

# Towards a Post-SDGs Era - Progress and Challenges of the SDGs

TOKUGAWA Shinji\*

## 1. Introduction

International peace, which is the educational philosophy of Ritsumeikan University, and the theme of this symposium, has yet to be achieved. While the causes of conflicts are varied, one important factor of them is the disparity between rich and poor. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is an effort to eliminate the causes of conflicts in order to eradicate this poverty. The SDGs was adopted by the UN General Assembly in 2015, setting 2030 as the target year for achievement. However, despite only five years remaining until 2030, various international circumstances have led to a result that achieving these goals would be difficult.

Therefore, after examining the progress of the SDGs from various angles, it is anticipated that serious discussions on post-SDGs will begin in 2027. This paper will provide an overview of the efforts made to achieve the SDGs to date and consider how we should approach this issue.

## 2. What are the SDGs?

The SDGs is the international goal that the 193 member states of the United Nations aim to achieve from 2016 until 2030. Based on the shared philosophy of “No one will be left behind,” the SDGs sets 17 goals and 169 targets for achieving them. Furthermore, on July 6, 2017, two years after the adoption of the SDGs, the UN General Assembly placed 232 indicators as the lower layer of targets of the SDGs. The SDGs is measured through the three-tiered structure of goals, targets, and indicators. The SDGs, building on decades of work by states and the UN, is incorporated into “Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development” adopted by the UN General Assembly. The SDGs is based on the concept of “transformation” and indicates the direction of that “transformation.”

The SDGs is a flexible agreement designed to address the shortcomings of the MDGs, which the UN General Assembly adopted in 2000, and do not clearly define any obligations.

---

\* Professor, College of Law, Ritsumeikan University.

As mentioned above, the SDGs sets goals but do not address the means to achieve them; it is established from a “goal-setting” perspective. Furthermore, the SDGs comprehensively addresses economic, environmental, and social issues related to the issue of “sustainable development,” leaving specific initiatives up to each player (governments, international organizations, companies, various organizations, individuals, etc.). As such, the SDGs has unique characteristics and is indicated to be the first in history to approach global governance with such a new strategy<sup>1)</sup>. In other words, unlike written international law such as international treaties, which clearly state rights and obligations, the SDGs is not legally binding. However, the SDGs three-tiered structure of goals, targets, and indicators to measure progress comprises a competitive principle. Therefore, each actor puts these goals into practice based on the pledges he voluntarily makes in accordance with the goals set out in the SDGs<sup>2)</sup>.

### 3. Current Status of the SDGs and Directions for Breakthrough

To this day, the term “sustainable development” has consistently been given high priority in documents of international conferences led by the United Nations, as will be discussed later, and it has successfully become established as an ideal and policy position that the international community should strive for.

However, despite this ideal, progress toward the SDGs remains quite challenging. In the years since 2019, the prolonged impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, escalatory conflicts, geopolitical tensions, and worsening climate change disruptions have significantly hindered progress toward the SDGs. As a result, even progress that had been steady up until then has been reversed. According to the 2025 SDGs Report, approximately 18% of the SDGs are on track to be achieved, or 35% even if slow progress is included. Meanwhile, the same number of goals are reported to have stagnated or regressed, making it extremely difficult to achieve the goals by 2030<sup>3)</sup>. Developing countries face heavy debt burdens, even as they seek to implement measures to achieve the SDGs. It has been reported that the funding gap for development has been widening since the 2020s. The *2024 Sustainable Development Financing Report: Financing for Development at a Crossroads* points the need for urgent measures to mobilize large amounts of funds to close the development financing gap, currently estimated at US\$4.2 trillion per year<sup>4)</sup>. Least developed countries are estimated to hover around US\$40 billion in annual debt repayments between 2023 and 2025<sup>5)</sup>, a more than 50% increase from US\$26 billion in 2022<sup>6)</sup>. It has been reported that more than half of the rapid increase in debt of developing countries is due to the increasing intensity and frequency of climate-related disasters. This rising debt burden of developing countries is widening the gap between rich and poor, resulting in growing inequality both among countries and among individuals.

