governance and power-related constraints. Overcoming these challenges requires aligning economic incentives with climate objectives, strengthening institutional capacity, and promoting inclusive and participatory decision-making.

Durable climate action depends on political leadership, social consensus, and institutional reform. Recognizing and addressing political economy barriers is therefore essential for translating scientific knowledge and policy frameworks into effective, equitable, and lasting climate outcomes.

Domain IV: Sustainability Pathways and Implementation Challenges

5.1 Conceptualising Sustainability Pathways in Climate Action

Sustainability pathways describe the long-term trajectories through which societies can transition toward low-carbon, climate-resilient, and socially inclusive development. Rather than representing a single or uniform route, these pathways encompass diverse combinations of technological change, institutional reform, economic restructuring, and social transformation shaped by national contexts and global constraints. In the context of climate change, sustainability pathways must address two parallel objectives: the rapid reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and the strengthening of adaptive capacity to manage unavoidable climate impacts.

Recent climate research underscores that pathways compatible with limiting global warming to 1.5°C or well below 2°C require immediate and sustained action across all major sectors **(IPCC, 2023**). Delays significantly reduce the number of feasible options and increase reliance on uncertain or controversial future technologies. Consequently, sustainability pathways must be assessed not only by their long-term climate outcomes but also by their near-term feasibility, equity implications, and governance requirements. The effectiveness of these pathways depends on whether they can be implemented within existing political, economic, and institutional constraints.

5.2 Mitigation Pathways Across Key Economic Sectors

Mitigation pathways focus on reducing emissions through structural changes in energy systems, industrial production, land use, and consumption patterns. The energy sector occupies a central position in these pathways, as decarbonizing electricity generation enables emissions reductions across transport, buildings, and industry. Core strategies include the rapid expansion of renewable energy, the phase-out of unabated coal, improvements in energy efficiency, and modernization of electricity grids to support variable renewable supply.

Electrification plays a key role in mitigation strategies, particularly in transport and buildings. The adoption of electric vehicles, heat pumps, and smart energy systems offers substantial emissions reduction potential, provided that electricity supply is increasingly low-carbon. However, large-scale deployment depends on infrastructure development, regulatory support, affordability, and consumer acceptance. In heavy industry, mitigation pathways are more

complex. Options such as material efficiency, fuel switching, process innovation, and carbon capture technologies are essential for addressing emissions that are difficult to eliminate using conventional approaches.

Land-use-based mitigation pathways emphasize ecosystem protection, forest restoration, and improved agricultural practices. Nature-based solutions can deliver multiple benefits, including carbon sequestration, biodiversity conservation, and livelihood support. Their success, however, depends on strong governance, secure land tenure, and safeguards to prevent social displacement or ecological harm.

5.3 Adaptation Pathways and Building Climate Resilience

Adaptation pathways aim to reduce vulnerability and enhance resilience to climate impacts that are already occurring or are unavoidable. Unlike mitigation, adaptation is inherently context-specific and closely linked to local development priorities. Effective adaptation involves integrating climate risk considerations into infrastructure planning, water management, agriculture, health systems, and urban development. Climate-resilient infrastructure forms a cornerstone of adaptation strategies. Investments in flood protection, resilient transport systems, and climate-proofed energy infrastructure can significantly reduce long-term economic losses and protect essential services. In agriculture, climate-smart practices such as drought-resistant crops, improved irrigation, and diversified livelihoods help maintain food security under changing climatic conditions. Urban adaptation is increasingly critical as cities concentrate populations, assets, and climate risks. Measures to manage heat stress, improve drainage, and enhance inclusive urban planning are essential, particularly for low-income communities. Successful adaptation pathways require participatory approaches that incorporate local knowledge and address social inequalities. Adaptation efforts that overlook community needs or power imbalances risk being ineffective or socially contested.

5.4 Finance, Technology, and Institutional Capacity as Enablers

The feasibility of sustainability pathways is strongly influenced by access to finance, technology, and institutional capacity. Transformational change demands substantial upfront investment, especially in developing countries where fiscal constraints and competing development priorities limit public spending. Aligning public and private financial flows with climate objectives is therefore a central challenge.

