

# **2003 Evian Final Compliance Report May 31, 2004**

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

## **Contents**

Overview .....	1
Table A: 2003 Evian Final Compliance Scores .....	4
Table B: 2003 Evian Interim Compliance Scores .....	5
Table C: G8 Compliance Assessments by Country, 1996–2004 .....	6
World Economy and Growth .....	7
Information and Communication Technology .....	16
Trade .....	25
Development: Official Development Assistance .....	33
Debt: Highly Indebted Poor Countries .....	38
Environment: Marine Environment.....	43
Health: AIDS and Infectious Diseases.....	51
Crime: Terrorist Financing.....	58
Terrorism: Counter-Terrorism Action Group .....	64
Transport Security .....	75
Weapons of Mass Destruction.....	91
Energy.....	113

## Overview

In February 2004, the University of Toronto G8 Research Group completed its second interim Compliance Report based on the compliance results of the Evian Summit from June 2003 to January 2004. The University of Toronto G8 Research Group has now made available the final Compliance Report, based on analytic results from the interim report until two weeks prior to the 2004 Sea Island G8 Summit in the United States. A summary of the final compliance scores is listed in the table A with an individual analytic assessment by country and issue area below.

Care should be given in interpreting the comparative results of the interim versus the final compliance reports as only the Kananaskis compliance study from 2002/03 provides comparable comparative data on how much compliance comes during the first six months following a summit. The focus of the compliance reports prior to Kananaskis are based on an assessment of the compliance scores for the full year prior to the subsequent summit taking place. In addition, data limitations, particularly for the European Union, means that although some compliance information for the EU is available in this report, overall compliance scores are calculated across the eight G8 members and do not take into account scores for the EU.

Since the conclusion of the Evian Summit in June 2003, the G7/G8 have complied with their priority commitments made across 12<sup>1</sup> major issue areas 51% of the time; a marginal increase of 4% from the interim compliance results (see Tables A & B). This average is based on a scale whereby 100% equals perfect compliance and -100% means that the member governments are either non-compliant or are in fact doing the opposite of what they committed to.<sup>2</sup>

Compliance scores following the Evian Summit varied widely by issue area, with commitments focused on international terrorism and weapons of mass destruction scoring perfect compliance scores across all Summit countries. These findings are consistent with the interim results where both of these issue areas scored perfect marks. Compliance scores were also high in the areas of Development (ODA) and Health (AIDS), both tied at 88%. Having scored a perfect score in the interim compliance report, ICT drops to tie the Summit's Energy commitment at 75%. While commitments in the area of Transport Security have increased significantly since the interim result (from 38% to 63%), commitments regarding the Environment (Marine), Debt (HIPC), and the World Economy all scored below the overall compliance average (50%, 38% and 25% respectively). Of the 12 issue areas assessed, two scores fell within the negative range: Trade (MTN) at -38% and Crime (Terrorist Financing) at -50%. Although trade has remained in the negative range since the interim report, the most significant variation between the interim and final scores has been with respect to terrorist financing, with the score dropping from 25% to -50%. These negative scores indicate that not only did the leaders not act to fulfill their priority commitments in these issue areas in the post-Evian period, they actually did the opposite of what they committed to in their final communiqué.

---

<sup>1</sup> These includee World Economy/Growth; ICT; Trade (MTN); Development (ODA); Debt (HIPC); Environment (Marine); Health (AIDS); Crime (Terrorist Financing); Terrorism (CTAG); Transport Security; Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD); and Energy.

<sup>2</sup> For a complete compliance methodological explanation, please visit the University of Toronto G8 web site at: [www.g8.utoronto.ca/g7/evaluations/methodology/g7c2.htm](http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/g7/evaluations/methodology/g7c2.htm).

We also find wide variation in compliance scores by country. Consistent with the interim results, the highest complying Summit member across the 12 priority issue areas was Canada, with a final compliance score of 83%; up by 25% since the interim report. France, Summit host, climbs from third place to second place in the final report with an overall compliance score of 75%; an increase also of 25% since the interim report. Tied for third place at 50% are the U.K., Germany and the U.S. — the next country in the hosting rotation. Japan's score remains unchanged since the interim report at 42%. Both Russia and Italy's scores drop from the interim report by a considerable margin to 33% and 25% respectively.

