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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 G8 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
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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 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 Research 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 scoring 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 (HIPC) 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*

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

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Lyon 96-97</th>
<th>Denver 97-98</th>
<th>Birmingham 98-99</th>
<th>Cologne 99-00</th>
<th>Okinawa 00-01</th>
<th>Genoa 01-02</th>
<th>Kanana-skis (interim) 02-03</th>
<th>Kanana-skis (final) 02-03</th>
<th>Evian (interim) 03-04</th>
<th>Evian (final) 03-04</th>
<th>Sea Island (interim) 04-05</th>
<th>Sea Island (final) 04-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (average n)</td>
<td>+36.1%</td>
<td>+12.8%</td>
<td>+31.8%</td>
<td>+43.5%</td>
<td>+80.8%</td>
<td>+45.9%</td>
<td>+29.8%</td>
<td>+35.8%</td>
<td>+47.1%</td>
<td>+51%</td>
<td>+40 (18)</td>
<td>+55% (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Economy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+0.86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+0.13</td>
<td>+0.25</td>
<td>+0.33</td>
<td>+0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI Reform</td>
<td>+0.29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange Rates</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macroeconomics</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microeconomics</td>
<td>+0.29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+0.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+0.86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>+0.57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>+0.29</td>
<td>+0.33</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
<td>0.00 / +0.14</td>
<td>+0.13 / -0.13</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>+1.00 / +0.22</td>
<td>+0.88 / +0.56</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev't (General/ODA)</td>
<td>0.00 b</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt/HiPC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>+0.86</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>+0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+0.58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Transnational Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>+0.89</td>
<td>+0.78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>+0.14</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+0.17</td>
<td>0.00 / +0.50</td>
<td>+0.57 / +0.57</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biotech</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Genome</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+0.80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health (General)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>+0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
<td>+0.33</td>
<td>+0.56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Safety</td>
<td>+0.29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime &amp; Drugs</td>
<td>+0.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>+0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
<td>+0.25</td>
<td>+0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>+0.11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorist Financing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+0.25</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>+0.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political/Security Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East/West Relations</td>
<td>+0.86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism</td>
<td>+0.71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>+0.40</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms Control</td>
<td>+0.29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>+0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landmines</td>
<td>+0.71</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>+0.71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Security</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>+0.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>+0.78</td>
<td>+0.78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Security</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>+0.86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>+1.00 / +0.78</td>
<td>+1.00 / +0.89</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Prevention</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>+0.60</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+0.78</td>
<td>+0.89</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Security</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+0.67</td>
<td>+0.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace-building</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+0.44</td>
<td>+0.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goverance Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Reform I ($)</td>
<td>+0.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Reform II (dev't agenda)</td>
<td>+0.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Gov (Africa)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>+0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review (Africa)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peacekeeping

Commitment

“[T]o provide extra resources for Africa's peacekeeping forces so that they can better deter, prevent, and resolve conflicts in Africa.”

-Chairman’s Summary (final press conference)\(^3\)

Background

The G8 commitment to the deterrence and prevention of violent conflict in Africa is founded in the *Africa Action Plan* created at the 2002 Kananaskis summit. The plan was enhanced at the 2003 Evian Summit with the *Joint Africa-G8 Action Plan to Enhance African Capabilities to Undertake Peace Support Operations*. The G8 has committed to work with its African counterparts to develop local capacities to undertake peace support operations in accordance with the United Nations Charter in an attempt to prevent outbreaks of violence and to ensure that any violent conflict is quickly diffused. The *G8 Action Plan: Expanding Peace Support Operations in Africa* builds upon past efforts undertaken by the G8 and its African partners. The G8 recognizes the financial and logistical difficulties faced by many African nations when deploying troops and equipment across the continent. Thus, the focus is on establishing infrastructure for transportation and logistical support to ensure that the troops ready to prevent and diffuse conflict in Africa can promptly arrive where they are needed, and are properly equipped to undertake peace support operations. The G8's long-term goal to train 75,000 African peacekeepers by 2010 was also reaffirmed in the Chair's Summary during the Gleneagles Summit of 2005.

Team Leader: Jonathan Scotland

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance -1</th>
<th>Work in Progress 0</th>
<th>Full Compliance +1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown

1. Canada: 0

The Canadian government registered a reasonable level of compliance with the Gleneagles peacekeeping commitment, contributing both financial support to peacekeeping missions and logistical support for African Union initiatives.

On 7 November 2005, Foreign Affairs Minister Pierre Pettigrew announced CAD$500,000 in funding for the Peacekeeping School in Bamako, Mali, with the possibility of an additional CAD$500,000 to be delivered in 2006. Following a 24 November video conference summit with the European Union (EU), Prime Minister Paul Martin, British Prime Minister (and then-holder of the EU’s rotating presidency) Tony Blair, European Commission President José Manuel Barroso and the EU High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy Javier Solana, issued a joint statement reaffirming their commitment to continue to work with the African Union (AU), providing both the logistical and transportation support essential to the development of an effective African Standby Force.

Other initiatives include CAD$90 million in assistance to the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) laid out on 11 April 2005. The government of Canada announced an additional contribution of CAD$170 million on 12 May 2005. Canadian initiatives are not exclusively monetary. In addition to Canada’s Special Envoy for Peace in Sudan, created in 1999 and headed by Senator Mobina Jaffer, Prime Minister Martin announced the creation of a special advisory team on 12 May 2005. The team’s goals include assessment of Canada’s contribution thus far, observation of AMIS, and assistance in the peace process in pursuit of a peace agreement for Darfur. Senator Roméo Dallaire will accompany the team as part of the Canadian government’s expanded support.

The Canadian government also supports The Special Court and The Truth and Reconciliation Commission in Sierra Leone, as well as the South African government’s commitment to the Kimberley Process aimed at reducing the trade in conflict diamonds. Foreign Affairs Canada, in addition to supporting the Darfur peace process, contributes to the Human Security Program. Through this program the Canadian government sponsors a number of peacebuilding initiatives that address sexual and gender-based violence, promote security sector and justice reform, provide training on human rights and international humanitarian law, strengthen governance institutions and community organizations and assist small arms reduction initiatives. In spite of attacks on aid workers in Uganda and Sudan this past November, Canada steadfastly maintains its commitment to peacekeeping through both the provision of funds and logistical support.

Analyst: Jenn Hood
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2. France: 0

The French government’s peacekeeping initiatives place it well on its way to achieving full compliance with the Gleneagles peacekeeping commitment to provide extra resources for Africa’s peacekeeping forces so that they can better deter, prevent and resolve conflicts in Africa.

The French government’s primary commitment lies in the Reinforcement of African Peace-keeping Capacities (RECAMP) Program, a joint action of the French Foreign and Defense Ministries begun in 1998 and operating under the auspices of the United Nations while coordinating its efforts with those of the African Union (AU). In addition to its continued commitment to this initiative, the French government helped to broker a full partnership between the AU and the European Union (EU) in RECAMP. The primary focus of this new partnership is to support the formation of the AU’s African Standby Force. This commitment was officially outlined by French President Jacques Chirac when he stated that “...France is prepared to place its RECAMP program in the European Union framework in order to more effectively support the efforts of the African Union, as it has done in Darfur.”

Other French initiatives include the decision of the French Defense Ministry to reshuffle its deployment of some 7,000 soldiers to better coordinate with the AU’s division of the continent into geographical zones. These moves are bolstered by the French government’s institutional support of peacekeeping initiatives such as United Nations (UN) Security Council resolution 1634, unanimously adopted 31 October 2005, which is designed to renew the UN Mandate for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO) mandate for six months, until 30 April 2006; the UN’s adoption of the resolution establishing the Peacebuilding Commission, and the establishment, on 6 October 2005, of the International Working Group, whose mission is to evaluate and follow the transition in Côte d'Ivoire and provide the Ivorian government with the assistance necessary for continuing the peace process and holding elections before 31 October 2006.

Analyst: Jonathan Scotland

3. Germany: +1

The German government has registered a moderate level of compliance with regard to its efforts to provide extra resources for Africa’s peacekeeping forces so that they can better deter, prevent and resolve conflicts in Africa. This has been achieved mainly through multilateral cooperation with institutions such as the United Nations (UN) and European Union (EU). Currently, the bulk of Germany’s activities are focused on the situation in the Sudan.

Germany has supported the African Union’s (AU) peace support mission in Sudan through the provision of communications equipment and set aside €2.25 million in aid for Darfur. Defence Minister Peter Struck

first indicated in September that Berlin might contribute soldiers to a UN mission in Sudan's Darfur region, referring to the crisis there as "genocide".  

On 16 December 2005, the German Bundestag voted a continuation of the German Armed Forces support for the AU in Darfur. That same day, the lower house of parliament also approved the government’s motion for a six-month extension of the mission until 2 June 2006. This enables the German army to continue to provide logistical support for the air transport of forces of the AU to Sudan with up to 200 soldiers.  

Germany has continued to contribute to improving logistical support arrangements through an increase in funding the AU Mission in Sudan, announced on 16 December 2005. According to the federal government of Germany, the additional costs for another six months will amount to up to €7 million. The costs for maintaining the present size of the operation are estimated at roughly €1 million. The goal of the AU mission is to visibly increase the presence of observers to guarantee observation of the armistice between the parties to the conflict in western Sudan and to allow humanitarian help. At the same time, the forces should protect the civilian population in the event of an immediate threat.  

Analyst: Justyna Janicka  

4. Italy: 0  

The Italian government has partially fulfilled its commitment to support peacekeeping forces in Africa. The bulk of its commitment takes the form of officer training for peacekeeping missions, with the main contribution focused on the newly established Centre of Excellence for Stability Police Units (CoESPU) in Vicenza, Italy. At the CoESPU specialized police units are trained for participation in peace support operations. The majority of those trained for peace support operations are expected to come from Africa. In November 2005, the first class of senior police officials completed the initial course, and in January 2006, a new senior officers’ course is set to begin. Further contributions to peacekeeping forces have, however, been limited. In September 2005, the Italian government made airlift commitments to transport troops for the African Union’s mission in Darfur. Beyond this commitment, the Italian government has not provided support to regional African peacekeeping forces since the Gleneagles summit.  

Analyst: Adrianna Kardynal  

5. Japan: +1  

The Japanese government’s contribution to African peacekeeping is distinct but qualifies as a reasonable level of compliance with Gleneagles peacekeeping commitments. It also provides aid in more traditional forms, most notably through financial contributions. One of the Japanese government’s most notable contributions to African peacekeeping is the ongoing Tokyo International Conference on African Development (TICAD). Another instalment of this conference is slated for 2008 to reassess African development, which is an important tool for procuring lasting

---

peace. In the meantime, Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi announced on 8 January 2006 a commitment to increase more conventional Japanese aid efforts by doubling official development assistance to Africa over the next three years.

Japan also welcomed the 20 December 2005 United Nations (UN) Security Council resolution aimed at establishing a Peacebuilding Commission. Japan pledges to contribute constructively to the project drawing on what it refers to as “its own experience and resources.” The Japanese government, therefore, allocated ¥14 billion in its 2006 budget to the area of human security projects worldwide. It has also allocated ¥16.5 billion for conflict prevention and peacebuilding projects, consistent with Japanese pledges to support of the Peacebuilding Commission established by the United Nations.

