

J20 SUMMIT DRAFT RESOLUTIONS - 3 SEPTEMBER 2025

SESSION 1 - ADVANCING JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY; PRESERVING THE RULE OF LAW AND REINFORCING JUDICIAL SECURITY IN AN EVOLVING GLOBAL LANDSCAPE

Preamble

We, participants of the 2025 J20 Summit, recognize that our gathering is taking place in a rapidly changing technological world where socio-economic inequality is deepening polarization in society, hardening anti-constitutional beliefs and entrenching a swing towards populist authoritarianism among citizens and leaders.

Attacks on the judiciary are a daily reality. Judges face an onslaught of threats and violent criticism through social media affecting their physical and psychological safety.

The discussions this week have underscored the importance of maintaining an independent and accountable judiciary, whose safety is ensured, to preserve the rule-of-law and protect the rights of all citizens.

Technology used in modern-day cyber-crime transcends boundaries and poses new challenges, thus requiring judicial collaboration.

We are mindful that a balance must be reached between using technological innovation such as AI and dispensing justice, which is inclusive. We recognize that while global harmonization of regulation for AI is essential, designing such

technologies must be contextual and inclusive of hyper-localities using design and concepts from the Global South.

We are living in an era of environmental catastrophe - one that is not constrained by national boundaries but poses a cross-border existential quandary for humanity and threatens the fundamental right to life. Climate justice therefore implies justice shared between countries, and courts would be expected to play an increased role in this regard.

Mindful of this imperative to safeguard our collective futures, we propose the following resolutions:

Proposed resolutions

1. Judicial security is a cornerstone of judicial independence. It is a constitutional imperative. The importance of judicial independence in the protection of democracy and the vindication of human rights in a rapidly changing world has been underscored by our discussion today.
2. We recognize the tension that sometimes exists between judicial independence on the one hand, and judicial accountability on the other. We must take care that efforts to promote judicial independence are crafted to not inadvertently compromise accountability.
3. Court processes and documents must be made accessible to the public through technology, likewise the reasoning behind judgments to counter opacity problems the public may encounter regarding these. This will deepen public trust in the judiciary.

4. Technology can increase judicial accountability by providing the public with increased access to the judicial system. However, technology provides new dangers to judges, who increasingly face social media and cyber-attacks. It is important that we take steps to ensure judges' data and personal security while training of judges to safely engage with technology must be encouraged.
5. We have heard how intolerance, rising authoritarianism, even in traditional democracies, and discrimination threaten the rule-of law and peace globally. This gathering should consider developing a protocol to express criticism against such action and solidarity with Judiciaries in various jurisdictions.

SESSION TWO: BALANCING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE INNOVATION WITH FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS IN JUDICIAL SYSTEMS

Proposed resolutions

1. The use of AI in the judicial system carries much potential for increasing efficiencies. However, we cannot abdicate humans' supervision in developing these tools or the responsibility for decision-making.
2. We recognize that AI, at least in its current state, has limitations and its use in the judicial system carries risks and pitfalls. Suitable precautions must be implemented for the use of AI in the judicial system within safe boundaries. to strengthen dignity rather than codify discrimination.
3. It is useful for courts to issue guidelines to court users (both lawyers and lay litigants) to educate them about the use of generative AI when they participate in the court process, to prevent misuse.
4. The summit acknowledges the importance of developing a common AI governance mechanism which can be applied in laws. Transnational

cooperation should be a priority when it comes to the preservation of human rights under law.

5. As AI continues to grow in its capabilities and the scope of its applications, the courts must keep abreast of developments to ensure that they can properly oversee the use of AI in the judicial system. Continuing judicial education, dialogues and exchanges are useful platforms to encourage communication and collaboration between judiciaries.

SESSION THREE: CLIMATE CHANGE JUSTICE THROUGH JUDICIAL COLLABORATION

Proposed resolutions:

1. We recognize that not all G20 Members have the same legal system, and that those which do not have a separate Bill of Rights may be presented with a different approach to environmental law to those which do.
2. We recognize that climate change litigation may require a greater transnational component, especially where there are cross-border or intergenerational claims for relief
3. We recognize the ‘drop in the ocean’ problem of causation for our courts in trying to identify what actual effect acts or emissions have had on global climate change, and we see this as a critical point for discussion amongst ourselves
4. We recognize that climate change is a quintessential issue, an existential crisis, and we have a huge responsibility. We need to obtain expertise and act accordingly. This is no longer optional but imperative

5. We should consider meaningful public participation and acknowledge that it is time for judiciaries to play a more active role in ensuring we reflect proportional contributions from the public to strengthen the voice of climate justice.

Combatting cybercrime: Strengthening cross-border judicial cooperation.

1. We recognise that cybercrime is borderless, and therefore, our responses should be similarly unconstrained. To this end, and harmonisation collaboration between jurisdictions and nations through diplomacy, agreements between states and multilateral treaties are essential to building coherent responses and global uniformity.
2. We believe a global correspondence of offences database needs to be built, and that cooperation between jurisdictions requires a certain standardising to recognise court documents and directives in different jurisdictions. This would require an understanding of individual nation's requirements to reduce delays in investigation and prosecution.
3. Law retains a relationship with jurisdictional identity so we must look for common priorities.
4. We understand it is imperative to safeguard citizens' rights to data privacy especially when this is held by one state, or it is moved between states where there may be uneven statutory protections or the threat of that information being abused by state and non-state actors. This right must be balanced with society's interests in sharing information and pursuing prosecutions.
5. We recognise that modern legal procedures need to be developed alongside the development of technologically driven forensic capacity to assist the combatting of cybercrime.

6. We recognise that we must not be pessimistic, and that behind all of these developments still lie the values of civilisation, basic laws that reflect our ways of life, and the everlasting features of human nature and social relations

-ENDS-