Although the final compliance scores in overall terms are slightly higher than the interim scores (51% versus 47%), these scores are notably higher than those of previous Summits including Kananaskis 2002 (35%), Genoa 2001 (49.5%), Cologne 1999 (39%), Birmingham 1998 (45%), Lyon 1996 (36%) and Denver 1997 (27%). Only in the post-Okinawa period in 2000 did the leaders perform better when their compliance scores hit an all time average high of 81.4% (see Table C).

### **Special Considerations**

In evaluating the results of this report, the following considerations should be kept in mind.

- Compliance has been assessed against a selected set of priority commitments, rather than all commitments the last summit produced. The priority commitments selected were not randomly chosen but identified to produce a representative subset of the total according to such dimensions as issue areas, ambition, specified time for completion, instruments used and, more generally, the degree of precision, obligation and delegation of each.
- In addition to the specific commitments assessed here, summits have value in establishing new principles in normative directions, in creating and highlighting issue areas and agenda items, and in altering the publicly allowable discourse used. Furthermore, some of the most important decisions reached and consensus forged at summits may be done entirely in private and not encoded in the public communiqué record.
- Some commitments inherently take longer to be complied with than the time available between one summit and the next.
- In some cases, it may be wise not to comply with a summit commitment, if global conditions have dramatically changed since the commitment was made or if new knowledge has become available about how a particular problem can best be solved.
- As each of the member countries has its own constitutional, legal and institutional processes for undertaking action at the national level, each is free to act in particular cases on a distinctive national time scale. Of particular importance here is the annual cycle for the creation of budgets, legislative approval and the appropriation of funds.
- Commitments encoded in the G8 communiqué may also be encoded precisely or partially in communiqués from other international forums, the decisions of other international organizations, or even national statements such as the State of the Union Address in the U.S., the Queen's Speech in the UK and the Speech from the Throne in Canada. Without detailed

process-tracing, it cannot be assumed that compliant behaviour on the part of countries is fully caused by the single fact of a previous G8 commitment.

- Compliance here is assessed against the precise, particular commitments made by the G8, rather than what some might regard as necessary or appropriate action to solve the problem being addressed.
- With compliance assessed on a three-point scale, judgements inevitably arise about whether particular actions warrant the specific numerical value assigned. As individual members can sometimes take different actions to comply with the same commitment, no standardized cross-national evaluative criterion can always be used. Comments regarding the judgements in each case, detailed in the extensive accompanying notes, are welcome (see below).
- Because the evaluative scale used in this compliance report runs from –100 percent to +100 percent, it should be assumed that any score in the positive range represents at least some compliance with the specific commitments made by the G8. It is not known if commitments in other international forums or at the national level on occasions such as the State of the Union Address, Queen’s Speech or Speech from the Throne, etc., are complied with to a greater or lesser degree than the commitments made by the G8.
- It may be that commitments containing high degrees of precision, obligation and delegation, with short specified timetables for implementation, may induce governments to act simply to meet the specified commitment rather than in ways best designed to address core and underlying problems over a longer term.
- In some cases, full compliance by all members of the G8 with a commitment is contingent on co-operative behaviour on the part of other actors.

## **Feedback**

As with previous compliance reports, this report has been produced as an invitation for others to provide additional or more complete information on country compliance with the interim results released in January 2004. As always, comments are welcomed and would be considered as part of an analytical reassessment. Please send your feedback to [g8info@library.utoronto.ca](mailto:g8info@library.utoronto.ca).

**Table A: 2003 Evian Final Compliance Scores\***

	CDA	FRA	GER	ITA	JAP	RUS	UK	U.S.	Issue Average
World Economy/Growth	1	0	1	-1	0	0	0	1	<b>0.25</b>
ICT	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	<b>0.75</b>
Trade (MTN)	0	0	0	-1	0	-1	0	-1	<b>-0.38</b>
Development (ODA)	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	<b>0.88</b>
Debt (HIPC)	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	<b>0.38</b>
Environment (Marine)	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	<b>0.50</b>
Health (AIDS)	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	<b>0.88</b>
Crime (Terrorist financing)	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	<b>-0.50</b>
Terrorism (CTAG)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	<b>1.00</b>
Transport Security	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	<b>0.63</b>
WMD	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	<b>1.00</b>
Energy	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	<b>0.75</b>
<b>Individual Country Average</b>	<b>0.83</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>0.33</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.50</b>	
<b>Issue Average</b>									<b>+0.51</b>
<b>Country Average</b>									<b>+0.51</b>
<b>Compliance Average</b>									<b>+0.51</b>

\*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. The overall compliance average is an average of the overall issue average and overall country average.