## **4. Expectations for Non-State Actors**

### **1) Involvement of Non-State Actors in the International Community**

The United Nations, as an organization founded by states and composed of them, respects state sovereignty and recognizes that states play key roles in the international community. However, this is not meant to be state-centrism, and the Charter contains provisions for channels with civil society directly, without the mediation of states. This point is particularly evident in the field of international economic and social cooperation, where Article 71 of the UN Charter, which stipulates the relationship with private organizations, supports that the UN has been aiming to expand these channels in recent years. One of the reasons is that, in the wake of experiences such as pandemics and other global disasters, growing trends towards strengthening state sovereignty and prioritizing state interests in various fields under the guise of “security” are increasing. Another point is the growing recognition of the importance of civil society’s role in decision-making processes within the international community. The latter point could be summarized in at least three ways; first, there is a growing recognition that more than state actions are required to resolve global emergencies such as pandemics, and that the participation of civil society and the private sector is essential; second, the economic power of the private sector has the potential to far surpass that of nation states, and the leverage of such power could resolve crises in the international community; finally, there are cases where demands from civil society have motivated states or even changed norms.

However, even if we aim to relativize dependence on state will in this way, international organizations are fundamentally institutions that carry out powers granted by the founding states. These powers are used to pursue the interests of the member states themselves, which cannot be realized by each member state. Therefore, conflicts may arise with the active utilization of civil society in this manner. Consequently, the United Nations faces the contradictory challenge of striving to realize the interests of its member states while simultaneously relativizing the power of those member states.

### **2) Expectations for Private Companies to Achieve the SDGs**

International law governs relations between states and fundamentally clarifies the relationships between their rights and obligations. Therefore, non-state actors, such as private companies, are governed through the mediation of states and state power. However, the United Nations has directly accessed and built relationships with non-state actors who possess influence exceeding that of states. This has been evident since the UN’s inception, and the UN Charter was constructed as a framework for multilateralism that includes non-state actors. However, this function was within the field of social, economic, and international cooperation; security remained exclusively dependent on the political and

military influence of the five major powers and was not understood as a field in which non-state actors could participate.

While this trend remains unchanged today, there is growing expectation for the participation and contribution of non-state actors in the field of social, economic, and international cooperation, and this trend is strengthening. However, it is inaccurate to show that non-state actors cannot be involved in security. In reality, they contribute indirectly to security. Furthermore, if security is sought in the passive maintenance of peace—the preservation of the *status quo* without armed conflicts—then it will depend on the military and political power of major powers. However, non-state actors may also make significant contributions to eliminating the root causes of potential conflicts. In fact, the field of social, economic, and international cooperation emphasizes this point, and the SDGs could be considered an active approach to peacebuilding.

This shift towards building an order that aims to correct structural inequalities can be seen as a transformation from a post-war order focused solely on military security to one aimed at eliminating economic disparities, sought by developing countries, arising out of the changes in the global structure brought about by the emergence of developing countries based on the right to self-determination. Within this context, the emergence and development of human rights norms in the international community, stemming from the idea of protecting human life and fighting discrimination that began after World War II, elevated human rights protection to a common interest of the international community, and this has supported the development of an international order that focuses on people.

For example, the United Nations held the United Nations Summit of the Future in September 2024, where the “Pact for the Future” was adopted<sup>7)</sup>. According to the Pact, states shall make clear commitments on various global issues, with strong attention to human rights, gender, and sustainable development, and resolve to achieve concrete results. Furthermore, the Pact outlines environmental directions not only for the current generation but also for future generations.

To achieve this, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) have essentially been established, but securing funding and closing the SDG funding gap does not rely solely on the usual form of government funding. States have agreed to make bold changes, including private sector financing, rather than relying solely on states. This consent indicates that, going forward, the SDGs will not only relativize the role of states in their implementation, but will also develop significantly based on business success, i.e., profit-seeking, and that the voice of the private sector has the potential to be greatly reflected in building order in the international community.

In response to this, the Fourth International Conference on Financing for Development (FfD4), held in June 2025, discussed the financial shortfalls needed to achieve the SDGs. The United Nations has emphasized its expectations for the private sector in order to fill the gap left by the Trump administration’s drastic cuts in ODA, calling for direct private

investment, arguing that investments in achieving the SDGs are profitable. In other words, the UN itself welcomes capital investment from the private sector, and is characterized by its explicit statement that it will promote investment not as the usual aid-oriented approach by NGOs, but as an extension of business.

The introduction of the principle of competition and the acceptance of profit-seeking in the SDGs is advantageous for the private sector. International organizations only set goals, leaving the means and process of achieving them to each entity's discretion. In other words, the degree to which goals are achieved is the evaluation standard, and determines the reputation associated with the actions taken by each entity. Therefore, the private sector is granted discretion within the scope of its compatibility with the international goals set by the International Organizations, allowing it to pursue its own interests based on the principle of competition. In other words, the private sector can gain legitimacy from the UN for its own profit-seeking in the name of achieving the international goals of the SDGs. The legitimacy of the actual substance of the international implementation plans presented so far can not be questioned, and the private sector could gain legitimacy for pursuing its own interests under the guise of achieving international goals.