Innovative financial instruments such as green bonds, blended finance, and concessional lending can help mobilize resources and reduce investment risks. At the international level, reforming development finance institutions to better support adaptation and just transitions remains essential. Technology transfer and capacity-building initiatives also play a critical role by enabling countries to adopt and maintain low-carbon and climate-resilient solutions. However, technology alone cannot deliver sustainability. Governance quality, human capital, and institutional effectiveness are equally important. Strengthening planning systems, regulatory frameworks, and monitoring mechanisms enhances policy implementation and reduces the likelihood of failure or unintended consequences.

5.5 Governance and Implementation Bottlenecks

Despite the availability of viable sustainability pathways, implementation is frequently constrained by governance bottlenecks. Policy fragmentation across sectors and levels of government undermines coherence and weakens outcomes. Short political time horizons often discourage long-term investments, while limited stakeholder engagement can reduce social acceptance and legitimacy.

In many contexts, climate policies coexist with continued support for carbon-intensive activities, reflecting unresolved political economy tensions. These contradictions dilute policy signals and slow progress. Addressing them requires integrated policy frameworks that align climate objectives with economic development and social priorities. Just transition strategies, which aim to protect workers and communities affected by structural change, are increasingly recognized as essential for maintaining public support and minimizing social disruption. Monitoring and evaluation systems are also critical. Transparent tracking of progress enables learning, accountability, and course correction. Without reliable data and feedback mechanisms, sustainability pathways risk remaining aspirational rather than operational.

5.6 Integrating Equity and Just Transition Principles

Equity considerations are central to the legitimacy and durability of sustainability pathways. Climate action that disproportionately burdens vulnerable groups or excludes marginalized communities risks generating resistance and political backlash. Just transition principles emphasize fairness in the distribution of costs and benefits, inclusive decision-making processes, and the protection of livelihoods.

Policies that combine climate objectives with social protection such as targeted subsidies, retraining programs, and community investment can enhance public acceptance and reduce transition risks. At the international level, equity considerations reinforce the importance of financial and technological support for developing countries, consistent with climate justice principles. Integrating equity into pathway design is not only an ethical requirement but also a practical necessity for sustaining momentum and achieving long-term outcomes.

5.7 Translating Pathways into Action

The analysis of sustainability pathways demonstrates that viable solutions to climate change already exist across sectors and contexts. The central challenge lies in translating these pathways into coordinated, scalable action. Achieving this requires political leadership, institutional reform, and sustained investment, supported by scientific evidence and societal engagement.

Effective sustainability pathways must remain adaptive, inclusive, and grounded in local realities while aligned with global climate objectives. As the next domain argues, the narrowing window for action heightens the importance of immediate implementation. Decisions taken in the present decade will determine whether sustainability pathways remain achievable or become increasingly constrained by delay.

Domain V: The Critical Window of the Next Fifteen Years and the Limits of Post-2035 Recovery

6.1 Understanding the Narrowing Window for Climate Action

Recent climate science and policy analysis increasingly converge on a shared conclusion: the coming fifteen years represent a decisive and rapidly narrowing window for meaningful global climate action. This period, extending roughly until the mid-2030s, is defined by shrinking carbon budgets, accelerating physical impacts, and rising risks of irreversible environmental change. According to the IPCC's Sixth Assessment Report, global greenhouse gas emissions must peak almost immediately and decline steeply thereafter to retain a realistic chance of limiting warming to 1.5°C (**IPCC, 2023**).

The idea of a "closing window" reflects more than urgency; it captures a structural reality. Climate outcomes are shaped by cumulative emissions, meaning that delays in action cannot

simply be offset by faster reductions later. From a socio-economic perspective, decisions made today regarding infrastructure, energy systems, and land use will lock in emissions trajectories for decades. As a result, the next fifteen years constitute not just another policy phase, but a turning point that will determine whether climate stabilization remains achievable.

