

2002 Kananaskis Interim Compliance Report March 2003

**Professor John Kirton, Dr. Ella Kokotsis and the
University of Toronto G8 Research Group**

The University of Toronto's G8 Research Group has completed the first phase of the 2002 Kananaskis Compliance Report. This phase takes the form of a new, Interim Compliance Report. It focuses on the extent to which the previous Summit's priority commitments have been complied with by the time the G7/8 hosting and chair passes, on January 1 each year, from one member country to the next.

In this first effort to produce an interim compliance report, compliance is reported not precisely as of January 1 for each country for each priority issue, but for compliance within a broader time "window" from January 1 into the first few months of 2003. Additional care should be taken in interpreting these results, as none of the earlier compliance studies provide comparable comparative data on how much compliance comes during the first six months following a Summit, rather than during the full year prior to the subsequent Summit taking place. This Interim Compliance Report has been produced as a preliminary diagnostic, as an invitation for others to provide more complete information on country compliance with their 2002 commitments, and for G8 member countries and other stakeholders to have some indication as to their compliance progress to date, as a foundation for action in the time before the 2003 Evian Summit takes place. Following past practice, the regular Compliance Report will be made available on this web site by mid-May; two weeks prior to the 2003 Evian-les-Bains G8 Summit in France.

A summary of the interim compliance scores is listed in the table A with an individual analytic assessment by country and issue area below. Although the final report will provide a comprehensive analytic assessment of the 2002 Kananaskis scores, some preliminary observations can be made based on the interim results.

Since the conclusion of the Kananaskis Summit in June 2002, the G7/G8 members have complied with their priority commitments made in 13 major issue areas 25% of the time (see Table A). This average is based on a scale whereby 100% equals perfect compliance, and -100% means that the member governments are in fact doing the opposite of what they committed to.¹

Compliance scores following the Kananaskis Summit varied widely by issue area, with commitments focused on international terrorism scoring perfect

¹ For a complete compliance methodological explanation, please visit the University of Toronto G8 web site at: <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/g7/evaluations/methodology/g7c2.htm>.

compliance scores across all Summit countries. Compliance scores were also high in the areas of arms control (63%) and conflict prevention (60%), followed by African good governance, official development assistance and the environment , each at 50%. African health issues, economic growth and free trade as well as transnational organized crime revealed scores below the overall average, while issue areas including African peer review and agricultural issues revealed a “work in progress”². A score in the negative range (-50%) was found on the issue of development assistance for the highly indebted poor countries (HIPC).

The highest complying Summit member across the 13 major issue areas was Canada, the hosting member, with a score of 77%. Canada’s score is followed by the UK at 44%, then France, the next country in the hosting order, with a score of 38%. The United States ranks in fourth place with an interim compliance score of 25%, followed by Russia at 14%, Japan at 10%, Germany at 8% and Italy at 0.

The interim Kananaskis compliance average of 25% is considerably lower than that of Genoa 2001 (49.5%), Okinawa 2000 (81.4%), Cologne 1999 (39%), Birmingham 1998 (45%), Denver 1997 (27%) and Lyon in 1996 (36%) (see pg 4: <http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/g7/evaluations/2001compliance/2001reportComp.pdf>). Once the final compliance scores are made available in mid-May, a comprehensive assessment of the 2002 Kananaskis compliance scores will be possible.

² “Work in progress” is depicted by an overall average score of “0”.

**Table A:
2002 Kananaskis Interim Compliance Scores***

	Canada	France	Germany	Italy	Japan	Russia	United Kingdom	United States	Individual Issue Average
Africa, Good Governance	+1	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	+1	+1	+0.50
Africa, Health	+1	0	0	0	0	0	+1	0	+0.25
Africa, Peer Review	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.00
Arms Control, Disarmament	+1	0	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.63
Conflict Prevention	+1	+1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	+1	+0.60
Development, HIPC	0	0	0	-1	-1	-1	0	-1	-0.50
Development, ODA	+1	+1	0	0	0	0	+1	+1	+0.50
Economic Growth, Agricultural Trade	+1	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	0	-1	0.00
Economic Growth, Free Trade	+1	0	0	0	N/A	0	0	0	+0.14
Environment, Sustainable Agriculture	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	0	0.00
Environment, Water	+1	+1	0	N/A	0	N/A	+1	0	+0.50
Fighting Terrorism	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1.00
Transnational Crime, Corruption	+1	+1	0	0	0	0	0	0	+0.25
Overall Country Average	+0.77	+0.38	+0.08	0.00	+0.10	+0.14	+0.42	+0.25	+0.25

*The average score by issue area is the average of all countries' compliance scores for that issue. The average score by country is the average of all issue area compliance scores for a given country. Where information on a country's compliance score for a given issue area was not available, the symbol "N/A" appears in the respective column and no compliance score is awarded. Countries were excluded from the averages if the symbol "N/A" appears in the respective column.