The United Nations appears to aim for a win-win relationship, achieving its goals by leveraging the power of the private sector and relying on capitalist economic activity. However, while the private sector operates independently of the state, it utilizes the state for its own profit-seeking, and therefore cannot be completely separated from the state. Rather, it is quite possible that the private sector will leverage the power of states that it deems to be of high utility to shape the order and structure of the international community. Given that such a selective and close relationship between the state and the private sector exists within the existing order, it is important to observe how the UN will intervene in this structure and transform it into the social structure it deems desirable.

## **5. Forming International Norms for the Post-SDGs Era**

### **1) Creating a Legal Environment for Private Business Activities**

For the United Nations to rely on the power of private companies to create the order it desires, it is naturally required to remove barriers that hinder the activities of those private companies and creating a legal environment that facilitates their activities. Therefore, the UN is inevitably expected to play an active role in creating that order.

The FfD4 mentioned above recognize that “private business activities, investments, and innovations are key drivers and catalysts for sustainable development, inclusive economic growth, the digital transition, and the creation of decent jobs.”<sup>8)</sup> To achieve this, legal frameworks are being proposed to reform and modernize the outdated international financial architecture and harmonize international rules on trade, investment, and finance. Specific examples include inclusive and effective international tax cooperation and the establishment

of a global minimum tax level for the wealthy.

Recognizing the active involvement of private companies in this way necessitates the creation of a legal environment that allows the private sector to maximize its potential, not only domestically but also internationally. This naturally leads to a demand for the internationalization of suitable environments for business and the creation of new norms, and the expansion of the international influence by developed states with the necessary expertise. In other words, it creates a struggle for leadership among developed nations regarding the formation of international norms.

Originally, the beneficiaries of the values envisioned in the SDGs were clearly defined as “vulnerable” or “victims” who, due to structural reasons in the international community, are not directly affected by those values. In this sense, the proponents and beneficiaries shall be assumed to be fundamentally separate. However, strongly advocating for the participation of private companies does not necessarily fully reflect this assumption. Nevertheless, strongly promoting the participation of private organizations could lead to the relativization of state-led norm formation. This is significant because it challenges the structure in which “the country that advocates the values” equals “the beneficiary of the values.” However, given that corporations, and even NGOs, are primarily composed of entities from developed countries, and that non-state actors are the entities that influence the values of developed countries, the danger of the “country that advocates the values” = “beneficiary of the values” structure remaining within developed countries could not be denied. In other words, in an international society where the advocates of values and norms are typically the beneficiaries of those values and norms, and that beneficiary is the state, the principle of competition among private sectors emerges through the creation of international norms for the private sector’s own profit-seeking, mediated by developed countries. Rather, it could be argued that this is obscured in the name of the participation of non-state actors for the SDGs, potentially leading to a struggle for “beneficiary” status among developed countries.

## **2) Forming International Norms Integrating Society, Environment, and Economy**

On the other hand, actors such as civil society are beginning to exert influence in normalizing the ideals that underpin the achievement of the SDGs, accelerating this movement in cooperation with developing countries, which are currently the most negatively affected in the international community.

The SDGs themselves contain little reference to international norms. In other words, they do not clearly define specific norms, and instead expect all actors to act according to their respective capabilities toward the set international goals. For this reason, some researchers have criticized the lack of international norms to support these goals, and have attempted to clarify and match them with existing norms. In this process, international human rights norms and standards have been recognised as norms which researchers have

attracted attention to as a central role. The idea of viewing society, economy, and environment as interdependent arises within international norms, and in particular, the development of the concept of human rights has traditionally been indicated to play a significant role in the interdependence from the perspective of guaranteeing human survival for future generations.