Analyst: Jenn Hood

6. Russia: -1

Though it increased its contributions to fighting disease and poverty in Africa prior to assuming the Presidency of the G8 for 2006, the Russian government has not substantially contributed to the advancement of peace and security on the African continent.

State Duma Deputy Vladimir Vasiliev has noted that the Russian government has deployed approximately 220 peacekeeping staff in United Nations (UN) operations in Africa. Indeed, in November 2005 Russia contributed 218 persons to 13 UN peacekeeping missions throughout the world. That figure is down from 332 personnel committed to UN missions in July 2005. The reduction in numbers is primarily a result of the withdrawal of 109 troops from the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSI). Such a move is commensurate with the actions of other G8 countries, which are withdrawing troops while providing logistical personnel and peacekeeper training. Mr. Vasiliev also noted, however, that Russia has trained 14 peacekeepers, and none in 2005.

These nominal contributions fail to provide real financial or technical support for AU peace support operations, Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) programs and other commitments as outlined in the Gleneagles statement on Africa.

Analyst: Bentley Allan

7. United Kingdom: +1

In making conflict prevention initiatives, with a special focus on African conflict, a central goal of its foreign policy, the government of the United Kingdom (UK) has demonstrated a high level of compliance with its peacekeeping commitments.

---

The Department of International Development, the Ministry of Defence, and the Foreign & Commonwealth Office have all made commitments to peacebuilding and peace support operations. The three agencies combine their resources and skills in the Africa Conflict Prevention Pool (ACPP). In 2005-06 the Pool is expected to disburse £60 million for conflict prevention programs commensurate with the goals of the G8 Africa Action Plans. With these funds, the ACPP works on conflict resolution programs in Uganda and Sudan that ensure the signing of peace agreements and the implementation of Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration (DDR) programmes essential to the maintenance of peace in post-conflict areas. The ACPP has also contributed to African-led Peace Support Operations in Côte d’Ivoire, Burundi and Liberia.

The British government has continued to push for an Arms Trade Treaty that would regulate conventional arms trade, including the small and light arms that threaten African security. The Arms Control Association reports that after Foreign Minister Jack Straw announced the plan for the treaty prior to the G8 summit, the British government has continued to promote it. However, little progress towards a real treaty has been made.

The UK also “reaffirmed key Gleneagles commitments” through its support of the establishment of a UN Peacebuilding Commission at the 2005 World Summit in September 2005. Moreover, the British government continues to support African Union Peace Operations, including the anticipated establishment of the Africa Standby Force, which the government hopes will be operational by June 2006.

Analyst: Bentley Allan

8. United States: +1

The American government is effectively pursuing its commitment towards providing extra resources for Africa’s peacekeeping forces. Bill H.R.3057, passed by the House of Representatives on 28 June 2005 and by the Senate on 20 July 2005, allocates US$114 million to the Global Peace Operations Initiative through which African peacekeepers will be trained and equipped.

One specific contribution for peacekeeping forces has been towards the Centre of Excellence for Stability Police Units (CoESPU). On 23 September 2005, the American and Italian governments signed an agreement formalizing American financial support to the CoESPU. The support has contributed to the training of officers from various African countries for peace support operations. The US has also contributed transportation capabilities to African Union’s peacekeeping mission in Darfur. Movement of Rwandan troops and cargo began 17 July 2005 by U.S. Air Force C-17 and C-130 aircraft. By 28 September 2005, approximately 1,200 personnel had been transported to Darfur as a result of American

---

support through a larger NATO effort.\textsuperscript{39} On 15 December 2005, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice appealed to Congress to provide US$50 million for the African troops in Darfur for further assistance.\textsuperscript{40}

The American government also made a new commitment to the government of South Africa to provide resources for multinational peace support operations. On 12 August 2005, South African Minister of Defense Mosiuoa Lekota and the American Ambassador to South Africa Jendayi Frazer signed an agreement under the African Contingency Operations Training and Assistance Program (ACOTA). Although the nature and extent of training and assistance to be provided to South Africa was not yet determined, the overall purpose of the program is to increase the capacity of African nations to participate in multinational peace support operations.\textsuperscript{41}

Analyst: Adrianna Kardynal

9. European Union: +1

The European Union (EU) has actively complied with its G8 commitment to provide extra resources for Africa’s peacekeeping forces so that they can better deter, prevent and resolve conflicts in Africa. The majority of its compliance activities have been achieved through active multilateral cooperation with other states and institutions such as the UN and NATO.

The European Commission welcomed the endorsement by the General Affairs and External Relations Council of the EU Strategy for Africa. This ambitious long-term plan marks an important milestone in EU-Africa relations and will boost Africa’s sustainable development. The strategy focuses on key requirements for sustainable development such as peace and security, good and effective governance, trade, interconnectivity, social cohesion and environmental sustainability. Discussions with African states and organizations are starting now focused on turning this strategy into concrete projects, in order to increase stability.\textsuperscript{42}

The adoption of the EU Strategy for Africa, proposed by the European Commission on 12 October 2005, marks the culmination of a year during which the international community, and the EU in particular, has focused on Africa. But this decision is not the end of the process; it should instead be seen as the beginning of a new partnership between the EU and Africa. The Strategy marks a change in the way the EU deals with the African continent.\textsuperscript{43}

On 16 November 2005, Louis Michel, European Commissioner for Development and Humanitarian Aid, announced that more than €10 million have been earmarked for assisting the Somali Government to provide a secure environment and that the Commission could provide further €49 million to support Somalia’s Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP), in parallel to progress in stabilization and entry into force of representative and working institutions. He also stated that he would shortly appoint a Special Envoy for Somalia and that the Commission would open a field office in Jowhar.\textsuperscript{44}

Analyst: Justyna Janicka

Good Governance

Commitment

“We will work vigorously for early ratification of the UN Convention against Corruption and start discussions on mechanisms to ensure its effective implementation.”

-Africa Report

Background

Since the creation of the African Action Plan (AAP) at the Kananaskis Summit in 2002, the G8 countries have been explicit in their commitment to focus aid money directed to Africa on initiatives that strengthen practices of good governance. This includes projects that encourage the rule of law; anti-corruption campaigns; and efforts for democratization and fair elections.

At the Gleneagles Summit, the G8 reiterated many of the commitments contained in the African Action Plan and the NEPAD agreement regarding good governance in Africa. The four key commitments were: support for the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM); support for African countries in their implementation of the APRM recommendations; support for greater transparency in public financial management; and supporting African partners in ratifying the Africa Union Convention on Preventing and Combating Corruption.

The promotion of good governance was presented hand-in-hand with Official Development Assistance policies; the goal is not more but better aid. The G8 has recognized that most development policies require transparent and capable leadership if development is going to be sustained and African-led.

The United Nations Convention Against Corruption has 140 signatories, including all G8 members and the European Community. This convention commits parties to promote international cooperation and technical assistance; to strengthen measures to combat corruption; and to promote integrity, accountability, and better management of public affairs and property.

Team Leader: Mary Albino


## Assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Individual Country Compliance Breakdown

#### 1. Canada: 0

The Government of Canada registered a moderate level of compliance with the commitments made at Gleneagles regarding good governance in Africa. Showing some initiative to combat corruption and improve transparency in Africa, Canadian efforts have generally been peripheral and little progress has been made.

On 10 June 2005, Minister of Finance Ralph Goodale announced that the Government of Canada would agree to take on the Presidency of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) for a 12-month period beginning July 2006.\(^{50}\) The FATF promotes global standards of anti-money laundering and anti-terrorist financing.\(^{51}\) Canada also participated in the 2005 APEC Anti Corruption and Transparency Symposium in September 2005 where it presented its economy’s anti-corruption strategies.\(^{52}\) The conference highlighted different procedures and conditions for extradition and asset recovery.\(^{53}\) This is particularly important as the G8 commitment made at Gleneagles stressed that asset recovery would be a central tenet in their fight against corruption.\(^{54}\)

Through further efforts to promote transparency, the Government of Canada sent a delegation, led by Senator Mac Harb, to the UN World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) from 16-18 November 2005.\(^{55}\) Foreign Affairs Minister Pierre Pettigrew asserted that “Canadians understand the need for

---


effective partnerships among government, industry, and civil society.\textsuperscript{56} Accordingly, the Canadian government has supported the process (WSIS) through a total contribution of CAD$1.7 million over the past three years to the International Telecommunications Union (ITU) special trust fund for WSIS.\textsuperscript{57} Moreover, Minister of International Cooperation Aileen Carroll and Foreign Affairs Minister Pierre Pettigrew announced on 12 July 2005 that Canada will provide CAD$10 million to support a free, fair, and transparent election process in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC).\textsuperscript{58}

Analyst: Fauzia Isakka

2. France: +1

France has demonstrated compliance with respect to the commitments made at the Gleneagles Summit concerning the establishment of good governance. France has pledged to increase aid efficiency to the region,\textsuperscript{59} in and effort to help Africa reach the UN Millennium Development Goals by the targeted deadline of 2015.\textsuperscript{60} Specifically, at the 23\textsuperscript{rd} Franco-African Summit in December 2005, France promised to target its aid on the development of infrastructure in African countries in order to establish the necessary conditions for effective governance.\textsuperscript{61} Moreover, France is the only G8 country to have ratified the UN Convention Against Corruption, having done so on 11 July 2005.\textsuperscript{62}

France is also in the process of seeking wider EU participation for the RECAM Program (Reinforcement of African Peacekeeping Capabilities), which will help to achieve stability in the region.\textsuperscript{63}

France has also shown dedication to encouraging better governance at the cultural level, believing that political stability has a cultural dimension. This was evident when the Francophone African countries stood together behind France to push through an international convention on cultural diversity in October 2005.\textsuperscript{64} The hope is that this convention will aid in fostering economic growth in Africa through the link between culture and sustainable development.

Analyst: Emilie Gelinas

3. Germany: 0

At the Gleneagles Summit Germany issued a report articulating its contribution to the NEPAD agreement and the African Action Plan (AAP). The two main points of emphasis were the importance of African-led initiatives in an environment of partnership, and the critical nature of building infrastructure so that

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{56} Canadian Delegation to Participate in UN World Summit on Information Society, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, (Ottawa), 16 November 2005. Date of Access: 3 January 2006. http://w01.international.gc.ca/minpub/Publication.asp?publication_id=383407&Language=E.
  \item \textsuperscript{57} Canadian Delegation to Participate in UN World Summit on Information Society, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, (Ottawa), 16 November 2005. Date of Access: 3 January 2006. http://w01.international.gc.ca/minpub/Publication.asp?publication_id=383407&Language=E.
  \item \textsuperscript{62} First global convention against corruption to come into force, Transparency International, (Berlin), 16 September 2005. Date of access: 5 February 2006. http://www.transparency.org/in_focus_archive/30th_ratification/30th_ratification.html
  \item \textsuperscript{63} France strives to recast its role in Africa as the past comes calling, David White, The Financial Times, (London), 2 December 2005.
\end{itemize}
economic and political reform initiatives meet better conditions. In both regards, Germany has registered a high level of compliance.