6.2 Carbon Budgets, Tipping Points, and Irreversible Change

Scientific evidence indicates that continued emissions growth significantly increases the risk of crossing climate tipping points thresholds beyond which changes in Earth systems become self-reinforcing and extremely difficult to reverse. These include the destabilization of polar ice sheets, large-scale forest dieback, permafrost thaw, and disruptions to ocean circulation. While uncertainties remain regarding the precise timing of these thresholds, research suggests that risks rise sharply as global temperatures exceed the 1.5–2°C range (**Armstrong McKay et al., 2022**).

Once such tipping points are crossed, subsequent mitigation efforts may be unable to restore previous climate conditions. This challenges the assumption that delayed action can be compensated through future technological advances or accelerated emissions reductions later in the century. Instead, climate risk exhibits a strong asymmetry: the consequences of delay are disproportionately larger than the costs of early action. Recovery from overshoot scenarios, if possible at all, is likely to be partial, prolonged, and socially disruptive.

6.3 Infrastructure Lock-In and Development Path Dependency

The coming fifteen years will also shape the long-term structure of global energy, transport, and urban systems. Infrastructure investments made during this period such as power plants, transport networks, industrial facilities, and buildings typically operate for several decades. If these investments continue to favor carbon-intensive technologies, they will embed high emissions pathways well beyond 2040.

IPCC assessments warn that emissions from existing and planned fossil fuel infrastructure alone could exceed the remaining carbon budget compatible with limiting warming to 1.5°C (**IPCC, 2023**). Retrofitting or retiring such assets prematurely would impose significant economic and political costs, particularly in developing economies. This path dependency underscores why near-term decisions carry disproportionate weight. Once carbon-intensive

systems are established, reversing them becomes increasingly expensive, politically contested, and socially disruptive.

6.4 Limits to Adaptation and Rising Loss and Damage

Delayed mitigation also constrains the effectiveness of adaptation. While adaptation measures can reduce vulnerability, they are subject to both physical and social limits. Extreme heat, sea-level rise, and ecosystem degradation may exceed adaptive capacity in many regions, particularly in small island states, low-lying coastal zones, and arid areas.

As warming intensifies, adaptation costs rise while effectiveness declines. Infrastructure designed for present-day climate conditions may fail under future extremes, and repeated climate shocks can erode community resilience over time (**UNEP, 2024**). In such contexts, adaptation shifts from risk prevention to damage management. The concept of loss and damage climate impacts that cannot be avoided through mitigation or adaptation has gained prominence as these limits become more apparent. Economic losses, cultural displacement, and irreversible ecological harm are expected to increase substantially if emissions reductions are delayed. These realities reinforce the conclusion that reliance on future recovery strategies cannot substitute for immediate action.

6.5 Technological Optimism and Its Constraints

Some climate pathways assume that future technologies such as large-scale carbon dioxide removal or geoengineering will enable recovery from delayed mitigation. While technological innovation is essential, excessive reliance on unproven solutions introduces significant uncertainty and risk. At present, carbon removal technologies operate at a scale far below what would be required to offset continued high emissions.

Rapid scaling would demand substantial land, energy, and financial resources, potentially creating new environmental and social trade-offs. Moreover, governance frameworks for such technologies remain underdeveloped, raising ethical, political, and geopolitical concerns. The IPCC cautions against treating future carbon removal as a justification for near-term inaction, emphasizing that early emissions reductions are more reliable, cost-effective, and equitable (**IPCC, 2023**).

6.6 Policy Urgency and Strategic Priorities

The evidence reviewed in this domain leads to a clear conclusion: the next fifteen years constitute a make-or-break period for global climate action. During this window, governments and institutions must prioritize policies with immediate and lasting impact. Key measures include phasing out unabated coal, accelerating renewable energy deployment, improving energy efficiency, and protecting critical ecosystems. Equally important is scaling up adaptation in vulnerable regions to prevent irreversible losses and humanitarian crises. Policy strategies should focus on actions that deliver near-term emissions reductions while building long-term resilience. Delaying action in anticipation of future recovery undermines both scientific evidence and policy realism. Beyond the mid-2030s, options narrow, costs escalate, and risks multiply.