Human rights are closely linked to “society,” the target of change under the SDGs. For example, regarding the relationship between “economy” and human rights, issues concerning the economic order, including food security, are now being called for a restructuring of the order based on Article 11, paragraph 2 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and human rights impact assessments might be conducted on related businesses and national practices. While the idea of connecting society and economy, and human rights has been addressed by the ILO, this idea has been taken a step further, and the concept of human rights is receiving even greater attention as it encompasses the entire SDGs. Concern for the “environment,” which has gained attention in the international community since the 1970s, has begun to strengthen its connection with human rights more than ever before. One manifestation of this connection shows the rapid increase in recognition of the right to a clean and healthy environment as a human right internationally in recent years. In July 2022, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution recognizing the “right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment” as a human right, following the Human Rights Council’s adoption<sup>9)</sup> in 2021, without opposition<sup>10)</sup>. The Secretary-General described this resolution as a “historic resolution” that “will also help States accelerate the implementation of their environmental and human rights obligations and commitments.”<sup>11)</sup>

This trend was strengthened in April 2024 when the European Court of Human Rights ruled that Switzerland’s climate change measures were insufficient to fulfill its obligation to mitigate the adverse effects on life safety, health, and quality of life, thus violating Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights, which guarantees respect for private life<sup>12)</sup>. This ruling clarified the relationship between environmental protection and human rights protection. The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea also issued an advisory opinion in May of the same year, albeit limited to marine environmental issues, clarifying the state’s obligations regarding the impact of climate change on the marine environment<sup>13)</sup>. Furthermore, in May 2025, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, in its advisory opinion, confirmed that the “right to a healthy environment” is an independent human right, including the right to a “healthy climate.”<sup>14)</sup> It also clarified that states have not only a negative obligation to avoid environmental destruction, but also a positive obligation to promote the regeneration and restoration of ecosystems. Finally, in July 2025, the International Court of Justice, in its advisory opinion, unanimously stated that “the protection of the environment is a precondition for the enjoyment of human rights, whose promotion is one of the purposes of the United Nations as set out in Article 1, paragraph 3,

of the UN Charter,”<sup>15)</sup> pointing out that addressing climate change is crucial for protecting fundamental human rights,<sup>16)</sup> and, under international law, the human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment is essential for the enjoyment of other human rights<sup>17)</sup>.

Thus, attempts are being made to extract norms from the goals and initiatives incorporated into the SDGs through the judicial process, and there is a growing trend to limit the scope of discretion held by entities, mainly states, regarding the SDGs.

However, as mentioned above, a power struggle is currently underway regarding the formation of international norms. For example, with the expectation of private sector participation, norm formation is seen as a way to create conditions for this, and there are movements to use these norms to pursue state interests. Naturally, this leads to a passive attitude towards linking these norms to human rights.

## 6. Normative “Innovation” Demanded by the International Community

When we examine the SDGs, which are goal-based, and look at the items they target, we notice that many of them relate to social rights within human rights norms. Therefore, even if each SDG item is incorporated into human rights norms, the choice of means to achieve the SDGs will inevitably be left to the discretion of each state. In other words, it is a framework that emphasizes the degree of state will and involvement in the realization of human rights, that is, a framework that inevitably allows state control. Consequently, when a crisis arises in the domestic situation, the reinforcement of state control under the guise of national security is justified by embedding the securing of social rights elements within a nationalistic policy. This situation has the most serious impact on states that lack resources. Strengthening “(international) solidarity,” as embedded in the SDGs, is what emerges to overcome this. The emergence of “solidarity” as a principle of international law and a human right in the political arena, as mentioned in the “Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration” (A/RES/73/195) adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 19, 2018, and the draft negotiating text for the WHO Pandemic Agreement issued on October 30, 2023 (A/INB/7/3), highlights the normative concept that international law must develop to adequately address the challenges of a globalized world. We could indicate that a situation is beginning to emerge in which “solidarity” needs to be transformed from a purely political discourse into a legal one. In this regard, it is noteworthy that the Declaration on the Right to Development, adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1986, has once again received renewed attention in the context of the SDGs, which emphasize the essentiality of maintaining and strengthening “international solidarity.” The Human Rights Council is currently drafting a “Covenant on the Right to Development” in 2023<sup>18)</sup>.