In November 2005, President Horst Koehler hosted the first annual Germany-Africa Partnership Forum in Bonn, a tradition that will continue until 2009. The purpose of the forum was, “to have open dialogue on relations between African and industrialized countries where tension and contradictions are not taboo at all with a view to moving towards partnership.” In attendance were AU Current Chairman and Nigerian President, Mr. Olusegun Obasanjo, and South African President Thabo Mbeki. Among other things, President Koehler agreed to help Nigeria to recover billions of embezzled dollars.

The German government had pledged a donation of 2.4 million euros to support the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM). Also, The Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung (KAS), a political foundation of German Government that promotes democracy in West Africa, has continued to contribute to strengthening good governance in Africa. The KAS works with governmental institutions to develop democratic structures and institutions, and to create democratic attitudes in the population. Since Gleneagles, KAS has hosted numerous workshops and lectures in African countries examining discreet issues of democratization such as the “role and management of political parties in Mali”. Since Gleneagles the German Government has also stepped up its offer of a partnership on development and governance policies with its former colony, Namibia. German support is aimed particularly at governance structures that will support ethnic monitories who suffered under German rule. Namibia is currently reviewing the offer. Germany has not, however, ratified the UN Convention Against Corruption.

Analyst: Mary Albino

4. Italy: 0

The Italian government supports many initiatives to combat corruption and improve transparency in Africa, and has, therefore, partially complied with its Gleneagles commitment. For one, the Italian Parliament launched the Global Centre for Information and Communication Technology (ICT) at the High-level Dialogue on Governance, Global Citizenship and Technology on 16 November 2005. Built on initiatives by Hon. Pier Ferdinando Casini, President of the Chamber of Deputies of Italy, and Hon. Ahmed Sorour of Egypt, along with key parliaments’ leaders around the world, the Global Centre aims to improve levels of openness and accountability in legislatures.

Italy also supports the e-government for development (EG4D) - E-Accounting Initiative which was launched in November 2005. Mapping out all of the financial activities of a public administration, E-Accounting is a prerequisite for the sound functioning of national governance systems. In short, it promotes transparency and efficiency in the whole public system.

In further combating corruption, on 22 November 2005 the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs hosted an international conference on “Corruption as an Obstacle to Development and the Policies, Instruments and Strategies to Combat it”. In particular, the Conference underlined how corruption impedes transparent and fair markets. Ample discussion time was devoted to strategies for the prevention and repression of corruption. Additionally, Italian Undersecretary for Foreign Affairs, Alfredo Mantica, inaugurated a specialized training course on “Governance and Public Politics”; the course will focus on subjects such as the transparency of governmental activities.

Like the United States, the government of Italy supports anti-corruption campaigns around the world without having ratified the United Nations Convention against Corruption. Italy has not, however, ratified the UN Convention Against Corruption.

Analyst: Fauzia Isakka

5. Japan: -1

The Government of Japan’s central focus regarding Africa continues to be economic growth through investment and trade. As a result, Prime Minister Koizumi has directed very little effort to improving good governance on the continent. For this reason Japan registers inadequate compliance with the commitment made at Gleneagles.

According to Ambassador Toshinori Shigeie, in a speech given in September 2005, the three pillars of Japan’s African Development Strategy are: 1. “human centred development”; 2. poverty reduction through economic deployment; and 3. consolidation of peace. Japan has made important contributions in each of these areas including large private investment initiatives in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda, and significant ODA, trade and private investments in South Africa, which it calls “the engine of economic growth in Africa.” Further, in an effort to realize the contents of the NEPAD Agreement Japan has partnered with the African Development Bank (AfDB) to create the “Enhanced Private Sector Assistance for Africa” facility.

---

While it can be argued that economic growth indirectly enhances better governance, Japan has failed to take direct actions to comply with commitments made at Gleneagles to improving governance in Africa. Moreover, Japan has not ratified the UN Convention Against Corruption.85

Analyst: Mary Albino

6. Russia: 0

The Russian commitment to promoting good governance can be evaluated in three ways: whether the Russian government has sought to ratify and implement the UN Convention against Corruption; whether Russia has attempted to eliminate corruption, increase transparency, and enhance governance structures in Africa; and whether Russia has made efforts to diminish domestic corruption.

Although Russia has not yet ratified the UN Convention against Corruption, President Vladimir Putin submitted the Convention to the Parliament’s lower chamber for ratification on 20 December 2005.86 Russia signed the convention on 9 December 2003.87 However, there is little evidence of implementation of anti-corruption measures stipulated by the Convention.88

The Russian government’s relationship with governance structures in Africa has been enhanced in the period since Gleneagles Summit. A report by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs indicates that Russia took an active role in the activities of the African Partnership Forum (APF), including the preparation of the Draft Joint Action Plan of the APF.89 This report also describes the strengthening of Russian involvement with the African Union and the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD).90 However, it appears that little action has been taken to directly combat corruption and increase transparency. A report by the NGO Christian Aid suggests that companies based in G8 countries including Russia are responsible for encouraging endemic corruption in Africa. Companies “pay enormous bribes to get a competitive advantage over their rivals” and G8 governments fail to prosecute them.91

Domestic corruption remains a major problem for Russia; in 2005 Transparency International moved Russia down the list on their Corruption Perceptions Index to the 126th most corrupt country in the world.92 Kirill Kabanov, the head of the National Anticorruption Committee, says that state corruption has increased exponentially over the past few years, while Transparency International finds that nearly 30% of Russians polled, or a close family member, have paid a bribe within the last month.93 The Indem Foundation expects USD$320 billion to be paid in bribes in 2005.94 Finally, Russia has yet to ratify the UN Convention Against Corruption.95

The Russian government has taken some limited anti-corruption measures since Gleneagles. A major assault on corruption in Russian courts was initiated in 2005, and there is significant Russian involvement in the Anti-Corruption Network for Transition Economies (ACN).

Analyst: Joanna Langille

7. United Kingdom: 0

In the final months of its presidency of the G8, Britain has made some progress in implementing the G8 commitment to reducing corruption and increasing transparency, particularly in Africa.

First, the British government facilitated the strengthening of the African Partnership Forum (APF) to monitor whether G8 members fulfill their Gleneagles commitments to Africa. The fifth meeting of the APF was held 4-5 October 2005 in London, and was hosted by the British government. The Joint Action Plan details how the G8, APF, African Union, etc. can work together to reach G8 commitments, including those which combat corruption and create transparency. The British government also proposed that the Gleneagles commitments be reviewed at the 2006 Summit in order to ensure implementation.

Second, Britain strengthened its relationship with African governance structures, particularly the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) and the African Union (AU). Britain continued its diplomatic support for NEPAD’s African Peer Review Mechanism, a governance-monitoring plan. In November Britain announced a USD 30 million boost to a NEPAD trade project. Although Britain did promote good governance in both of these ways, it has made little specific progress on this issue. The above measures tend to promote G8 commitments generally, with little effort ensure that corruption and transparency are affected.

Third, Britain placed a travel ban on Kenyan Minister Chris Murunguru, a convicted perpetrator of political corruption. Britain has also failed in its commitment to ratify the UN Convention against Corruption, despite calls from British NGOs, think tanks, and opposition parties. Britain has not attempted to change laws which permit British governments to perpetuate corruption abroad, thus indirectly contributing to corruption in Africa and elsewhere. In addition, Britain has not ratified the UN Convention Against Corruption.

Analyst: Joanna Langille

8. United States: 0

Despite having not yet ratified the UN Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC), the United States has made some significant contributions to good governance initiatives around the world. It has done this in two main ways: through significant financial contributions and by actively encouraging other countries to do the same.

The government affiliated Human Rights and Democracy Fund (HRDF), which monitors and promotes human rights and democracy worldwide, spent US$4.5 million on the National Endowment for Democracy Sub-Saharan Africa project. This money was used to support work on the rule of law, democratic initiatives, accountability, constitutional reform, and civic education. HRDF also contributed US$415,000 to evaluate various countries’ commitment to human rights and democracy through a series of surveys. It also gave US$250,000 to the National Endowment of Democracy World Movement for Democracy, which gathers in order to exchange ideas and experiences in efforts to promote democracy.

The US Agency for International Development (USAID) has significantly contributed to good governance initiatives. It donated US$2,560,000 to its Rule of Law Program in 2005, and US$2,095,000 to its Elections and Political Processes Program. Through the governance program, anti-corruption efforts, democratic governance, legislatures, and management of the policy reform process was supported by US$2,795,000.

At the 13th Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Leaders’ Meeting, President George W. Bush took leadership in taking stronger action against corruption. Moreover, APEC leaders collectively decided to continue denying safe haven to corrupt officials and individuals and make the implementation of UNCAC principles a top priority.

The US receives a score of partial compliance because it has yet to ratify or move closer to ratifying the UN Convention against Corruption.

Analyst: Venus Yam

9. European Union: 0

The European Union registered partial compliance with the commitment it made to good governance at the 2005 Gleneagles Summit. The EU is dedicated to ensuring that levels of aid money from G8 countries is not only increased but also better allocated. The EU recognizes that good governance is an integral part of all further development policies.

---

In this context, the EU has made it a priority to direct its support to strengthening the internal institutional structure of the African Union and the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM). The EU also agreed to launch several new joint initiatives, including deepening political cooperation between the EU and the AU, as well as between European and African institutions.\textsuperscript{118} There was also an acceptance by the AU to transform the draft “EU Strategy for Africa” into a formal treaty, and to develop a plan for its implementation.\textsuperscript{119} The EU also pledged its support to the fight against corruption, including a promise to help return all illegally acquired assets currently being held in foreign banks to the country of origin.\textsuperscript{120} These commitments were reiterated in the EU Strategy for Africa report issued in October 2005. Although the European Community and all of the EC’s G8 member states are signatories to the UN Convention Against Corruption,\textsuperscript{121} its G8 member states (with the exception of France) have yet to ratify the convention.\textsuperscript{122}

Analyst: Emilie Gelinas


\textsuperscript{121} United Nations Convention Against Corruption, (New York), 5 February 2006. Date of access: 5 February 2006.

Global Health: HIV/AIDS

Commitment

“We will work to meet the financing needs for HIV/AIDS, including through the replenishment this year of the Global Fund to fight AIDS, TB and Malaria; and actively working with local stakeholders to implement the ‘3 Ones’ principles in all countries.”

- Africa (July 8, 2005)\(^{123}\)

Background

With a growing political awareness of global health, including AIDS, TB, and malaria, the G8 reaffirmed its commitment to eradicating these diseases at the Gleneagles summit in July 2005. The commitment included continued support for the “3 Ones” principles developed by UNAIDS, the World Bank, and global donors. These principles call for collaboration and more effective use of resources to combat the spread of HIV/AIDS, and to meet the needs of people living with the disease through performance-based funding. Grant recipients who demonstrate measurable and effective results from the monies received will be able to receive additional funding.\(^{124}\) While the initiative is an essential step to global coordination with multi-sector participants, the National AIDS Coordinating Authority that would be created as a result requires extensive funding to undertake its task. That task would also include monitoring and assessment tools to not only determine program success but to ensure accountability to donors. These new goals, however, do indicate a major priority shift from the goals leading up to the Gleneagles Summit where world leaders were expected to strengthen HIV vaccine research. Instead of preventative research being the focal point, the issue has fallen back on programs to reduce and monitor global levels of HIV/AIDS.

