

## Introduction

In February 2006, the University of Toronto's G8 Research Group completed its fourth Interim Compliance Report based on results of the 2005 Gleneagles Summit between June 2005 and January 2006. The interim report assessed the compliance results mid-way through the summit's annual cycle, offering preliminary observations based on the interim findings following the transition in the hosting rotation from the United Kingdom to Russia.

The University of Toronto G8 Research Group's Final Compliance Report extends the reporting period to June 2006. It thus monitors G8 members' compliance with their priority commitments made at the Gleneagles Summit, which took place on July 6-8, 2005, for the full year. A summary of the final compliance scores is listed in Table A, with individual analytical assessments by country and issue area in the sections that follow.

This report spans a record 21 priority issue areas, including those identified by the Russian Federation as their key issues for the St. Petersburg Summit: global energy security (with commitments on renewable energy and climate change), infectious diseases (covering commitments on HIV/AIDS and polio eradication) and education (particularly in Africa).

### The Overall Final Compliance Scores

From the time of the conclusion of the Gleneagles Summit in July 2005 to the lead-up to the St. Petersburg Summit in June 2006, the final compliance results reveal that G8 members (plus the European Union) complied with their 21 priority commitments 65% 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 either non-compliant or are, in fact, doing the opposite of what they committed to.<sup>3</sup>

This overall final compliance score of 65% for Gleneagles indicates a compliance increase of 18% since the release of the interim Gleneagles report earlier this year, as well as an increase of 10% since the release of the Sea Island final compliance report from one year ago. This score also falls on the high end of compliance historically, as only post-Okinawa in 2000 were the G8 leaders able to achieve higher overall compliance results than at Gleneagles (see Table C).

### Compliance by Country

Marking a shift from the interim compliance report, the United Kingdom has surpassed the United States, becoming the highest complying G8 country across the 21 priority commitments with a score of 95%. Second is Germany, showing the most significant increase, jumping from 33% in the interim to 88% in the final. Following closely behind is the United States with a score of 81%.<sup>4</sup> The high scores for both the United Kingdom and Germany are consistent with earlier findings that reveal that compliance scores tend to be highest by those countries that have just hosted a summit as well as those next in the hosting rotation. With Germany assuming the

---

<sup>3</sup> A complete methodological explanation is available from the University of Toronto G8 Information Centre at [www.g8.utoronto.ca/g7/evaluations/methodology/g7c2.htm](http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/g7/evaluations/methodology/g7c2.htm).

<sup>4</sup> The EU scores 89%, placing it just below the United Kingdom in aggregate terms.

hosting rotation after Russia in 2007, these scores point to a Germany preparing to assume its role as G8 summit host.

Moving up from 52% and placing in the third tier (and above the median) is the typically high-ranking Canada, with a compliance score of 81%. Also moving up considerably from its lower place standings in previous reports is France, with a score of 57%. Tied with its score from the interim period is Japan at 52%. The traditionally weak Italy dropped from a respectable 43% in the interim report to 29% in the final. Russia, on the other hand, being the only summit country to score in the negative range at the interim mark, has secured a score in the positive range, at 14%. Although varying considerably in range, all summit countries complied positively overall with their Gleneagles commitments.

### **The Compliance Gap by Country**

Although consistent with the interim report, the compliance gap between the highest and lowest complying summit members remains exceptionally high at 81% (95% for the UK and 14% for Russia). These numbers suggest that those countries on the lower end of the compliance performance spectrum either tend to decrease or stay within their earlier range as the year progresses, whereas those countries on the higher end of the performance spectrum from the outset tend to produce even better compliance results as time lapses and the next summit approaches.

### **Compliance by Issue Area**

Compliance also varies considerably by issue area, as it did in the interim report. Of the 21 priority commitments assessed, 7 issues score perfect compliance: debt relief for Africa, Middle East reform, renewable energy, transnational crime, terrorism, non-proliferation and assistance for tsunami relief efforts. This marks a considerable increase from the interim report where three issue areas scored perfect compliance (Middle East reform, climate change and renewable energy).

On the Middle East, perfect compliance reflects the leaders' commitment to stimulate a global financial contribution of up to US\$3 billion per year over the coming three years for the region.

On renewable energy, perfect compliance reflects the leaders' commitment to develop markets for clean energy technologies, increase their availability in the developing world and help vulnerable communities adapt to the impact of climate change.

On transnational crime, the leaders collectively agreed to fully implement their efforts at reducing substantially global trade in pirated and counterfeit goods and effectively combating the transnational networks that support it through shared risk analysis and enhanced cooperation at international borders.