Another important concept is the “human rights of future generations.” In 1997, UNESCO adopted the “Declaration on the Responsibilities of the Present Generation

towards Future Generations,” emphasizing the “need to establish new, equitable, global partnerships and links of intragenerational solidarity, and to promote intergenerational solidarity, for the perpetuation of humanity” (Preamble), which was previously present in international documents such as the United Nations. It also stated that “present generations have a responsibility to ensure that the needs and interests of present and future generations are adequately protected” (Article 1). Furthermore, the 2012 UN Secretary-General’s report “Intergenerational solidarity and the needs of future generations” and the 2021 UN Secretary-General’s report “Our Common Agenda”<sup>19)</sup> were published, and in response, the “Declaration on Future Generations”<sup>20)</sup> was adopted at the 2024 UN Future Summit. According to this declaration, it is the responsibility of the present generation to “seize opportunities to leave a better future for future generations, and to meet the demands of the present while protecting the needs and interests of future generations without leaving anyone behind.” It explicitly states that measures should be taken to systematically consider the impact on the future, thereby consciously avoiding foreseeable harm to future generations and protecting their interests. This idea has also been discussed in the context of the responsibility for protection and improvement of the environment in the 1972 Declaration on the Human Environment, the 1992 Rio Declaration, and the 2015 Paris Agreement, and is spoken of as aiming for compatibility between economic and social activities and environmental protection. Thus, this idea is almost always explicitly stated in recent international documents. Furthermore, the content of the Future Summit, like the UNESCO Declaration<sup>21)</sup>, emphasized the importance of the initiative of future generations and young people, ensuring their freedom to choose systems and maintain a peaceful environment. It explicitly stated that the current generation has an obligation to invest in education and health for them. In this respect, while it began with environmental protection, it clarified the existence of generations different from the current generation, who are the bearers of modern international society, within a comprehensive normative structure that extends beyond the field of environmental protection. This represents a further step in ensuring intergenerational consideration throughout the entire framework.

This structure could call for a structural transformation in the generation of human rights norms centered on the current generation. In other words, it demands the creation of norms that respect the initiative of future generations, including minors who need protection from the current generation, and future generations yet to be born. However, these issues have drawn criticism not only because of their ambiguity regarding the subject of rights, but also because the content of the rights is too broad and can change significantly depending on the external factors in which the subject is located. As a result, the realization as human rights norms and the codification into treaties has been criticized by Western countries. However, the emergence of these norms, which depart from individual approaches that emphasize accountability and redress, is well-suited to the SDGs, which emphasize solidarity and change. They create a legal discourse calling for liberation from global

subjugation to socio-economic structures<sup>22)</sup>. Rather than relying on hard law, these norms represent a “successful” example of a structural approach that seeks to raise normative awareness and change through support and reputation from the international community and civil society, which seeks social structural change. This structure can be seen as a manifestation of norm creation seeking structural change by moving away from hard law approaches or judicial resolution approaches, and as an expectation for the generation and development of human rights norms through soft law.

## **In Conclusion**

Many commentators believe that the SDGs will be no fundamentally changed in discussion toward the post-SDGs, which are scheduled to begin in 2027. While some argue that the goals should continue as they are, others are calling for changes. For example, Japan, under its Ministry of Foreign Affairs, established the “Expert Panel on International Sustainability” to consider how to ensure growth and sustainability in 2024<sup>23)</sup>. At its fourth meeting in September 2024, an “Interim Report” was released<sup>24)</sup>. The report places “individual well-being = improving quality of life” as a core pillar of post-SDGs<sup>25)</sup>, and explores the creation of indicators and quantifications to achieve growth and sustainability across the international community. The report outlined several key points, including the importance of a new social collaboration model in the era of decentralization and diversity, a shift from individualism to a “we”-centered way of thinking and acting (“We-turn”), and a well-being perspective that focuses not only on results but also on the process. Post-SDGs is seen as realizing values closely related to these, and a combination of sustainability and well-being is gaining traction. We will not examine in detail here how this direction of consideration can connect with the international community movements mentioned above. However, the report does indicate a framework that aims to restructure the social and economic structure through digital transformation, with the goal of “improving the quality of life” underpinned by it. Although we could not elaborate on it here, this trend aligns with the fact that digital policies, which have a significant disparity between developed and developing countries, are being discussed at international conferences, in response to the accelerating active use of private companies. Post-SDGs, with their direction outlined using words like “well-being,” “we,” and “well-going,” could be seen as a shift towards a more human rights-oriented approach, while still emphasizing the economy and the environment. On the other hand, advances in science and technology are spurring digital transformation efforts in various countries, meaning that these measures have already taken steps toward fundamental transformations of social and economic structures toward sustainable growth and prosperity. In response to these developments, the United Nations adopted the Digital Declaration of 2024, mentioning the acceleration of SDGs by closing the digital divide and the development of digital spaces that respect and promote human rights<sup>26)</sup>. From this, it is

necessary to create Post-SDGs that encompass well-being in both the physical and cyber worlds. In that case, the growth of the ideology supporting new social collaboration models and the norms that underpin them will likely attract attention.