Compliance levels, measured by financial contributions required to ensure the success of this venture, have been very positive, with most countries exhibiting either full compliance or progressive steps which will greatly boost the ability to reduce the global spread of these diseases. The political and financial commitments were visible in 2005, with the Global Fund announcing the successful closing of the 2005 funding gap with nearly US$729 million in new commitments.\(^{125}\) These funds were instrumental in bringing anti-retroviral drugs to patients with HIV/AIDS, treating tuberculosis (TB) patients, and limiting malaria by distributing insecticide treated bed nets among other social, medical, and educational outreach programs.\(^{126}\) The Global Fund does, however, “continue to face a resource shortfall of approximately US$1.1 billion for 2006,” making new funding announcements by G8 leaders very important between the Gleneagles and St. Petersburg Summits to realize this goal.\(^{127}\)

Team Leader: Barbara Tassa
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### Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1. Canada 0

Canada registered a high level of compliance with Gleneagles’ HIV/AIDS commitment in terms of raising awareness of the importance of HIV/AIDS and the allocation of new funds to meet global health commitments. Before the G8 Summit in Gleneagles, Canada was already a lead contributor to the Global Fund to fight AIDS, TB and Malaria. On September 9, 2005, Aileen Carroll, Minister of International Cooperation announced that the Canadian International Development Agency will deliver $250 million to the Global Fund. Additionally, the federal budget in February 2005 announced CDN$140 million committed to the Global Fund to fight AIDS, TB, and Malaria.

Following the Gleneagles Summit, the Canadian Government has taken further steps to meet the financing needs for HIV/AIDS. On 9 September 2005, the Minister of International Cooperation, Ms. Aileen Carroll, announced that a further CDN$250 million would be committed towards replenishing the Global Fund. Canada is also taking an active role in raising awareness of the HIV/AIDS epidemic by agreeing to host the XVI Annual International AIDS Conference in Toronto from 13-18 August 2006. The Conference will attract delegates, NGOs, and other stakeholders from all over the world.

With high compliance for meeting HIV/AIDS funding, however, there was limited support or discussion of the ‘3 Ones’ principles. In sum, following the 2005 G8 Summit Canada has taken positive steps towards fulfilling its commitment to meet the financing needs of HIV/AIDS and replenish the Global Fund.

Analyst: Danielle Takacs
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cida.gc.ca/cida_ind.nsf/0/93BE4E9797AB99B58525707700411691%3FOpenDocument+september+2005+canada+%24250+million
+to+global+fund&hl=ca&ct=clnk&cd=1
asp.gc.ca/aids-sida/hiv_aids/report05/conf_toronto_e.html.
2. France: 0

France has demonstrated both political and financial support of the Gleneagles HIV/AIDS commitment to replenish the Global Fund for AIDS, TB, and malaria. In December 2005, the French parliament announced approval for its plan to add an airline surtax to fund its commitment. The plan was announced earlier at the January 2005 World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland. Just prior to the Gleneagles Summit in July 2005, French President Chirac announced an increased contribution to the Global Fund of €225 million in 2006 and €300 million for 2007. On 6 September 2005, Mme. Brigitte Girardin, Minister Delegate for Cooperation, Development and Francophony, reiterated France’s commitment to the increased contribution.

Analyst: Barbara Tassa

3. Germany: -1

Germany registered non-compliance for Gleneagles’ HIV/AIDS commitments through continued support for the Global Fund, though no new commitments were made. To date, Germany has contributed nearly two-thirds of the €328.5 million it pledged to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria during the period 2002-2007. In 2005, Germany contributed €102.9 million to the Global Fund. While it is clear that in the past Germany has contributed to the Global Fund it has not made any new commitments and thus has failed to replenish the Global Fund.

Analyst: Benita Hansraj

4. Italy: 0

Italy has been active in funding HIV/AIDS initiatives and has partially complied with the commitment made at Gleneagles. For instance, Italy provided €400 million to the Global Fund to fight AIDS, TB, and Malaria from 2001-2005. Italy announced a further contribution of new funding in November 2005 to provide another €260 million to the Global Fund from 2005-2007. While there were no statements or announcements in support of the 3 Ones principles, the significant funding Italy has provided for the Fund indicates that they are complying with their commitment to help meet the financing needs for HIV/AIDS.

Analyst: Danielle Takacs

5. Japan +1

The Japanese government fulfilled its 2005 pledge of US$100 million to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS on 8 November 2005. With this announcement, the Japanese government fulfilled its commitments to the Global Fund ahead of schedule. On 9 November 2005, the Japanese government pledged US$3.8 million to UNICEF to prevent AIDS, malaria, tetanus, and measles among the children of Myanmar, including the purchase of HIV/AIDS test kits. This announcement came three months after the UN Global Fund to...
Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria announced that it would cut funding to Myanmar. The Japanese government has demonstrated its financial commitment to fighting AIDS beyond its commitments to the Global Fund, but has neither supported the 3 Ones principles, nor made any substantial contributions to HIV vaccine development. Overall, Japan has showed great leadership in financing new 2006-07 goals for the Global Fund in accordance with its Gleneagles Summit commitment in July 2005.

Analyst: Jennifer Hertz

6. Russia: 0

Russia complied with the Gleneagles global health commitment to fighting AIDS, TB, and malaria through both political and financial contributions. In August 2005, Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov stated that the “topic of fighting epidemics, AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis” would be one of the “massive initiatives” Russia would be introducing during their G8 presidency. By September 2005, President Putin earmarked three billion roubles (US$105 million) - a twenty-fold increase over the previous year - to fight AIDS in 2006. In early November, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed between the Moscow Chamber of Industry and Trade and the Russian Office of UNICEF, ensuring continued partnership within “young people’s health...[and] HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment” programs. On 14 November, Russian Deputy Health and Social Development Minister, Mr. Vladimir Starodubov, announced that Russia would allocate “about US$1 billion for HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention programs from its consolidated budget within the next five years” during a presentation of a UNICEF global campaign in Moscow.

Following a series of damming reports by UNAIDS on the large and growing HIV/AIDS epidemic in Russia, the Russian government reaffirmed its allocation of some US$104 million in federal funds in 2006 to fight HIV/AIDS in the country. In a 90-page report, the International Treatment Preparedness Coalition highlighted the lack of a national treatment protocol in Russia, a faulty drug procurement system, a lack of collaboration among providers, and a lack of national leadership as reasons for the Russian government’s slow and ineffective response to the growing epidemic. Shortly thereafter, the deputy of the Russian Ministry of Public Health announced that the government planned to devote US$107 million in 2006 and US$267 million in 2007 to an “unprecedented effort” to fight the disease domestically.

Finally, on December 1st, World AIDS Day, the Russian government broadcast a film, held panel discussions, and staged a beauty contest, “Miss Positive 2005” in its attempts to “change the public’s attitude,” stated Russia’s Chief Public Health Official. On the eve of World AIDS Day, nongovernmental

---

organizations praised President Putin for “promising to drastically increase funds to fight AIDS,” though warned that “the money might be spent in vain.” With significant political awareness and financial contribution to fight AIDS, Russia has shown strong compliance with its G8 commitment.

Analyst: Abby Slinger

6. United Kingdom: +1

During its presidency of the G8, the British government placed issues relating to Africa, including HIV/AIDS, prominently on the agenda but, thus far, has failed to be a strong leader in the commitment to replenish the Global Fund. In total, the British government has committed 51 million to the Global Fund to fight AIDS, of which 10.2 million has been paid to date. The British government also allocated funds for HIV vaccine development and the development of microbicides to prevent the transmission of HIV to women.

Britain is one of the few countries to have discussed an HIV vaccine and microbicide development since the Gleneagles Summit. On 1 December 2005, World AIDS Day, Prime Minister Blair announced that the British government would give 20 million to the International AIDS Vaccine Initiative and 7.5 million to the International Partnership of Microbicides. The International AIDS Vaccine Initiative finances partnerships with private companies and academic and government agencies to develop HIV vaccine candidates. Vaccine development was a goal stated in the G8’s statement on Africa. The International Partnership of Microbicides finances the development of a microbicide for women to prevent the transmission of HIV. Microbicides were not specifically mentioned in the G8’s Gleneagles commitments and go beyond the UK government’s commitment to HIV/AIDS research.

Prime Minister Blair has continually discussed the importance of HIV/AIDS goals. This has been widely publicized in both his speech to the UN General Assembly at the 2005 World Summit, and on World AIDS Day, where he played a soccer game in Essex to raise awareness of HIV and AIDS, stating that “it is important that we continue to make a big commitment from the wealthy countries to funding access to HIV/Aids treatment”. With reference to financing Mr. Blair said that, “the Global Health Fund back in September agreed to almost four billion dollars worth of funding, so we are moving this along, but it is important continually to keep people aware of what this HIV/AIDS threat is doing to countries like Malawi and other African countries”. Even though the British government has not yet fulfilled its funding pledge to the Global Fund, it issued a 51 million promissory note on 26 July 2005 of which 10.2 million has been cashed to date in accordance with an agreed-upon payment schedule. Regardless of political commitments to this cause, the UK has not been a leader in financial contributions, which are at the core of the G8 commitment.

Analyst: Jennifer Hertz

7. United States: 0

The United States has yet to achieve full compliance with its 2005 G8 health commitment due to insufficient Global Fund donations, but has continued to stress the importance of its commitment. In mid-July 2005, First Lady Laura Bush visited Africa in order to highlight US aid and partnerships promoting


programs for girls’ education as well as HIV/AIDS awareness. In September 2005, President Bush’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (by way of USAID) announced the awarding of a contract to The Partnership for Supply Chain Management (the Partnership), a consortium that would provide and implement effective, transparent and accountable supply chain systems of high-quality, low-cost medicines. By the end of the month, however, the largest G8 economies, namely the US, Japan and Germany, had refused to take part in the deal to distribute existing vaccines to poor countries, known as the International Finance Facility for Immunization (IFFIm).

On November 14th, President Bush signed into law a USD$20.9 billion foreign spending bill for the fiscal year (ending September 30th, 2006) that would provide USD$2.8 billion to fight HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis worldwide. In late November, the U.S. Congress began considering “whether to provide USD$250 million more than the USD$300 million President Bush requested for the Global Fund for 2006.” Critics, however, suggested that were the additional fees to be granted, the amount would continue “to be less than [America’s] previously acknowledged ... [global] share.” Having initially promised to “supply one third of the funding for the Global Fund [e.g., $700 million],” analysts state that “current funding plans [falling] short by $150 million.” Accordingly, the final funding plans for HIV/AIDS globally will need to be finalized.

Finally, on World AIDS Day, President Bush—renewing the U.S. commitment to “turning the tide against the disease”—announced the “New Partnership Initiative” that would lend US funds to faith-based groups which help to provide health care in the developing world. US Global AIDS’ Coordinator, Mark Dybul, also called on other countries to commit more funding to the fight against HIV/AIDS. Moreover, in a speech attended by five Cabinet secretaries and many African ambassadors, President Bush detailed the progress of the five-year, US$15 billion global US initiative against HIV/AIDS. However, European states issued statements highlighting the growing US preoccupation with the abstinence based strategy for combating HIV/AIDS. In early December, the US government, which provides half of all funding to fight HIV/AIDS and is the single largest donor to the Global Fund, called on other countries to increase their contributions by following the US lead. As a large donor, however, President Bush’s global AIDS

---

proposal funding only allocated six percent for the Global Fund. Therefore, while the US has shown resolve for the fight against HIV/AIDS, it has yet to comply with the G8 commitment towards replenishing the Global Fund.