Perfect compliance on the issue of terrorism marked the G8's commitment to improve the sharing of information on the movement of terrorists across international borders.<sup>5</sup>

The leaders also fully complied with their commitment to mobilize US\$20 billion over ten years for non-proliferation initiatives.

On tsunami relief, the leaders collectively fulfilled their commitments to support the UN on post-tsunami humanitarian aid and reconstruction as well as work to reduce the risk from future disasters.

Compliance is also well above the median on commitments to support the African Union's mission in Sudan, scoring a respectable 89%.

Advancing global efforts to tackle climate change at the United Nations fall from a perfect compliance score at the interim mark to 89% in the final (as Italy's score goes from a 100% to 0, marking a work in progress).

One of the most significant improvements from the interim period is the commitment to reduce Iraq's debt by implementing the terms of the November 2004 Paris Club agreement, jumping from 25% in the interim to 88% in the final.

Scoring just slightly above the median at 67% and tying are commitments on the provision of additional resources for Africa's peacekeeping forces and the initiative aimed at the development of cleaner, more efficient and lower emitting vehicles (surface transportation).

Commitments aimed at supporting a comprehensive set of actions to raise agricultural productivity (see Promoting Growth: Africa) scores 56%.

Scoring 44% and showing some movement since the interim report are commitments to address products of interest to least developed countries (LDCs) in trade negotiations.

One of the summit's priority themes for St. Petersburg — infectious diseases — secures a score of 33% for its pledge to meet the funding needs for HIV/AIDS through the replenishment of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. Although well below the median, this represents an increase of 11% from the interim score.

Tied also at 33% are commitments in support of the Education for All initiative as well as support for a comprehensive set of actions to raise agricultural productivity in Africa.

Commitments aimed at the early ratification of the UN Convention Against Corruption score 25%, up considerably from their interim score of -11%.

Agreements to double aid to Africa remain the same from the interim report at 22%.

Efforts aimed at eradicating polio score 11%, down considerably from 44% at the interim point.

---

<sup>5</sup> G8 Statement on Counter-Terrorism, G8 Gleneagles 2005 (Gleneagles), 8 July 2005. Accessed: 10 May 2006. [www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2005gleneagles/counterterrorism.pdf](http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2005gleneagles/counterterrorism.pdf).

Commitments to reduce trade-distorting domestic agricultural subsidies in Africa fall from 11% at the interim to 0 in the final, indicating a work in progress.

Unlike the interim report, there are no scores that fall within the negative range, thereby showing positive movement in overall compliance since the interim assessment.

These findings reveal some interesting patterns when compared to previous final compliance assessments (see Table B). Where political security issues revolving around terrorist financing, transnational crime and Middle East reform fell well below the compliance median in the post–Sea Island period, these issues have yielded perfect compliance scores in the post-Gleneagles period. One of the more striking developments from previous years, however, has been on debt relief for Africa as well as on renewable energy, where perfect compliance scores show significant upward movement from previous assessments. This trend sets an interesting tone for Russian president and host Vladimir Putin as he elevates education and infectious diseases (both tied heavily to debt relief in Africa) as well as energy security to the apex of the leaders’ agenda when they meet in St. Petersburg on July 15-17, 2006.

### **Interim and Final Compliance Scores Compared**

With the Gleneagles final compliance scores now available, an overall assessment of year-over-year compliance scores is now possible. The 2005 score of 65% for Gleneagles compares very favourably with other years, scoring higher than any other summit in the post-Lyon period (1996) with the exception of Okinawa (2000), where the leaders secured a compliance score of 80%. (see Table C).

**Table A: 2005 Gleneagles Final Compliance Scores<sup>a</sup>**

	CDA	FRA	GER	ITA	JAP	RUS	UK	US	EU	Issue Average
Peacekeeping	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	0.67
Good Governance	0	+1	0	0	-1	+1	+1	0	n/a	0.25
Health: HIV/AIDS	0	0	0	-1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	0.33
Health: Polio Eradication	+1	-1	+1	-1	-1	-1	+1	+1	+1	0.11
ODA	+1	+1	+1	-1	-1	-1	+1	0	+1	0.22
Debt Relief: Africa	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	1.00
Growth: Africa	+1	0	+1	0	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	0.56
Education: Africa	0	+1	+1	0	0	0	+1	0	0	0.33
Trade: Africa	+1	-1	+1	0	0	-1	+1	+1	+1	0.33
Trade: Market Access and Export Subsidies	0	-1	+1	-1	0	0	+1	0	0	0.00
Trade: LDCs	+1	0	0	0	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	0.44
Middle East Reform	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	1.00
Debt Relief: Iraq	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	n/a	0.88
Sudan	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0.89
Terrorism	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	1.00
Non-proliferation	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	1.00
Transnational Crime	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	1.00
Renewable Energy	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	1.00
Climate Change	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0.89
Tsunami	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	1.00
Surface Transportation	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	-1	+1	+1	+1	0.67
Country Scores	+81%	+57%	+88%	+29%	+52%	+14%	+95%	+81%	+89%	
Country Average		+65%								
Issue Average		+65%								
Interim Compliance	+52%	+48%	+33%	+43%	+52%	-14%	+67%	+71%	+75%	+47%
2004 Sea Island Final Compliance	+72%	+50%	+67%	+44%	+39%	+6%	+67%	+72%	+72%	+54%