Finally, as discussed above, the underlying principle of the SDGs is the concept of “transformation” from the *status quo*. From the perspective of research and education at universities, it is noteworthy that the aforementioned ICJ advisory opinion was issued. 27 law students of the University of the South Pacific in Vanuatu, a country facing the threat of national extinction due to climate change, were asked, in a 2019 “free participation extracurricular seminar”, “What are the most effective legal methods for combating climate change?” This prompted them to take action and initiate a movement<sup>27)</sup>. This led to the Vanuatu government and other countries requesting an advisory opinion from the UN General Assembly. The UN Future Summit called for the active participation of “youth and future generations.”<sup>28)</sup> Witnessing this symbolic result in which university education has set the international order in motion, it seems that universities have significant roles to play in achieving the SDGs and post-SDGs.

- 1) Norichika KANIE, *Jizokukanouna Kaihatsumokuhyo towa nanika: 2030nen he muketa Henkaku no Agenda (What is the SDGs: Agenda for Innovation Towards 2030)*, Minerva Shobo, 2017, p.1.
- 2) Furthermore, as a successor to the MDGs, the SDGs possesses the following characteristics: ① it aims to integrate and harmonize the three pillars of environment, economy, and society, ② it is a comprehensive and integrated goal that involves diverse fields, ③ it explicitly states the commitment to “leaving no one behind, ④ it is a goal based on the concept of “transformation, ⑤ it was formulated through a democratic process, ⑥ it applies to all countries and regions, ⑦ it emphasizes localization. It positions all people as stakeholders in working towards the SDGs and supports grassroots efforts by people.
- 3) [https://www.unic.or.jp/files/UN-SDG-Report-2025-Social-Media-Cards-for-language-translation\\_J-19\\_L.jpg](https://www.unic.or.jp/files/UN-SDG-Report-2025-Social-Media-Cards-for-language-translation_J-19_L.jpg) (final access on 10th March, 2026)
- 4) 2024 Financing for Sustainable Development Report: Financing for Development at a Crossroads, p.84; this figure has ballooned since the pandemic, rising from \$2.5 trillion before the COVID-19 pandemic. Meanwhile, rising geopolitical tensions, climate-related disasters, and a global cost of living crisis are hitting billions of people and hindering progress on healthcare, education, and other development goals.
- 5) Ibid., p.149.
- 6) Ibid., p.122.
- 7) UN Doc. A/RES/79/1.
- 8) Compromiso de SEVILLA - FfD4 Outcome Document, Outcome document of the Fourth International Conference on Financing for Development, para.31.
- 9) UN Doc. A/HRC/RES/48/13.
- 10) UN Doc. A/Res/76/300.
- 11) UN Doc. SG/SM/21386.
- 12) Verein KlimaSeniorinnen Schweiz v. Switzerland, Judgment of 9 April 2024, Application no. 53600/20[GC].

- 13) ITLOS, Advisory Opinion No.31 (2024).
- 14) IACtHR, AO-32/25 (2025).
- 15) ICJ, Advisory Opinion concerning Obligations of States in Respect of Climate Change (2025), para.373.
- 16) Ibid., para.386.
- 17) Ibid., para.393.
- 18) UN Doc. A/HRC/54/50.
- 19) UN Doc. A/68/322.
- 20) UN Doc. A/RES/79/1.
- 21) Declaration on the Responsibilities of the Present Generations Towards Future Generations (1997).
- 22) Kaoru OBATA, 'Kokusaijinken no Shiso to Kokuminkokka no Kihonho toshiteno Kenpo niyoru Kihonkenhogo tono aida(Between the Thought of International Human Rights and the Protection of Constitution Rights)', *Ho no Kagaku (Science in Law)*, Vol.56 (2025), p.47.
- 23) [https://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/press/release/pressit\\_000001\\_00615.html](https://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/press/release/pressit_000001_00615.html) (final access on 10th March, 2026)
- 24) <https://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/files/100719498.pdf> (final access on 10th March, 2026)
- 25) Ibid., p.7.
- 26) Actions 28 to 33 and Annex I (Global Digital Compact) of the Pact for the Future (UN Doc. A/RES/79/1).
- 27) See, Pacific Islands Students Fighting Climate Change Home page, at <https://www.pisfcc.org/> (final access on 10th March, 2026)
- 28) Actions 36 and 37 of the Pact for the Future (UN Doc. A/RES/79/1).