Analyst: Abby Slinger

8. European Union: +1

The European Union has offered full compliance with the Gleneagles Initiatives to combat HIV/AIDS. According to the Global Fund, the European Commission fulfilled its pledge commitment of US $69.5 million in 2005 and planned contribution of US$106 million for 2006. The severity of the HIV/AIDS pandemic was given even greater prominence by the Commission of European Communities on December 15, 2005 when the Commission released a statement to the European Parliament outlining the mandate of the Commission on combating HIV/AIDS within the European Union and its neighbouring states, to be deemed effective between 2006 and 2009. The cornerstone of this mandate was initially laid at the United Nations General Assembly Special Session on HIV/AIDS, during which Heads of State and Government met on the matter from 25 to 27 June 2001. However, the mandate released by the European Commission in December 2005 exceeds the framework established by the UNGA Special Session on HIV/AIDS from 2001.

The mandate of the European Commission is quite comprehensive and outlines the standards to be promoted by all European Union member states including greater emphasis on HIV/AIDS prevention, increased involvement with civil society in policy development and implementation of HIV/AIDS prevention and response, as well as, private actors. The mandate extends beyond the European Union member states to include future assistance to be offered to the Russian Federation in HIV/AIDS prevention and reduction. Given the extensive analysis, mandate, and commitment of the European Commission in meeting the standards promoted by the G8 on the matter of HIV/AIDS, the European Commission has achieved full compliance with the Gleneagles commitment.

Analyst: Benita Hansraj

---

Health: Polio Eradication

Commitment

“Supporting the Polio Eradication Initiative for the post eradication period in 2006-8 through continuing or increasing our own contributions toward the $829 million target and mobilising the support of others.”

-Africa, 8 July 2005

Background

In 1988, the World Health Organization created the Global Polio Eradication Initiative (GPEI), an international public health effort to eliminate polio. Spearheaded by the World Health Organization (WHO), Rotary International, United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), and the Centers for Disease Control; it relies on government and private sector donations to achieve its goals. November 2005 analyses show six countries with endemic polio (Nigeria, India, Pakistan, Niger, Afghanistan, and Egypt), and 10 countries that were re-infected (Somalia, Yemen, Indonesia, Sudan, Ethiopia, Angola, Mali, Cameroon, Chad, and Eritrea). At the 2004 Sea Island Summit, the G8 released the G8 Commitment to Help Stop Polio Forever in which G8 members committed to closing the 2004-2005 funding gap in the GPEI budget. As of July 2005, the funding gap had been closed. At the 2005 Gleneagles Summit, leaders pledged to support the 2006-2008 post-eradication period by continuing or increasing contributions towards the US$829 million target for the 2006-2008 period. At the completion of the interim compliance period, the GPEI still faces a funding shortfall of US$750 million for 2006-2008. According to the WHO, multi-year and flexible financing commitments are needed to cover the unmet funding requirement of US$750 million for 2006-2008, of which US$200 million is immediately required for efforts in 2006. These funds are needed to buy oral polio vaccine, conduct polio immunization campaigns, implement emergency outbreak response, sustain highly sensitive disease surveillance, and provide technical support to G8 members. Increased contributions are required if this commitment is to be fulfilled by the end of the Gleneagles compliance period.

Team Leader: Laura Hodgins

### Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Individual Country Compliance Breakdown

1. Canada: 0

Since 1988, Canada has been among the top five donors to the GPEI, providing a total of CAD$110 million. In its February 2005 budget, Canada pledged CAD$42 million towards eradicating polio by the end of that year; however, it has made no pledges beyond 2005. Due to the upcoming federal election, a working 2006 budget has not yet been passed. However, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) anticipates that the government's upcoming international policy statement will provide further direction for the GPEI. Until a 2006 budget is prepared, Canada cannot be said to have met its Gleneagles commitment.

Analyst: Russell Ironside

2. France: +1

France has registered full compliance with its Gleneagles commitment to fund the 2006-2008 polio eradication period. France is a core donor to the Global Polio Eradication Initiative, and prior to the 2004 Sea Island Summit, the French government pledged to augment its funding for the GPEI by $12.8 million for 2006. According to the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the government of France will allocate €10 million in its 2006 budget to boost its efforts in the field of polio eradication. Having taken positive steps to fulfil its Gleneagles commitment on polio, the government of France receives a score of +1, indicating full compliance.

Analyst: Russell Ironside

---

3. Germany: 0

The German government has registered partial compliance with the Gleneagles polio eradication commitment. The GPEI requires US$75 million to fund global immunization initiatives and polio surveillance in the first quarter of 2006.\(^\text{183}\) Germany contributed US$12 million to GPEI to fund the distribution of oral polio vaccine (OPV) in Nigeria.\(^\text{184}\) In fall 2005, Germany contributed an additional US$1 million to fund global polio initiatives.\(^\text{185}\) Since Germany has yet to deliver any funds towards the 2006-2008 target, it receives a score of 0, indicating work in progress.

Analyst: Gunwant Gill

4. Italy: 0

Italy has demonstrated partial compliance with the Gleneagles polio eradication commitment.\(^\text{186}\) Italy is a 6th tier donor to the GPEI, indicating that it has contributed between US$5-24 million US from 1988-2008.\(^\text{187}\) Italy has allocated US$5.5 million to the Gleneagles polio eradication commitment for the 2006 fiscal year—a pledge that few other public sector donors have matched since the Gleneagles summit. Additionally, in 2005, Italy contributed US$15,000 for outbreak response in Angola.\(^\text{188}\) While Italy has contributed over US$12 million throughout 2004-2005, it is unclear whether Italy has introduced new policy or allocated new funding toward this commitment since the Gleneagles summit.

Analyst: Orsolya Soos

5. Japan: 0

Japan has registered partial compliance with the Gleneagles polio eradication commitment for the 2006-2008 period. Between 1988-2008 Japan’s commitment to the Polio Eradication Initiative is second only to the United States and Great Britain - falling in the range of $250-500 million US.\(^\text{189}\) In August 2005, the government of Japan also announced a donation $5 million to UNICEF towards the Polio Eradication Initiative.\(^\text{190}\) This contribution is meant to support immunization programs for the next twelve months, as well as other health programs in Sudan.\(^\text{191}\) The extent of Japan’s contribution to the 2006-2008 eradication commitment is, however, unclear. Japan receives a score of 0 indicating only partial compliance.

Analyst: Laura Hodgins

---


6. Russia: 0

Russia has shown an uncertain degree of compliance with the Gleneagles polio eradication commitment. In a 28 December 2005 statement on African-Russian relations, Deputy Foreign Minister Stortchak reaffirmed Russian commitment to infectious disease control in Africa, both as part of its role in the G8, and as part of the responsibilities that come with Russia’s increasingly stable economic position. He stressed Russia’s past contributions, however, and did not announce any new funding for the GPEI.\(^{192}\)

The Russian Federation was acknowledged by the Rotary Club, the largest non-governmental partner of GPEI, as a major donor to the GPEI in its January 2006 update.\(^{193}\) Yet although Russia is classified a 6th tier donor, indicating that it has contributed between $5-24 million US from 1988-2008,\(^{194}\) it has thus far not offered new commitments consistent with its Gleneagles pledge. Russia thus receives a score of 0, indicating only partial compliance with the polio commitment.

Analyst: Lisa Skinner

7. United Kingdom: +1

Great Britain has registered a high level of compliance with the Gleneagles polio eradication commitment. In July 2005, the UK government pledged US$108 million US over the next three years.\(^{195}\) Through its contribution, the UK government unilaterally closed the $36 million US funding gap for 2005. The remaining funds are to be distributed in 2006-2007 in two US$72 million instalments. WHO Director-General Dr. Lee Jong-Wook praised the UK government’s announcement, stating that “flexible, multi-year funding commitments are now more crucial than ever.”\(^{196}\) The quarterly newsletter of the GPEI noted that the UK government donated US$900,000 to the GPEI’s response to the 2005 Indonesian polio outbreak.\(^{197}\) Consequently, the United Kingdom receives a score of +1 for its successful compliance.

Analyst: Orsolya Soos

8. United States: +1

The United States has continued its significant support of the Global Polio Eradication Initiative, and has pledged new funds to respond to the unexpected outbreak in Indonesia. The United States remains the largest government donor to the Global Polio Eradication Initiative.\(^{198}\) Although the United States has often covered funding shortfalls to ensure continuous progress,\(^{199}\) as of 3 January 2005 the United States had not stepped up to reduce either the urgent $75 million shortfall,\(^{200}\) without which programs for the spring of 2006 are at risk, or the $200 million shortfall for operations for the year 2006.\(^{201}\)

---


The US provides support through a variety of institutions, most prominently the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and USAID. In 2005 the CDC allocated US$96,276,000 for worldwide polio vaccination. Before the Gleneagles Summit, the budget for 2006 requested US$96,324,000. This is a US$48,000 increase over the previous year. According to the autumn newsletter of the GPEI, USAID donated US$2 million for work in Afghanistan in the second half of 2005. In November 2005, Mr. Kent Hill, the Global Health Assistant Administrator of Health and Human Services announced a USAID commitment of an additional US$2.5 million for 2006 to combat the outbreak in Indonesia. The US pledge for 2006 is in full compliance with the Gleneagles polio eradication commitment, and so the US government receives a score of +1.

Analyst: Lisa Skinner

9. European Union: +1

The European Union has demonstrated a high level of compliance with the Gleneagles polio eradication commitment. The European Commission Humanitarian Office (ECHO) continued its commitment to fight polio outbreaks by approving a US$580,000 US grant to the World Health Organization (WHO). The funds supported global immunization initiatives in the final quarter of 2005. Furthermore, in December 2005, the EU worked in collaboration with WHO, UNICEF, and Rotary International to immunize children against polio in Sierra Leone. The European Union receives a score of +1, indicating full compliance.

Analyst: Gunwant Gill


Official Development Assistance: Africa

Commitment

We have agreed to double aid for Africa by 2010. Aid for all developing countries will increase, according to the OECD, by around $50bn per year by 2010, of which at least $25bn extra per year for Africa.

- Chairman’s Summary

Background

Official Development Assistance (ODA) was featured as one of the most scrutinized and monitored of all of the commitments at the Gleneagles summit. With Africa’s attainment of the Millennium Development Goals as Tony Blair’s main priority, and the loud voices of civil society groups such as the Make Poverty History Campaign in the background, there was significant pressure on the G8 to contribute generously to the trio of trade, debt and aid. In the weeks leading up to the summit, the G8 countries were divided over how much ODA to give and when to give it. The UK’s Commission for Africa suggested that G8 countries borrow from their future ODA budgets to grant African countries large enough sums of money to build-up infrastructure, which would have a huge impact on local capacity for economic development. Unable to secure unanimous support on this approach, the UK agreed to the doubling of 2004 aid levels by 2010. By most accounts this commitment was well received. Bob Geldoff granted the G8 a 10 out of 10 on its promises for ODA. Of course, the values of this commitment will be determined by the degree to which they are translated into action. More challenging than a verbal commitment is the creation of binding timetables which are needed to make the promises a reality.