Notes: ODA = official development assistance; LDCs = least developed countries.

<sup>a</sup> The average score by issue is the average of all countries' compliance scores for that issue. The average score by country is the average of all issue scores for a given country. The overall compliance average is an average of the overall issue average and overall country average. N/A indicates insufficient information has been obtained to assess the compliance outcome and thus no compliance score is awarded; such scores are excluded from the average.

**Table B: G8 Compliance by Country, 1996-2005**

	Lyon 96-97 <sup>a</sup>	Denver 97-98 <sup>b</sup>	Birming- ham 98-99 <sup>c</sup>	Cologne 99-00 <sup>d</sup>	Okinawa 00-01 <sup>e</sup>	Genoa 01-02 <sup>f</sup>	Kanan- askis 02-03 (interim) <sup>g</sup>	Kanan- askis 02-03 (final) <sup>h</sup>
France	0.26	0	0.25	0.34	0.92	0.69	0.38	0.64
U.S.	0.42	0.34	0.60	0.50	0.67	0.35	0.25	0.36
UK	0.42	0.50	0.75	0.50	1.0	0.69	0.42	0.55
Germany	0.58	0.17	0.25	0.17	1.0	0.59	0.08	0.18
Japan	0.21	0.50	0.20	0.67	0.82	0.44	0.10	0.18
Italy	0.16	0.50	0.67	0.34	0.89	0.57	0.00	-0.11
Canada	0.47	0.17	0.50	0.67	0.83	0.82	0.77	0.82
Russia	N/A	0	0.34	0.17	0.14	0.11	0.14	0.00
EU	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.17	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Average	0.36	0.27	0.45	0.39	0.80	0.53	0.27	0.33

	Evian 03-04 (interim) <sup>i</sup>	Evian 03-04 (final)	Sea Island 04-05 (interim) <sup>j</sup>	Sea Island 04-05 (final)	Glen- eagles 05-06 (interim) <sup>k</sup>	Glen- Eagles 05-06 (final)	Ave. (final scores only)
France	0.50	0.75	0.39	0.50	0.48	0.57	49%
U.S.	0.50	0.50	0.44	0.72	0.71	0.81	53%
UK	0.58	0.50	0.50	0.67	0.67	0.95	65%
Germany	0.42	0.50	0.50	0.67	0.33	0.88	50%
Japan	0.42	0.42	0.33	0.39	0.52	0.52	44%
Italy	0.38	0.25	0.39	0.44	0.43	0.29	40%
Canada	0.58	0.83	0.50	0.72	0.52	0.81	66%
Russia	0.42	0.33	0	0.06	-0.14	0.14	14%
EU	N/A	N/A	0.50	0.72	0.75	0.89	59%
Average	0.47	0.51	0.40	0.55	0.47	0.65	49%

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

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

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

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

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

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

<sup>g</sup> 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).

<sup>h</sup> 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 official development assistance.

<sup>i</sup> Applies to the 12 priority issues, embracing economic, transnational and political security domains (weapons of mass destruction, transport security and terrorism).

<sup>j</sup> Applies to the 18 priority issues embracing world economy, energy, the environment, debt relief and infectious diseases.

<sup>k</sup> Applies to the 21 priority issues, embracing peacekeeping, official development assistance, infectious diseases, renewable energy, climate change and Middle East reform.

