



**Gleneagles Interim Compliance Report
July 8, 2005, to January 1, 2006
Interim Report**

**February 9, 2006
(revised)**

**Professor John Kirton, Dr. Ella Kokotsis, Vanessa Corlazzoli, Mike Varey, Aaron Rath
and the University of Toronto G8 Research Group**

www.g8.utoronto.ca
g8@utoronto.ca



Table of Contents

Preface	3
Analysts	4
Special Considerations	5
Summary	7
Table A: 2005 Gleneagles Interim Compliance Scores	10
Table B: G8 Compliance by Issue, 1996-2005	11
Peacekeeping	12
Good Governance	19
Global Health: HIV/AIDS	28
Health: Polio Eradication	35
Official Development Assistance: Africa	40
Debt Relief: Africa	47
Promoting Growth: Africa	53
Education: Africa	62
Trade: Africa	70
Trade: Export Subsidies	77
Trade: Least Developed Countries	88
Middle East Reform	97
Debt Relief: Iraq	106
Sudan	112
Terrorism	118
Non-proliferation	125
Transnational Crime	131
Renewable Energy	142
Climate Change	152
Tsunami	163
Surface Transportation	170
Appendix: Priority Commitments: 2005 Gleneagles Summit	180

Preface

Each year since 1996, the G8 Research Group has produced a compliance report on the progress made by the G8 member countries in meeting the commitments issued at each leaders' summit. Since 2002, the group has published an interim report, timed to assess progress at the transition between one country's year as host and the next, and then a final report issued just before the leaders meet at their annual summit. These reports, which monitor each country's efforts on a carefully chosen selection of the many commitments announced at the end of each summit, are offered to the general public and to policy makers, academics, civil society, the media and interested citizens around the world in an effort to make the work of the G8 more transparent and accessible, and to provide scientific data to enable meaningful analysis of this unique and informal institution. Compliance reports are available at the G8 Information Centre at <www.g8.utoronto.ca/compliance>.

The G8 Research Group is an independent organization based at the University of Toronto. Founded in 1987, it is an international network of scholars, professionals and students interested in the activities of the G8. The group oversees the G8 Information Centre, which publishes, free of charge, analysis and research on the G8 as well as makes available official documents issued by the G8.

For the 2005 Interim Compliance Report, 19 priority commitments were selected from the 212 commitments that were made at the Gleneagles Summit, hosted by the United Kingdom from July 6 to 8, 2005. This report assesses the status of compliance with those commitments as the hosting responsibilities pass from the United Kingdom to Russia, which will host the G8 Summit, for the first time, in St. Petersburg from July 15 to 17, 2006.

We rely on publicly available documents — government announcements, media reports, website documentation — to make our assessments. In an ongoing effort to ensure accuracy and comprehensiveness, we welcome comments on the report. Any such feedback would remain anonymous and would not be attributed. The opinions and information contained in this report lie exclusively with the G8 Research Group.

This interim compliance report is being released at our conference “Checking In on the G8's Progress: From Gleneagles to St. Petersburg” on February 9, 2006. The webcast of the conference, held at the University of Toronto, is available from the G8 Information Centre website at <www.g8.utoronto.ca/conferences>.

The work of the G8 Research Group would not be possible without the dedication of many people around the world. In particular, this report is the product of a team of energetic and hard-working analysts directed by Dr. Ella Kokotsis, Director of Analytical Research, and Vanessa Corlazzoli, chair of the student executive, as well as Mike Varey and Aaron Raths.

John Kirton
Director
G8 Research Group
Toronto, Canada

Analysts

Professor John Kirton, Director, G8 Research Group
Dr. Ella Kokotsis, Director of Analytical Research, G8 Research Group
Vanessa Corlazzoli, Chair, G8 Research Group
Aaron Rath, Co-Chair, Compliance
Mike Varey, Co-Chair, Compliance

Team Leaders

Mary Albino	Brian Kolenda	Stanislav Orlov	Adam Sheikh
Chris Collins	Mike Lehan	Sadia Rafiquddin	Barbara Tassa
Laura Hodgins	Francesca	Aaron Rath	Mike Varey
Susan Khazaeli	Mattacchione	Jonathan Scotland	