Team Leader: Mary Albino

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance -1</th>
<th>Work in Progress 0</th>
<th>Full Compliance +1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown

1. Canada: + 1

Canada is making some progress towards fulfilling its commitment of doubling Official Development Assistance (ODA) from its 2002/2003 levels by 2010/2011. Minister of International Cooperation Aileen Carroll has made numerous public statements since the 2005 Gleneagles summit, restating the Canadian government’s commitment to doubling ODA with a particular emphasis on Africa. The G7 finance ministers and central bank governors also restated this commitment.

In its February 2005 budget, the Canadian government progressed toward this goal by committing an additional $3.4 billion over the next five years. Included in this total is a doubling of Canada’s 2003-2004 aid to Africa by 2008-2009. The Canadian government will seek to provide a greater ‘country’ and ‘sector’ focus in the delivery of its aid programs. To ensure a greater country focus, Minister Carroll has announced that two-thirds of all bilateral aid would focus on 25 'development partner' countries, over half of which are African. In its 2005 International Policy Statement, the government announced that it will provide greater sector focus in aid in focusing on: (i) good governance, (ii) health, (iii) education, (iv) private sector development, and (v) sustainable development. The crosscutting theme will be gender equity.

It has yet to be seen whether Canada’s new Prime Minister, Stephen Harper, will continue to support Canada’s current commitment to doubling ODA by 2010.

Analyst: Michael Manulak

2. France: 0

To date France has demonstrated partial compliance with its commitment to double aid for Africa by 2010. According to the projections of the OECD’s Development Assistance Committee Secretariat, French Official Development Assistance (ODA) must increase from 0.47% of Gross National Income (GNI) in 2006 to 0.61% in 2010. While President Jacques Chirac announced that France would make an effort to reach 0.7% ODA/GNI by 2012, there has not been a firm commitment to doubling aid by 2010. France’s 2006 budget allocates 0.47% of GNI to ODA for 2006, and predicts meeting their Monterrey commitment of 0.5% in 2007.

Analyst: Daniel McCabe

---

3. Germany: 0

The German government is making some progress towards meeting the commitments it made regarding ODA at Gleneagles. In the May 2005 EU General Affairs and External Relations Council meeting in Brussels, the government committed to increase ODA to 0.51% of Gross National Income (GNI) by 2010 primarily through the Department of Economic Cooperation and Development.\(^{217}\) The government further committed to reach 0.7% of GNI by 2015.\(^{218}\) With a view to the other sections of the G8 Africa Action Plan, the German government has also sought to increase the effectiveness of aid by improving and harmonizing cooperation in its delivery. The German commitment to development is based on priorities of peace and security, good governance, economy and investment, water, and education and health.\(^{219}\)

The German government’s ability to meet this commitment is predicated on its ability to find innovative approaches to development financing which it has thus far shown interest in doing but has not taken action.\(^{220}\) Germany’s Minister of Economic Cooperation and Development, Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul, repeatedly refers to the G8 commitment on ODA, despite frequent references to Germany’s difficult financial position. Early indications are that new German Chancellor Anna Merkel will maintain an aid and African policy in continuity with the previous government of Gerhard Schroeder. In a 28 November meeting with Namibian President Hifikepunye Pohamba, Merkel pledged her government’s continued support of Namibian development.\(^{221}\)

Analyst: Michael Manulak

4. Italy: 0

The Government of Italy has failed to take the necessary steps to implement its commitment of 0.51% GNI to ODA by 2010. This is not surprising, as Italy-- with the exception of Russia-- has historically been the worst performer among the G8 on the issue of ODA. In 2004, Italy was the worst performing country of all the OECD donor countries, allocating only 0.15% GNI to development assistance.\(^{222}\) In 2005 Italy issued around $2.5 billion dollars in aid, approximately one third of Germany’s contributions.

Italy deserves positive recognition for making the verbal commitment to increasing its ODA at the standard of the other G8 countries. Given its track record, Italy will be put to a greater test to follow through with its pledge than other countries. Further, a significant portion of its ODA in the last few years had been directed towards debt relief, which will largely be exhausted by 2006.\(^{223}\) Along with Germany, the Government of Italy issued a statement in the spring of 2005, shortly after it agreed to pledge 0.51% of GNI to ODA, that due to budgetary problems it may be unable to meet this threshold.\(^{224}\)

---


There are currently no indications that Italy is making the necessary steps to following through on its commitment. Italy will likely be strapped with the cost of the 2006 Olympics in Torino, in addition to their normal budgetary constraints.

Analyst: Mary Albino

5. Japan: 0

Japan has registered a moderate level of compliance in regards to its ODA commitments made at the 2005 Gleneagles Summit. In his personal message to Africa following the Gleneagles Summit, Prime Minister Koizumi renewed Japan’s commitment to “realize a strategic expansion of its ODA volume in order to ensure a credible and sufficient level of ODA.”\(^{225}\) In this context, the Koizumi also stated that, “Japan intends to increase its ODA volume by US$10 billion in aggregate over the next 5 years. Japan will also double its ODA to Africa specifically in the next 3 years.”\(^{226}\) The Japanese Cabinet Office has since requested an additional ¥55.8 million in the 2006 budget for ODA. The funds will be used to conduct the Study on the Basic Strategy of Economic Cooperation and the Study on the Promotion of Building a Disaster Reduction System in Developing Countries.\(^{227}\) Both studies intend to make ODA delivery more effective.

Unfortunately, the December 2005 draft proposal for Japan’s 2006 ODA budget is poised to cut ODA spending by around 3.4 percent.\(^{228}\) It thus remains unclear whether Japan will be able to meet its commitment to provide the additional funds pledged at the 2005 Gleneagles Summit.

Analyst: Johannes Bast

6. Russia: 0

Russia has not demonstrated compliance with the G8’s commitment to double Official Development Aid to Africa by 2010. Since Russia is not a member of the OECD, the organization’s Development Assistance Committee did not make a projection that Russia would be required to meet in order to ensure the doubling of African ODA. Rather, Russia is a recipient of OECD development aid.\(^{229}\) With respect to Africa, Russian efforts have been focussed on providing technical assistance and training, and debt reduction.\(^{230}\)

Analyst: Daniel McCabe

7. United Kingdom: +1

The United Kingdom has registered a high level of compliance with its commitments to ODA. In addition to making the appropriate adjustments to its own budget, the UK has taken a leadership role in ensuring that the rest of the G8 also follow through on their commitments.

In the December 2005 pre-budget report statement to the House of Commons, Chancellor of the Exchequer Gordon Brown reaffirmed the UK’s commitment to increased Official Development Aid, stating


that the pledges made at the 2005 Gleneagles Summit are “only the beginning of what we must do in future years.” Following the outcome of the 2004 Spending Review the Department for International Development (DFID) will see its budget increased to more than £5.3 billion a year by 2007-08. Total UK official development assistance, which contains spending on development outside of DFIDs budget, will reach nearly £6.5 billion a year by 2007-08.

More specifically, on the 6th of October 2005, the Infrastructure Consortium for Africa was launched and committed itself to identify funding for 5 priority African projects by June 2006. The UK has committed £20 million over 3 years to support the establishment of the consortium. While the precise strategy for raising the additional pledged funds remains undeclared, the UK is poised to meet its commitments to aid by continuing its work through the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) and the International Finance Facility (IFF), which frontloads aid through the international capital markets.

In an effort to ensure that all of the G8 countries honour the promises they made at Gleneagles, the UK has initiated the Africa Partnership Forum’s Joint Action Plan and the Gleneagles Implementation Plan.

Analyst: Johannes Bast

8. United States: 0

The United States has registered minimal progress towards compliance with its ODA commitments in the time since the Gleneagles Summit in July 2005. It should be noted, however, that this is largely due to the success of the Bush Administration in the area of ODA in his previous term in office (2001-2005); due to dwindling political and budgetary resources it may be difficult to duplicate in regards to the Gleneagles compliance period (2005-2006).

Namely, between the years of FY2000 (the last budget of the Clinton Administration) and FY2004 (the last budget of the first George W. Bush Administration), US aid to Africa increased by 56% in constant dollars (67% in nominal dollars). In real terms, the US’ foreign aid budget for Africa grew from US$2.034-billion in FY2000 to US$3.399-billion in FY2004. There are some caveats to this, however, in that the vast majority of this increase (53%) is accounted for by emergency food aid, and hefty amounts of security assistance to Liberia and Sudan. There is debate, especially between American and European governments, over whether these forms of aid constitute development aid that promotes sustainable development or whether they are more aptly termed humanitarian aid for emergency relief (and not counted as ODA). The European Union, for instance, classifies food aid as humanitarian aid. As well, Washington tends to favour including debt relief as a form of foreign aid, including those figures sporadically in its ODA spending. It is unclear which formula was used to calculate US aid to Africa. In terms of non-food aid and non-security assistance spending, the US foreign aid to Africa increased by 33% in real dollars from FY2000 to FY2004 (43% in nominal dollars). Nevertheless, since the commitment does not specify a benchmark date from which the promised doubling of aid to Africa is to be


measured, one can only assume such a date is the concluding day of the summit – 10 July 2005 – rendering all of the above increases irrelevant as evidence of compliance.

Since the Gleneagles Summit the momentum achieved from FY2000 to FY2004 has considerably declined. The White House’s budget request to Congress for aid to Africa for FY2005 was US$3.492-billion excluding food aid (25% increase over FY2004), and US$4.506-billion including food aid (13.79% increase over FY2004).240 These numbers cover the fiscal year beginning prior to the Gleneagles Summit. The White House’s budget request for FY2006 would be debated in, and include, most of the Gleneagles compliance period and it exhibits a much more restrained level of compliance. The FY2006 budget request for aid to Africa excluding food aid is US$3.627.5-billion, a modest increase of 3.9% over the FY2005 budget request – very modest in comparison to the goal of a 100% increase by 2010. When emergency food aid is included in the US’ aid budget the trend is even more disturbing, with the White House requesting a combined total of US$3.856-billion – down -14.4% from FY2005.241 This would require the US to increase its total aid budget for Africa by 114.4% in four years to meet its Gleneagles commitments, if emergency food-aid is included in the baseline figure as Washington is prone to do. The unlikelihood of this renders the US’ compliance minimal at best and when emergency food aid is included, non-existent.

Analyst: Anthony Navaneelan

9. European Union: 0

The European Union has registered an acceptable level of compliance with its ODA commitment from the 2005 Gleneagles Summit, primarily in the form of re-stating the language in official declarations and documents, and in formally incorporating the commitment into its official development policy. The EU carries an extra burden of compliance on this issue seeing as it was Brussels which pushed the G8 to adopt the measure at Gleneagles, and considering that the 25-member bloc publicly committed to it in the days leading up to the Summit.