**Table C: G8 Compliance by Issue, 1996-2005**

Issue Area	Lyon 96-97	Denver 97-98	Birming- ham 98-99	Cologne 99-00	Okinawa 00-01	Genoa 01-02
TOTAL (average n)	+36.1% (19)	+12.8% (6)	+31.8% (6)	+43.5% (6)	+80.8% (12)	+45.9% (9)
<i>Economic Issues</i>						
World Economy	-	-	-	-	+0.86	-
IFI Reform	+0.29 <sup>a</sup>	-	-	-	-	-1.00
Exchange Rates	-	-	-	0	-	-
Macroeconomics	+1.00	-	-	+1.00	-	-
Microeconomics	+0.29 <sup>d</sup>	-	-	-	-	-
Employment	-	+0.38 <sup>c</sup>	0 <sup>d</sup>	-	-	-
Aging	-	-	+0.33 <sup>e</sup>	-	+0.86	-
ICT	+0.57 <sup>b</sup>	-	-	-	+1.00	+0.75
Trade	+0.29 <sup>d</sup>	-	+0.33 <sup>f</sup>	-0.25	+1.00	+0.88
Development (General/ODA)	0 <sup>b</sup>	0	-	-	-	0
Debt of the Poorest/HIPC	-	-	0	+0.86	-	+1.00
Education	-	-	-	-	-	+0.58
<i>Global Transnational Issues</i>						
Energy	-	-	-	-	-	-
Environment	+0.14	+0.50 <sup>c</sup>	+1.00 <sup>g</sup>	-	-	+0.17
Biotech	-	-	-	-	+0.75	-
Human Genome	-	-	-	-	+0.80	-
Health (General)	-	-	-	-	+1.00	+0.75
HIV/AIDS	-	-	-	-	-	-
Polio	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cultural Diversity	-	-	-	-	+0.63	-
Nuclear Safety	+0.29	-	-	-	-	-
Crime & Drugs	+0.43 <sup>d</sup>	0 <sup>c</sup>	+0.25 <sup>h</sup>	0.00 <sup>i</sup>	+0.88	-
Terrorist Financing	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Political/Security Issues</i>						
East/West Relations	+0.86 <sup>d</sup>	-	-	-	-	-
Terrorism	+0.71 <sup>d</sup>	-	-	+1.00	+0.40	+1.00
Arms Control	+0.29 <sup>d</sup>	-	-	-	+0.88	-
Landmines	+0.71	+0.75 <sup>c</sup>	-	-	-	-
Human Rights	+0.71 <sup>d</sup>	-	-	-	-	-
Transport Security	-	-	-	-	-	-
WMD	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Regional Security</i>						
Asia	-0.43 <sup>b</sup>	-	-	-	-	-
Europe	+0.86 <sup>l</sup>	-	-	-	-	-
Middle East	-0.43 <sup>b</sup>	-	-	-	-	-
Russia	-	-0.86	-	-	-	-
Conflict Prevention	-	-	-	-	+0.63	-
Food Security	-	-	-	-	-	-
Peacebuilding (Africa)	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Governance Issues</i>						
UN Reform I (\$)	+0.14	-	-	-	-	-
UN Reform II (development agenda)	+0.14	-	-	-	-	-
Good Governance (Africa)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Peer Review (Africa)	-	-	-	-	-	-