Analysts

Bentley Allan	Aaron Ghobarah	Kathryn Kotris	Adrian Roomes
Ashley Barnes	Gunwant Gill	Attila Kovacs	Hitomi Roppongi
Johannes Bast	Lisa Graham	Afsheen Lalani	Vaneet Sangha
Eugene Berezovsky	Ioana Hancas	Joanna Langille	Akiko Sasayama
Aprile Cadeau	Benita Hansraj	Mark Lavery	Vera Serdick
Marie-Adèle Cassola	Andrew Harder	Stephanie Law	Zain Shafiq
Evelyn Chan	Jennifer Hertz	Rosita Lee	Abby Slinger
Matthew Chomyn	My-Hanh Hoang	Hugues Letourneau	Constance V. Smith
Claire Chow	Jennifer Hodgins	Anastassia Litchak	Orsolya Soos
Jeff Claydon	Jenn Hood	Jelena Madunic	Jackie Stillman
Kyle D'Souza	Russell Ironside	Michael Manulak	Joseph Tabago
Joanna Dafoe	Fauzia Issaka	Geoffrey Marianangeli	Danielle Takacs
Raluca David	Taleen Jakujyan	Steve Masson	Alex Turner
Keith Dellaquilla	Justyna Janicka	Daniel McCabe	Liliane Vicente
Kristin Eberth	Kevin Jarus	Sakshi Mehta	Nathan Weatherdom
Michael Erdman	Adrianna Kardynal	Matto Mildenberger	Venus Yam
Asif Farooq	Elaine Kanasewich	Melissa Molson	Ayako Yamamoto
Melissa Fourage	Ani Kevork	Tony Navaneelan	Loretta Yau
Jennifer A. Francis	Sarah Kim	Farzana Nawaz	Christopher Yung
Emilie Gelinis	Kathryn Kinley	Brendan Dahlin Nolan	
André Ghione	Tiffany Kizito	Nina Popovic	

Editing Committee

André Ghione
Adrianna Kardynal
Brian Kolenda
Joanna Langille

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 according to a disciplined and systematic process intended 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. The aim is to provide a comprehensive portrait of the compliance performance of the summit as a whole. As such, the individual commitments selected cannot in all cases claim to be the most important ones in their appropriate issue area, nor do they necessarily represent that issue area lodged.
- 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.
- Although G8 Reserach Group analysts have made an exceptional effort to seek relevant information on Russia, credible commentary on the preliminary draft of this report suggests that information herein about the compliance-related activity of the Russian Federation remains incomplete. The greater such incompleteness, the lower the Russia's scores would likely be as a result.

Further Research and Reports

The information contained within this report provides G8 member countries and other stakeholders with an indication of their compliance results in the post-Gleneagles period. 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 2005 Gleneagles commitments. As always, comments are welcomed and would be considered as part of an analytical reassessment. Please send your feedback to <g8@utoronto.ca>.

Summary

The University of Toronto's G8 Research Group has completed its fourth annual Interim Compliance Report, based on the results from the G8's compliance from July 2005 to January 2006 with their 19 priority commitments reached at the 2005 Gleneagles Summit (see Appendix). This six month period allows for a compliance assessment with the summit's priority commitments at a time when the hosting responsibility transferred from the United Kingdom to the Russian Federation on January 1, 2006.

The interim compliance scores are summarized in Table A, with individual analytic assessments by country and issue area in the sections below. The final compliance report, due to be published just prior to the 2006 St. Petersburg Summit, will provide a more detailed and comprehensive set of compliance results. This report is intended to assess the compliance results mid-way through the year, following the transition in the hosting rotation, and hence offers preliminary observations based only on the interim findings to date.

This report spans a record 21 priority commitments, including two on global health (HIV/AIDS and polio eradication) and three on trade (Africa, export subsidies and least developed countries). Each priority commitment is surveyed across all G8 countries plus the European Union (EU).

The Overall Interim Compliance Score

The interim compliance results reveal that from the period following the conclusion of the 2005 Gleneagles Summit until January 2006, G8 members and the EU have complied with their priority commitments 47.3% of the time (see Table A). This average is based on a scale whereby 100% is equivalent to perfect compliance and -100% means that the member governments are either non-compliant or are, in fact, doing the opposite of what was committed to. A score of "0" suggests a work in progress, whereby a commitment has been initiated, but not yet completed within the one year time frame.¹

The interim compliance score of 47.3% surpasses those of previous interim compliance studies which included 40% for Sea Island (2004), 47% for Evian (2003) and 25% for Kananaskis (2002).

Compliance by Country

Marking quite a dramatic shift from previous interim compliance reports, the highest complying G8 country across the 21 priority commitments is the United States, with a score of 71%.² Although the U.S. did rank second overall in the two previous interim reports, its compliance score increased by over 20% from the 2004 Sea Island interim report the year before. Placing second and also scoring above the median is the typically high-ranking United Kingdom, with a compliance score of 67%. Moving up considerably from its lower place standings in previous reports is Japan, with a compliance score this year of 52%. Canada, traditionally one of the Summit's highest compliers, has dropped considerably during this interim assessment, tying Japan with a score of 52%. Dropping also from third place last year to fifth place is France, with an interim compliance score of 48%. Italy and Germany follow, with scores of 43% and 33%

¹ For a complete explanation of the compliance methodology, please visit the G8 Information Centre web site at: www.g7.utoronto.ca/evaluations/methodology/g7c2.htm

² The EU does score 75%, placing its aggregate score ahead of the United States in overall terms.

respectively. Russia is the only country to score in the negative range with an interim score of -14%.