**Table B: 2003 Evian Interim Compliance Scores\***

	CDA	FRA	GER	ITA	JAP	RUS	UK	U.S.	Issue Average
World Economy/Growth	0	0	1	-1	0	0	0	1	<b>0.13</b>
ICT	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	<b>1.00</b>
Trade (MTN)	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	-1	<b>-0.25</b>
Development (ODA)	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	<b>0.88</b>
Debt (HIPC)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0.00</b>
Environment (Marine)	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	<b>0.38</b>
Health (AIDS)	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	<b>0.88</b>
Crime (Terrorist Financing)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0.25</b>
Terrorism (CTAG)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	<b>1.00</b>
Transport Security	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	<b>0.38</b>
Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	<b>1.00</b>
Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Individual Country Average</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>0.33</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>0.50</b>	
<b>Overall Issue Average</b>									<b>+0.47</b>
<b>Overall Country Average</b>									<b>+0.47</b>
<b>Overall Compliance Average</b>									<b>+0.47</b>

\*Scores here are assessed for the six month period between the conclusion of the Evian Summit (June 2003) to the handover of the Summit presidency to the United States (January 2004).

**Table C: G8 Compliance Assessments by Country, 1996–2004**

	1996 –97 <sup>a</sup>	1997 –98 <sup>b</sup>	1998 –99 <sup>c</sup>	1999– 00 <sup>d</sup>	2000 –01 <sup>e</sup>	2001 –02 <sup>f</sup>	2002 –03		2003 –04	
							Interim <sup>g</sup>	Final <sup>h</sup>	Interim <sup>i</sup>	Final
U.S.	0.42	0.34	0.6	0.50	0.67	0.35	0.25	0.36	0.50	0.50
UK	0.42	0.50	0.75	0.50	1.0	0.69	0.42	0.55	0.58	0.50
GER	0.58	0.17	0.25	0.17	1.0	0.59	0.08	0.18	0.42	0.50
JAP	0.21	0.50	0.2	0.67	0.82	0.44	0.10	0.18	0.42	0.42
ITA	0.16	0.50	0.67	0.34	0.89	0.57	0.00	–0.11	0.38	0.25
CDA	0.47	0.17	0.5	0.67	0.83	0.82	0.77	0.82	0.58	0.83
RUS	N/A	0	0.34	0.17	0.14	0.11	0.14	0.00	0.42	0.33
EU	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.17	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Average	<b>0.36</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0.39</b>	<b>0.80</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>0.33</b>	<b>0.47</b>	<b>0.51</b>

Notes: 1996–97: Lyon, France; 1997–98: Denver, U.S.; 1998–99, Birmingham, UK; 1999–2000, Cologne, Germany; 2000–01, Okinawa, Japan; 2001–02: Genoa, Italy; 2002–03, Kananaskis, Canada; 2003–04, Evian, France.

a Applies to 19 priority issues, embracing the economic, transnational and political security domains.

b Applies to six priority issues, embracing the economic, transnational and political security domains.

c Applies to seven priority issues, embracing the economic, transnational and political security domains (human trafficking).

d Applies to six priority issues, embracing the economic, transnational and political security domains (terrorism).

e Applies to 12 priority issues, embracing economic, transnational, and political security domains (conflict prevention, arms control and terrorism).

f Applies to nine priority issues, embracing economic, transnational, and political security domains (terrorism).

g Applies to the 13 priority issues assessed in the first interim compliance report, embracing economic, transnational, and political security domains (arms control, conflict prevention and terrorism).

h Applies to the 11 priority issues assessed in the final report, embracing economic, transnational and political security domains (arms control, conflict prevention and terrorism). Excluded in the final report, which were assessed in the interim are debt of the poorest (HIPC) and ODA.

i Applies to the 12 priority issues, embracing economic, transnational and political security domains (WMD, transport security and terrorism).