On 24 May 2005, the EU Foreign and Development Ministers emerged from an annual meeting with a landmark agreement on increasing EU-ODA. With an eye to the then-upcoming G8 Summit in the UK, the EU Ministers committed the EU-15 (pre-expansion countries) to commit 0.56% gross national income (GNI) on aid by 2010 and at least 0.7% by 2015 – the latter being the UN’s prescribed benchmark.242 Currently, the EU-15 give 0.35%/GNI in ODA in 2004.243 The EU-10 (10 expansion countries from Eastern and Southern Europe) committed to giving 0.17%/GNI in ODA by 2010 and 0.33%/GNI by 2015. Half of the increased aid promised was to be awarded to Africa.244 The European Council approved the deal in June 2005.

On 12 October 2005, the European Commission adopted the EU Strategy on Africa, a comprehensive document intended to detail and coordinate a single general development policy between Africa and the 25 EU member-states.245 In the document, the European Commission restates the commitment approved by the European Council in June 2005 to “increase ODA to 0.56% of GNI by 2010 and 0.7% by 2015. Compared to what is expected in 2006, this commitment should result in an estimated additional €20 billion per year in ODA by 2010 and an additional €46 billion per year by 2015. The EU also agreed to

allocate at least 50% of this agreed increase to Africa. If implemented correctly, this will mean that by 2015 the EU collectively will be disbursing an additional €23 billion a year in Africa. The EU’s 25 heads of state, in turn, endorsed the EU Strategy for Africa on 15 December 2005 making it official EU policy.

While this may seem quite generous on the part of the EU, the question remains whether it will meet the even higher level of generosity demanded by the Gleneagles commitment. If the benchmark year by which the doubling of aid is measured is again 2005, as would be expected, Africa received approximately US$40-billion in ODA from all donors, according to the OECD. Since the EU claims to account for 60% of all ODA flow to Africa, this would place the 25-nation’s bloc total contribution around US$24-billion. The EU’s new aid deal accounts only for an increase of €20-billion in aid by 2010, of which Africa is allotted 50% or €10-billion. Even with a very generous exchange this still amounts to an increase of US$12.5-billion, bringing the EU’s projected 2010 ODA to Africa to $36.5-billion — an increase of slightly more than 50% but half-short of the goal of doubling aid. Indeed, the EU’s promise of increasing aid to Africa by €20-billion by 2015 represents an almost 100% increase in ODA levels from 2005, meaning Brussels is budgeting a 5-year delay in fulfilling its Gleneagles commitments.

Analyst: Anthony Navaneelan

---


Debt Relief: Africa

Debt Relief (Africa)

“The G8 has also agreed that all of the debts owed by eligible heavily indebted poor countries to IDA, the International Monetary Fund and the African Development Fund should be cancelled, as set out in our Finance Ministers agreement on 11 June.”

Chair’s Summary (final press conference)\(^{251}\)

Background

Launched by the IMF and the World Bank in 1996, the Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative joined together multilateral institutions, the Paris Club, and official bilateral creditors in a comprehensive approach aimed at reducing the external debts of low-income, heavily indebted poor countries.\(^{252}\) Under the HIPC plan, developing states would have to adopt extensive IMF or World Bank-supported structural reform strategies in order to become eligible for debt relief.\(^{253}\) Thusly, debt relief would only become available to a limited number of countries, and at slow rates. In preparations for the 1999 Cologne Summit, the G8 Finance Ministers expressed concern about the “vulnerability of many HIPCs to exogenous shocks” and called for “faster, deeper and broader debt relief for the poorest countries that demonstrate a commitment to reform and poverty alleviation.”\(^{254}\) Cognizant that the mounting debt stocks of the developing countries are hindrances to economic growth and sustainable development, the G8, at Cologne, introduced the Enhanced HIPC Initiative by reinforcing the old HIPC framework with “the prospects for a robust and lasting exit for qualifying countries from recurrent debt problems.”\(^{255}\) To date, several developing countries have benefited from the Enhanced HIPC Initiative. Since then, particularly with the adoption of the Africa Action Plan at the 2002 Kananaskis Summit, “good governance, prudent new borrowing, and sound debt management” have been explicitly tied to debt relief.\(^{256}\) At the 2005 Gleneagles Summit, the G8 leaders met with the heads of the IMF, the World Bank and African leaders to discuss new debt relief strategies that could help HIPC states achieve the framework of the UN Millennium Development Goals. On 8 July 2005, the G8 announced that it would cancel 100% of the debts held by 18 eligible HIPC countries, all of which are in Africa.\(^{257}\) While many anti-poverty campaigners and NGOs remained critical of the outcome, believing the G8 could and should do more, UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan said that the announcement marked the beginning of fight against global poverty.\(^{258}\)

Team Leader: Susan Khazaeli


Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown

1. **Canada: 0**

   The Canadian government is making progress towards fulfilling its commitment on African debt relief. Canada supports the G8 proposal for 100% debt cancellations for eligible HIPCIs. In an address to the IMF’s Monetary and Financial Committee, Finance Minister Ralph Goodale called on the IMF to fulfil “its core competency of helping countries achieve macroeconomic stability through policy advice, capacity building, and, when necessary, financial assistance”.

   The Canadian government announced that it would increase its contribution to IDA14 by 40% in order to finance the regular IDA window, IDA grants and HIPC debt relief, prompting the IDA to also increase its financial support for developing countries.

   In addition to supporting the HIPC Initiative in deputations to the IMF, the Canadian government also encourages bilateral debt relief through the Paris Club. In an effort to help low-income, heavily indebted countries reduce poverty and achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the Canadian government announced on 24 September 2005, that it would pledge an additional CAD$1.3 billion toward debt relief.

   Canada has long linked debt relief and aid to good governance: A Canadian representative was sent as an observer in the reorganization of Nigeria’s debt at the Paris Club meeting, which applauded Nigeria’s economic reforms and progress.

   Analyst: Susan Khazaeli

2. **France: 0**

   France is making strong progress towards fulfilling its G8 commitment on African debt relief. In late October 2005, the French government agreed that it would relieve Nigeria of 60% of its debt to the Paris Club creditors, which including moratorium interest amounts to approximately US$30 billion.

---


Minister, Mr. Thierry Breton, also reaffirmed France’s dedication to the HIPC debt relief initiative when he joined other G8 finance ministers in drafting a letter to World Bank President. In the letter, Mr. Breton explicitly stated that France would “cover its share of the costs for the full duration of the cancelled loans” and that it would “seek in 2005 Parliamentary appropriations for commitment for the financial compensation for the lost reflows covering the period to 2015.” The French government was also successful in promoting the debt relief initiative to the IMF, which announced that it would offer 100% debt cancellation to 19 eligible HIPCs (many of them from Africa) by early 2006. Lastly, on 29 December 2005, the French government gave Zambia a debt write-off of €67 million following the country’s successful reform of fiscal and monetary policies.

3. Germany: 0

Germany registered partial compliance with the specific commitments agreed upon at the 2005 Gleneagles Summit, participating in a large debt relief agreement through the Paris Club which purports to cancel an estimated 60% of Nigeria’s debt and mobilizing nearly 20% of the gross total of its own ODA budget for debt relief. At the annual meeting of the World Bank and IMF, Development Minister, Ms. Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul, declared: “The further debt relief envisaged by the G8 in Gleneagles for the poorest developing countries must now be implemented speedily.” After discussing the “financial shortfalls” that might accompany debt reduction, Ms. Wieczorek-Zeul announced Germany’s decision to provide €120 million over the next three years to a plan designed to compensate for the deficiencies.

The German government reaffirmed its commitment to the HIPC Initiative. On 24 September 2005, Minister of Finance Hans Eichel stated that, “Although the Fund’s debt relief should be financed primarily by its own resources, Germany and other G8 countries stand ready to provide bilateral contributions as necessary.” On 8 December 2005, Germany, along with the other IMF Executives approved the G8 plan of 100% debt relief for all eligible HIPC; renamed the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative (MDRI). Shortly thereafter, IMF Managing Director Rodrigo de Rato revealed that 19 eligible countries – including 13 from Africa, had qualified for immediate debt relief, available in early January 2006. Further action must be taken by the German government in order to achieve full compliance.

Analyst: Alex Turner

4. Italy: 0

The Italian government has been slow in implementing its commitments regarding debt relief. While Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Gianfranco Fini, met with his South African counterpart, Mr. Nkosazana Dlamini Zuma, who praised Italy’s commitment to the HIPC initiative, the Italian government has thus far not been active in the promotion of the initiative to cancel the debt stocks of eligible HIPC’s. Positive action in support of the Gleneagles debt-cancellation proposal includes Italy’s participation in Nigeria’s debt reorganization: After extending “strong support to Nigeria’s economic development policy,” Italy, alongside other Paris Club creditor nations, offered Nigeria an estimated USD$18 billion in debt relief.

Analyst: Nina Popovic

5. Japan: 0

Japan partially complied with the commitments set out at Gleneagles, participating in a multinational effort to reduce an estimated 60% of Nigeria’s debt to the Paris Club creditors. On 24 September 2005, Mr. Sadakazu Tanigaki, Governor of the Bank and Fund for Japan, encouraged other non-G8 countries to support the HIPC Initiative, saying “The enhanced HIPC Initiative, to which Japan has made the largest contribution as an official bilateral creditor, continues to be effective, while we have to maintain our efforts to encourage non-Paris Club and private creditors to participate in the Initiative.” Japan holds a Director position on the IMF Executive Board and supports the full debt cancellation of all eligible HIPCs. On 21 December 2005, thirteen African countries became beneficiaries of immediate debt relief, to be made available in January 2006. In addition to offering debt relief through the IMF, the Japanese government cancelled Zambia’s debt of USD$692 million.

Analyst: Alex Turner

6. Russia: 0

The Russian government has taken several measures in support of the HIPC Initiative pertaining to African debt relief. In deputations to the IMF and the World Bank, Finance Minister Aleksei Kudrin encouraged the Gleneagles proposal for debt cancellation. Arguing that such actions would not undermine the integrity of either financial institution, Mr. Kudrin called “on all Fund and Bank members to support the G-8 proposal for a full cancellation of the debt owed to international financial institutions by the countries beneficiaries of the HIPC Initiative.” The Russian government has also demonstrated

---

support for increased aid for development, growth, and infrastructure in order to help African states achieve the MDGs. Since the annual IMF Boards of Governors meeting, which was held in late September 2005, the Russian government has moved to implement two multilateral debt relief programs with both the Paris Club and the IMF. On 20 October 2005, Russia was a signatory to a USD$18 billion Paris Club debt cancellation plan for Nigeria. Shortly thereafter, the Russian government welcomed the IMF announcement that it would cancel the debts of 19 HIPC countries, totalling an estimated USD$3.3 billion.

Analyst: Eugene Berezovsky

7. United Kingdom: 0

As host of the 2005 Gleneagles Summit, the United Kingdom demonstrated strong support for the African debt relief initiative. The Department for International Development called on both the IMF and the World Bank to “assist the world’s poorest countries to meet the MDGs while ensuring that debt burdens remain sustainable.” In order to secure the participation of the aforementioned international financial institutions in the HIPC initiative, the British government pledged USD$476 million. On 20 October 2005, the British government worked alongside other G8 countries to broker a USD$18 billion Paris Club debt relief package for Nigeria. Shortly thereafter, on 21 December 2005, the British government welcomed the IMF’s announcement that it would forgive the USD$3.3 billion debts of 19 HIPCs. In addition to the cancellation of all bilateral debts owed by eligible HIPCs, the British government committed to mobilizing an estimated $2.2 billion of debt relief in support of the HIPC initiative.