6.7 The Present Decade as a Historical Turning Point

Viewed from a long-term perspective, the coming fifteen years are likely to be remembered as a defining chapter in humanity's response to climate change. Choices made during this period will determine whether societies stabilize the climate system or commit future generations to escalating disruption and constrained recovery options.

Recognizing this temporal urgency strengthens the case for immediate, coordinated, and equitable action. Aligning policies, institutions, and societal priorities within this narrowing window is essential for achieving global sustainability and avoiding irreversible climate outcomes. The challenge ahead is not a lack of knowledge, but the willingness and capacity to act decisively while meaningful options still remain

7. Conclusion and Policy Implications

Climate change stands as one of the most far-reaching and complex challenges confronting the global community in the twenty-first century. As this paper has demonstrated, it is not solely an environmental problem but a multidimensional crisis with deep implications for economic stability, social equity, institutional governance, and long-term sustainability. Scientific evidence leaves little ambiguity regarding the anthropogenic drivers of climate change or the accelerating pace of its impacts. At the same time, existing policy responses and governance arrangements remain insufficient to match the scale and urgency of the challenge.

The analysis of scientific risks and emissions patterns highlights that the central obstacle is no longer a lack of knowledge, but a persistent gap between understanding and action. Structural lock-ins across energy, transport, industry, and land-use systems continue to delay emissions reductions, while climate impacts increasingly test the limits of adaptation, particularly in vulnerable regions. The uneven distribution of both responsibility and harm reinforces climate change as an issue of global justice, demanding responses that go beyond efficiency and incorporate equity at their core.

An examination of global and national climate governance frameworks reveals a mixed picture. The Paris Agreement has succeeded in mobilizing near-universal participation and embedding climate considerations within national planning processes. However, the reliance on voluntary commitments, weak enforcement mechanisms, and fragmented domestic implementation has produced a persistent ambition gap. Climate finance commitments have fallen short of assessed needs, and adaptation remains significantly underfunded relative to mitigation. These shortcomings underscore the limits of incremental reform within existing governance structures.

The political economy analysis further demonstrates that climate action is shaped as much by power relations, vested interests, and institutional capacity as by technological feasibility. Fossil fuel dependence, policy incoherence, and unequal access to finance continue to constrain progress. At the same time, the growing role of civil society, indigenous communities, and knowledge actors highlights the importance of inclusive governance and social legitimacy in sustaining long-term climate action. The exploration of sustainability pathways confirms that viable solutions already exist across sectors. Clean energy transitions, resilient infrastructure, nature-based solutions, and inclusive adaptation strategies offer credible routes toward low-carbon and climate-resilient development. Yet the feasibility of these pathways is increasingly constrained by time. As argued in the preceding domain, the next fifteen years represent a critical window during which delayed action would sharply limit future options and increase reliance on uncertain recovery strategies. The notion that future technological breakthroughs can compensate for present inaction is neither scientifically robust nor politically realistic.

Taken together, these findings suggest that the defining challenge of climate governance lies not in designing new goals, but in accelerating implementation, strengthening institutions, and aligning political and economic incentives with long-term sustainability objectives.

Policy Implications

Several key policy implications emerge from this analysis.

First, policy urgency must be substantially elevated. Governments should move beyond incrementalism and prioritize measures with immediate and durable emissions-reduction impacts. These include the rapid phase-out of unabated coal, the removal of fossil fuel subsidies, accelerated deployment of renewable energy, and large-scale investments in energy efficiency. Delayed action will only increase transition costs and heighten climate risks.

Second, climate policy coherence must be strengthened. Climate objectives should be embedded across economic, industrial, and development planning processes rather than treated as a separate policy domain. Aligning short-term economic incentives with long-term climate goals requires stronger inter-ministerial coordination, regulatory consistency, and institutional accountability.

Third, international climate finance architecture requires reform. Scaling up adaptation finance, improving access for climate-vulnerable countries, and reducing borrowing costs are essential to addressing equity concerns and preventing irreversible losses. International financial institutions must align lending practices fully with climate goals and prioritize resilience alongside mitigation.