The Compliance Gap by Country

The compliance gap between member countries continues to increase at this year's interim point with the scores spanning almost 90% from highest to lowest (75% for the E.U. to -0.14% for Russia). This compliance gap represents a considerable increase from 50% at the interim point post-Sea Island and 25% at the interim period post-Evian. The score is similar, however, to the compliance gap during the first interim report post-Kananaskis, which hit 77%.

Compliance by Issue Area

Compliance by issue area also varies considerably at the interim point. Of the 21 priority issues assessed, commitments geared towards Middle East Reform, renewable energy and climate change rank the highest with a perfect compliance score of 100%. On the Middle East, this commitment primarily includes the stimulation of a global financial contribution of up to \$3 billion per year over the coming three years for the region. On renewable energy, perfect compliance to date reflects the leaders' commitment to develop markets for clean energy technologies, increase their availability in the developing world, and to help vulnerable communities adapt to the impact of climate change. Advancing global efforts to tackle climate change at the UN also score in the ranks of perfect compliance. Compliance is also high with commitments to support the African Union's mission in Sudan, as well as efforts aimed at tackling terrorism, each scoring a respectable 89%. A significant gap in compliance is detected in the next strata of scores as commitments geared towards helping build Africa's capacity to trade and mobilize investment as well as support for UN work on post-tsunami humanitarian aid and reconstruction, each score 67%. Commitments to support the "Education for All" initiative, as well as those geared towards the development of cleaner, more efficient and lower-emitting vehicles tie at 56%. Scoring slightly below the median at 44%, and tying three ways, are commitments to support the polio eradication initiative, the commitment to mobilize \$20 billion over ten years for non-proliferation initiatives, and the provision of additional resources for Africa's peacekeeping forces. Scoring 33% are commitments to address products of interest to Least Developed Countries (LDCs) in trade negotiations. Just below this, at 25%, is the G8's commitment to reduce Iraq's debt by implementing the terms of the November 2004 Paris Club agreement. Tied at 22% are three commitments including one to meet the financing needs for HIV/AIDS through the replenishment of the Global Fund, another aimed at doubling aid for Africa by 2010, and the final geared towards supporting a comprehensive set of actions to raise agricultural productivity in Africa. Issues focused on transnational crime, particularly through the improvement of coordination on anti-counterfeiting and anti-piracy crime strategies, as well as commitments to reduce trade distorting domestic agricultural subsidies in Africa, score quite low on the overall compliance spectrum at 11%. The one commitment in which a "work in progress" score of "0" is logged by all G8 members and the EU is with respect to the cancellation of all debts owed by eligible highly indebted poor countries (HIPCs) to IDA, the IMF and the African Development Fund. Good governance, particularly focused on the early ratification of the UN Convention against Corruption, is the only issue to fall within the negative range with an interim score of -11%.

These interim findings reveal some striking differences with the interim results from previous assessments (see Table B). Where debt relief initiatives to the highly indebted poor countries garnered the highest compliance rate (100%) at the interim point post Sea Island, commitments in this area fall at the opposite end of the spectrum, with a compliance score of 0 in the post-

Gleneagles period. Another significant shift is with respect to the environment, where leaders scored a “0” post Sea Island, but jumped to 100% following Gleneagles. Transport security and polio eradication also showed significant gains with compliance scores increasing by over 40% in both cases from one year ago. Where no significant changes were made from the previous assessments were in the areas of polio eradication (44%) and transnational crime (11%). Improvements are seen, however, in overall compliance terms post Gleneagles as only one issue area falls within the negative range, contrary to the post Sea Island period, where three issues fell scored in the negative range at the interim point.

Interim and Final Compliance Scores Compared

Although a comprehensive analytical assessment will not be available until the final compliance scores are in, to date, these interim compliance scores compare favourably with the overall scores from previous Summits including Cologne 1999 (39%), Birmingham 1998 (45%), Denver 1997 (27%) and Lyon (36%). Scores post Gleneagles are comparable to Evian 2003 (51%) and Genoa 2001 (49.5) and only significantly surpassed by Okinawa 2000 (81.4%).