Issue Area	Kan-anaskis (interim) 02-03	Kan-anaskis (final) 02-03	Evian (interim) 03-04	Evian (final) 03-04	Sea Island (interim) 04-05	Sea Island (final) 04-05	Glen-eagles (interim) 05-06	Glen-eagles (final) 05-06
TOTAL (average n)	+29.8% (13)	+35.8% (13)	+47.1% (12)	+51% (12)	+40 (18)	+55% (18)	+47% (21)	+65% (21)
<i>Economic Issues</i>								
World Economy	-	-	+0.13	+0.25	+0.33	+0.22	+0.22	+0.56
IFI Reform	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Exchange Rates	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Macroeconomics	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Microeconomics	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Employment	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Aging	-	-	-	-	-	-		
ICT	-	-	+1.00	+0.75	-	-		
Trade	+0/ +0.14 <sup>m</sup>	+0.1/ -0.13 <sup>m</sup>	-0.25 <sup>n</sup>	-0.38	+1.00/ +0.22 <sup>r</sup>	+0.88/ +0.56 <sup>r</sup>	+0.67/ +0.11/ +0.33 <sup>t</sup>	+0.33/ 0/ +0.33 <sup>t</sup>
Development (General/ODA)	+0.50	+0.50	+0.88	+0.88	-1.00	-1.00	+0.22	+0.22
Debt of the Poorest/HIPC	-0.50	+0.25	0	+0.38	+1.00	+1.00	+0/ +0.25 <sup>u</sup>	+1.0/ +0.88 <sup>u</sup>
Education	-	+0.63 <sup>p</sup>	-	-	-	-	+0.56	+0.33
<i>Global Transnational Issues</i>								
Energy	-	-	0	+0.75	+0.89	+0.78	+1.0	
Environment	0/ +0.50 <sup>i</sup>	+0.57/ +0.57 <sup>l</sup>	+0.38 <sup>o</sup>	+0.50 <sup>o</sup>	0	+1.00	+1.0/ 0.67 <sup>x</sup>	+0.89/ +1.00 <sup>x</sup>
Biotech	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Human Genome	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Health (General)	+0.25 <sup>k</sup>	-	-	-	-	-	+0.44	
HIV/AIDS	-	-	+0.88	+0.88	+0.33	+0.56	+0.22	+0.33
Polio	-	-	-	-	0	+0.44	+0.44	+0.11
Cultural Diversity	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Nuclear Safety	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Crime & Drugs	+0.25	+0.25	-	-	0	+0.11		
Terrorist Financing	-	-	+0.25	-0.50	-0.11	+0.44		
<i>Political/Security Issues</i>								
East/West Relations	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Terrorism	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00	-	-	+0.89/ +0.11 <sup>w</sup>	+1.00/ +1.00
Arms Control	+0.63	+0.25	-	-	-	-		
Landmines	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Human Rights	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Transport Security	-	-	+0.38	+0.63	+0.11	0	+0.67	+0.67
WMD	-	-	+1.00	+1.00	+0.78	+0.78	+0.44	+0.89
<i>Regional Security</i>								
Asia	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Europe	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Middle East	-	-	-	-	+1.00/ +0.78 <sup>q</sup>	+1.00/ +0.89 <sup>q</sup>	+1.00/ +0.89 <sup>v</sup>	+1.0/ +0.89
Russia	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Conflict Prevention	+0.60	+0.38	-	-	+0.78 <sup>s</sup>	+0.89 <sup>s</sup>		
Food Security	-	-	-	-	+0.67	+0.67		
Peacebuilding (Africa)	-	-	-	-	+0.44	+0.67	+0.44	+0.67
<i>Governance Issues</i>								
UN Reform (\$)	-	-	-	-	-	-		
UN Reform (development)	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Good Governance (Africa)	+0.50	+0.25	-	-	-	-	-0.11	+0.25
Peer Review (Africa)	0	0	-	-	-	-		



NOTE: Data refer to members' compliance to commitments expressed in the Communiqué, as evaluated immediately prior the next summit (i.e., 1996/1997 data refer to commitments made at the Lyon Summit in 1996 and assessed on the eve of the 1997 Denver Summit). Unless otherwise indicated, data refer to all G7 countries.

HIPC = heavily indebted poor countries; ICT = Information and communications technology; includes Digital Divide and Global Information Society; IFI = international financial institutions; ODA = official development assistance; WMD = weapons of mass destruction.

<sup>a</sup> Excludes Italy and France.

<sup>b</sup> Excludes Italy.

<sup>c</sup> Refers to G8 (includes Russia).

<sup>d</sup> Refers only to Japan, UK, Russia.

<sup>e</sup> Refers only to Canada, Germany, U.S.

<sup>f</sup> Excludes Germany.

<sup>g</sup> Refers to G8 countries (includes Russia); is average of data for two commitments referring to the Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change.

<sup>h</sup> Refers to human trafficking; refers only to France, Germany, Japan.

<sup>i</sup> Refers specifically to the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering.

<sup>j</sup> Excludes Japan.

<sup>k</sup> Refers to Africa Health.

<sup>l</sup> Refers to Environment/Sustainable Agriculture (0.0/+0.13) and Environment/Water (+0.50/+0.57).

<sup>m</sup> Refers to Economic Growth/Agricultural Trade (0.0/+0.13) and Economic Growth/Free Trade (+0.14/-0.13).

<sup>n</sup> Refers to Multinational Trade Round (MTN).

<sup>o</sup> Refers to Marine Environment.

<sup>p</sup> Refers to Africa Education.

<sup>q</sup> Refers to BMENA Democracy Assistance (+1.0) and BMENA Iraqi Elections (+0.78/+0.89).

<sup>r</sup> Refers to Trade Doha (+1.0/+0.88) and Trade Technical Assistance (+0.22/+0.56).

<sup>s</sup> Refers to Regional Security in Darfur.

<sup>t</sup> Refers to Trade in Africa, Export Subsidies and LDCs.

<sup>u</sup> Refers to Debt Relief in Africa and Iraq.

<sup>v</sup> Refers to Middle East and Sudan.

<sup>w</sup> Refers to non-proliferation and transnational crime.

<sup>x</sup> Refers to climate change and tsunami support.