Fourth, just transition principles should guide implementation. Climate policies must explicitly address social impacts by protecting livelihoods, supporting affected workers and communities, and promoting inclusive decision-making. Equity is not an auxiliary concern but a prerequisite for political durability and social acceptance.

Finally, the present decade must be treated as a strategic inflection point. Decisions taken now will shape emissions trajectories, infrastructure systems, and adaptive capacity for generations. Effective climate governance therefore requires decisive leadership, institutional reform, and sustained societal engagement to act within this narrowing window of opportunity.

Closing Reflection

In conclusion, climate change is no longer a distant or abstract threat but a present reality with escalating consequences. The pathway to global sustainability remains open, but it is increasingly constrained by delay and inaction. Whether the international community succeeds in stabilizing the climate system will depend on its ability to translate scientific knowledge into policy, commitments into implementation, and urgency into lasting institutional change.

REFERENCE

Armstrong McKay, D. I., Staal, A., Abrams, J. F., Winkelmann, R., Sakschewski, B., Loriani, S., Fetzer, I., Cornell, S. E., Rockström, J., & Lenton, T. M. (2022). Exceeding 1.5°C global warming could trigger multiple climate tipping points. Science, 377(6611), eabn7950. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abn7950

Abbass, K., Qasim, M. Z., Song, H., Murshed, M., Mahmood, H., & Younis, I. (2022). A review of the global climate change impacts, adaptation, and sustainable mitigation measures. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 29(28), 42539–42559. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-19718-6

Falkner, R. (2023). Global climate governance after Paris: Fragmentation, polycentricity and coordination. Global Environmental Politics, 23(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1162/glep_a_00680

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2023). AR6 Synthesis Report: Climate change 2023. IPCC. https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/syr/

International Energy Agency (IEA). (2024). World energy outlook 2024. IEA. https://www.iea.org/reports/world-energy-outlook-2024

International Monetary Fund (IMF). (2023). Global fossil fuel subsidies remain large: An update based on country-level estimates. IMF. https://www.imf.org

Murshed, M., & Dao, N. T. T. (2022). Revisiting the CO_2 emission–economic growth nexus: A global perspective. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 29(2), 2070–2088. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-15719-0

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2023). Climate finance provided and mobilised by developed countries in 2016–2021. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org

Our World in Data. (2024). CO_2 and greenhouse gas emissions. https://ourworldindata.org/co2-and-greenhouse-gas-emissions

Oxfam. (2023). Climate finance shadow report 2023: Assessing progress towards the $100 billion goal. Oxfam International. https://www.oxfam.org

Rockström, J., Gupta, J., Lenton, T. M., Qin, D., Lade, S. J., Abrams, J. F., Jacobson, L., Rocha, J. C., Zimm, C., Bai, X., Bala, G., Bringezu, S., Broadgate, W., Bunn, S. E., DeClerck, F., Ebi, K. L., Gong, P., Gordon, L. J., Kanie, N., … Winkelmann, R. (2017). A roadmap for rapid decarbonization. Science, 355(6331), 1269–1271. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aah3443

Setzer, J., & Higham, C. (2022). Global trends in climate change litigation: 2022 snapshot. Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment. https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2022). Human development report 2021–22: Uncertain times, unsettled lives. UNDP. https://hdr.undp.org

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). (2024). Adaptation gap report 2024: Coming clean on adaptation finance. UNEP. https://www.unep.org

United Nations Environment Programme Finance Initiative (UNEP FI). (2023). Integrity matters: Net-zero commitments by financial institutions. UNEP FI. https://www.unepfi.org

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). (2024). Nationally determined contributions under the Paris Agreement. UNFCCC. https://unfccc.int

World Bank. (2024). State and trends of carbon pricing 2024. World Bank. https://www.worldbank.org

Newell, P. (2021). Power shift: The global political economy of energy transitions. Cambridge University Press. https://wires.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/wcc.733