Table A: 2005 Gleneagles Interim Compliance Scores*

	CDA	FRA	GER	ITA	JAP	RUS	UK	US	EU	Issue Average
Peacekeeping	0	0	+1	0	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	44%
Good Governance	0	+1	0	0	-1	-1	0	0	0	-11%
Global Health: HIV/AIDS	0	0	-1	0	+1	0	+1	0	+1	22%
Health: Polio Eradication	0	+1	0	0	0	0	+1	+1	+1	44%
Debt Relief: Africa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ODA for Africa	+1	0	0	0	0	0	+1	0	0	22%
Promoting Growth:	+1	0	0	0	0	0	0	+1	0	22%
Africa										
Education: Africa	0	+1	0	+1	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	56%
Trade: Africa	+1	0	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	67%
Trade: Export Subsidies	0	-1	0	0	0	0	+1	0	+1	11%
Trade: LDCs	0	0	0	0	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	33%
Middle East Reform	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	100%
Debt Relief: Iraq	0	+1	-1	+1	+1	-1	0	+1	n/a	25%
Sudan	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	89%
Terrorism	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	89%
Non-proliferation	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	-1	0	+1	0	44%
Transnational Crime	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+1	11%
Renewable Energy	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	100%
Climate Change	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	100%
Tsunami	+1	+1	+1	0	0	0	+1	+1	+1	67%
Surface Transportation	+1	+1	0	+1	0	-1	+1	+1	+1	56%
Country Average	52%	48%	33%	43%	52%	-14%	67%	71%	75%	
Country Average										47.4%
Issue Average										47.2%
Interim Compliance Average										47.3%
2004 Sea Island Interim Compliance										39%

*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.

Table B: 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	Kanana- skis (interim) 02-03	Kanana- skis (final) 02-03	Evian (interim) 03-04	Evian (final) 03-04	Sea Island (interim) 04-05	Sea Island (final) 04-05
TOTAL (average <i>n</i>)	+36.1% (19)	+12.8% (6)	+31.8% (6)	+43.5% (6)	+80.8% (12)	+45.9% (9)	+29.8% (13)	+35.8% (13)	+47.1% (12)	51% (12)	+40 (18)	+55% (18)
Economic Issues												
World Economy	-	-	-	-	+0.86	-	-	-	+0.13	+0.25	+0.33	+0.22
IFI Reform	+0.29	-	-	-	-	-1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
Exchange Rates	-	-	-	0.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Macroeconomics	+1.00	-	-	+1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Microeconomics	+0.29	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Employment	-	+0.38	0.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aging	-	-	+0.33	-	+0.86	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ICT	+0.57	-	-	-	+1.00	+0.75	-	-	+1.00	+0.75	-	-
Trade	+0.29	-	+0.33	-0.25	+1.00	+0.88	0.00 / +0.14	+0.13 / - 0.13	-0.25	-0.38	+1.00 / +0.22	+0.88 / +0.56
Dev't (General/ ODA)	0.00 b	0.00	-	-	-	0.00	+0.50	+0.50	+0.88	+0.88	-1.00	-1.00
Debt/ HIPC	-	-	0.00	+0.86	-	+1.00	-0.50	+0.25	0.00	+0.38	+1.00	+1.00
Education	-	-	-	-	-	+0.58	-	+0.63	-	-	-	-
Global Transnational Issues												
Energy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.00	+0.75	+0.89	+0.78
Environment	+0.14	+0.50	+1.00	-	-	+0.17	0.00 / +0.50	+0.57 / +0.57	+0.38	+0.50	0.00	+1.00
Biotech	-	-	-	-	+0.75	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Human Genome	-	-	-	-	+0.80	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Health (General)	-	-	-	-	+1.00	+0.75	+0.25	-	-	-	-	-
HIV/AIDS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+0.88	+0.88	+0.33	+0.56
Polio	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.00	0.44
Cultural Diversity	-	-	-	-	+0.63	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nuclear Safety	+0.29	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Crime & Drugs	+0.43	0.00	+0.25	0.00	+0.88	-	+0.25	+0.25	-	-	0.00	+0.11
Terrorist Financing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+0.25	-0.50	-0.11	+0.44
Political/Security Issues												
East/West Relations	+0.86	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Terrorism	+0.71	-	-	+1.00	+0.40	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00	-	-
Arms Control	+0.29	-	-	-	+0.88	-	+0.63	+0.25	-	-	-	-
Landmines	+0.71	+0.75	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Human Rights	+0.71	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Transport Security	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+0.38	+0.63	+0.11	0.00
WMD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+1.00	+1.00	+0.78	+0.78
Regional Security												
Asia	-0.43	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Europe	+0.86	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Middle East	-0.43	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+1.00 / 0.78	+1.00 / +0.89
Russia	-	-0.86	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Conflict Prevention	-	-	-	-	+0.63	-	+0.60	+0.38	-	-	+0.78	+0.89
Food Security	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+0.67	+0.67
Peace-building	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+0.44	+0.67
Governance Issues												
UN Reform I (\$)	+0.14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
UN Reform II (dev't agenda)	+0.14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Good Gov (Africa)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+0.50	+0.25	-	-	-	-
Peer Review (Africa)	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.00	0.00	-	-	-	-