Analyst: Eugene Berezovsky

8. United States: 0

The American government is making progress towards fulfilling its Gleneagles commitment on African debt relief. Treasury Secretary, Mr. John Snow, endorsed the HIPC Initiative by appealing to the World Bank President to cancel the arrears of eligible indebted countries. In a G8 Finance Ministers’ letter drafted to Mr. Paul Wolfowitz, Mr. Snow stated that since the Gleneagles Summit, “the US Administration has provided clear support for a Congressional bill that would approve the debt relief initiative and to authorize "such sums as may be necessary for payment" for the full duration of the cancelled loans.”

In late October 2005, the American government agreed that it would relieve Nigeria of 60% of its debt to the Paris Club creditors, which is estimated at US$18 billion. In addition, the US worked alongside...
other G8 governments in encouraging the IMF and its concessional arm, the IDA, to cancel the US$3.3 billion debts of 19 eligible HIPCs. Finally, on 30 December 2005, the United States government cancelled Zambia’s debt of US$280 million.

Analyst: Tiffany Kizito

9. European Union: 0

The European Union is on track to achieve compliance with regard to the African debt relief initiative to which it agreed at Gleneagles. The European Union has reaffirmed the existing “need for broader and deeper debt relief”. It recently adopted a new proposal for an “EU Strategy for Africa.” While the strategy focuses primarily on helping African states attain the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), debt relief is also a factor. The strategy maintains that, “Apart from remaining committed to full implementation of the enhanced HIPC initiative, the EU would consider supporting new international initiatives, which might for example cover countries emerging from conflict or suffering from external exogenous shocks”.

In addition to the aforementioned proposal, the EU Finance Ministers have been instrumental in promoting the G8’s debt cancellation plan to the shareholders of the International Monetary Fund and of the World Bank. Following a meeting with his EU equivalents on 10 September 2005, Britain’s Foreign Minister, Mr. Gordon Brown, expressed his hope that, “at the annual meetings in a few days time all the shareholders of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank will be able to vote on a debt relief package that will wipe out the stock of debt of the poorest countries”. Pressures on the IMF have thus far been successful: in December, the IMF announced that it would offer 100% debt relief, approximately US$3.3 billion, to 19 eligible nations. However, further action on the part of the European Union is necessary for full compliance.

Analyst: Nina Popovic

Promoting Growth: Africa

Commitment

“We agree to support a comprehensive set of actions to raise agricultural productivity, strengthen urban-rural linkages and empower the poor, based on national initiatives and in cooperation with the AU/NEPAD Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) and other African initiatives.”

- Africa, 8 July 2005

Background

The Promoting Growth commitments contained in the Africa Document released by the G8 on 8 July 2005 builds upon a framework of cooperation established by United Nations, the G8, and African leadership. At the Kananaskis Summit in 2002, the G8 agreed to establish an Africa Action Plan (AAP). The G8 Africa Action Plan contains commitments on promoting peace and security; strengthening institutions and governance; fostering trade, economic growth, and sustainable development; implementing debt relief; expanding knowledge; improving health and confronting HIV/AIDS; increasing agricultural productivity; and improving water resource management. The Africa Action Plan was also intended to complement the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD). NEPAD is a programme of the African Union designed to meet its development objectives and overcome its greatest challenge: the increasingly impoverished state of the continent. NEPAD aims to facilitate international assistance with African initiatives to address issues such as escalating poverty levels, underdevelopment, and the continued marginalization of Africa. Founded on the idea of mutual accountability, the NEPAD framework is based on the idea that if Africa is going to achieve the goals set out in NEPAD, both African governments and the international community must meet their commitments to African aid and development. These commitments include African Governments’ commitments through NEPAD to improve economic and political governance, the G8’s commitments as stated in the Africa Action Plan, and international commitments to meet the United Nation’s Millennium Development Goals. Under the auspices of NEPAD, African governments have proposed a Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP). Launched in November 2002, the objective of CAADP is to increase agricultural output in Africa by 6 percent a year over the next 20 years. Hence, the commitments made at Gleneagles to support increases in agricultural productivity are fundamentally linked to the work being undertaken by NEPAD and the nations of Africa. Compliance with this commitment must thus be demonstrated by a cooperative aid approach that includes the NEPAD/CAADP framework.

Team Leader: Laura Hodgins

### Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Canada**: +1
- **France**: 0
- **Germany**: 0
- **Italy**: 0
- **Japan**: 0
- **Russia**: 0
- **United Kingdom**: 0
- **United States**: +1
- **European Union**: 0

**Overall**: 0.22

### Individual Country Compliance Breakdown

#### 1. Canada: +1

Canada has demonstrated a very high level of compliance to its commitment to promote growth in Africa. Canada channels its contributions to African development through the Canada Fund for Africa, a CAD$500 million fund created by former Prime Minister Jean Chrétien prior to the Kananaskis Summit where the G8 established the African Action Plan. Through this fund Canada has pursued closer collaboration with the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), with the African Union, and with various African governments in order to facilitate the fulfilment of the Africa Action Plan. The fund is now in its second phase and is currently accepting proposals that aim to raise awareness of the principles and objectives of NEPAD such as governance, peace and security, health, education, knowledge, and economic development. It is accepting these proposals from the African civil society, as well as the private and public sectors.

The Canada Fund for Africa Secretariat will disburse the CAD$2,500,000 in funds. The fund made a CAD$40 million investment for Africa-specific research at the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research and a CAD$30 million investment for the construction of a bio-sciences centre for agriculture in Kenya. Moreover, the Canadian government committed to concentrate bilateral assistance in sub-Saharan Africa in its International Policy Statement, released 19 April 2005. This is consistent with its 2005 Budget promise to double aid to Africa from 2004-05 levels by 2008-09. The Statement also pledged to “continue to press forward, in close collaboration with other partners in Africa and other donors, to support regional initiatives such as NEPAD.”

---


Canada has also recently introduced a number of new initiatives aimed at promoting growth in Africa. On 24 November 2005, the Minister of International Cooperation, Ms. Aileen Carroll, announced that Canada will contribute more than CAD$64 million through the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) to new private sector development (PSD) initiatives to help alleviate poverty in developing countries. The Minister also committed to hosting an annual PSD conference beginning in 2006. Of this CAD$64 million, CAD$9.3 million will go to revitalize the agri-food system in Burkina Faso; CAD$1.3 million will go towards carrying out an environmental feasibility study for a power transmission line that will run through the Inga corridor in Africa; CAD$800,000 will help fund the pilot phase of the CARE Canada Enterprise Partners Program, which aims to build upon existing unregistered assets of the poor by developing bridging strategies between the formal and informal economies in developing countries; and CAD$1.4 million for the United Nations Capital Development fund, to support innovative approaches to local economic development through local governance and microfinance interventions.

Finally, at the sixth WTO ministerial conference in Hong Kong in December 2005, the Minister of International Trade, Mr. Jim Peterson, restated the importance of the Doha Development Agenda and encouraged other countries to act outside the WTO to support development. Canada receives a score of +1 for the promoting growth commitment, indicating full compliance.

Analyst: Laura Hodgins

2. France: 0

The Government of France has pursued few major commitments to promote growth in Africa since the Gleneagles Summit. The most significant initiative was the contribution of the French finance minister in the participating nations’ decision to increase funding for ‘aid for trade’ [trade capacity building] by US$4 billion, announced at the December 2005 meeting of the G7 Finance Ministers in London. France has also taken other small steps. Notable is President Chirac’s use of the December 2005 Africa-France Summit in Bakamo to emphasize the importance of supporting and training African youth. In his opening address, President Chirac highlighted the need to promote education and increase the number of centres for apprenticeship and vocational training in Africa. The French Development Minister also signed a partnership convention between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the French Development Agency, and the Permanent Conference of African and Francophone Chambers (of Commerce, Agriculture, Industry and Crafts). This partnership aims at increasing the availability of tools to support the growth of small business and occupational training in Africa. While France has shown fidelity to these aspects of the Gleneagles Plan, it has not taken steps to expedite the progress of the Doha Development Round. Although France agreed to the pledge made in Hong Kong to eliminate agricultural export subsidies by 2013, France took no step to reform existing EU CAP subsidies either in Hong Kong or at the December meeting of the European Council in Brussels. Instead, President Chirac urged ‘vigilance’ to ensure the stability of the CAP through to 2013. The absence of major initiatives and commitments to advance the promises

---

made at Gleneagles leaves France with significant work to do if it is to register compliance with its Africa commitments in the lead-up to the St. Petersburg summit. France receives a score of 0 for the promoting growth commitment, indicating work in progress.

Analyst: Steven Masson

3. Germany: 0

Since the Gleneagles Summit in 2005, Germany has demonstrated a moderate level of compliance with the promoting growth commitment. Germany’s attendance and newly made commitments at the December 2005 WTO Ministerial Conference demonstrated its support for promoting growth. During the WTO Ministerial Conference in Hong Kong, Germany pledged its support for a comprehensive development project for Less Developed Countries (LDCs). As part of the aid-for-trade commitments declared at the meetings, Germany agreed to eliminate all export subsidies on cotton in 2006. While a date for this specific project has not been firmly set, German Development Minister, Wieczorek-Zeul, commented on the general success of the WTO Ministerial Conference, noting in particular the decision to grant the poorest developing countries almost complete tariff- and quota-free access to industrialized markets as of 2008.

Germany’s compliance with its commitment to promote growth was also demonstrated through its recent meeting with the Mozambique government. During a bilateral meeting in Maputo between the German and Mozambique governments in December 2005, Germany pledged EU$68.5 million to be distributed throughout 2005 and 2006 to support Mozambique with respect to education, rural development, and sponsorship within the private sector. Mozambique is considered one of the poorest countries in the world, and was relieved of its multilateral debts at the 2005 Gleneagles Summit. Germany and Mozambique’s cooperation is a strong indicator of Germany’s compliance with the commitment concerning promoting growth. Germany, however, has not undertaken any new initiatives unilaterally, in cooperation with NEPAD’s Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme, or in cooperation with any other body. Germany therefore receives a score of 0 for the promoting growth commitment, indicating a work in progress.

Analyst: Orsolya Soos

4. Italy: 0

Italy has demonstrated partial compliance with the promoting growth commitment. From 7 June 2005 through 11 June 2005, the Undersecretary of State for Foreign Affairs Alfredo Mantica visited Angola, Gabon and Cameroon to discuss trade relations. His visit to Cameroon included a follow-up on the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD), and on the United Nations reform project. On 31 December 2005, the Angola Press Agency reported that Italy is expected to provide three million Euros to fund agricultural projects in the provinces of Luanda, Bengo and Kwanza-Sul. This demonstrates Italy’s aspiration to comply with the commitment to improve agricultural productivity in Africa through cooperative initiatives. Italy has yet to demonstrate more significant form of cooperation with NEPAD’s
Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme, however, and thus receives a score of 0 for this commitment, indicating work in progress.

Analyst: Laura Hodgins

5. Japan: 0

Japan has registered partial compliance with the commitment to promote growth in Africa as laid out at the 2006 Gleneagles Summit. On 22 April 2005, Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi announced that Japan would double its Official Development Assistance (ODA) to Africa by 2008.\(^2\) He also pledged to hold “TICAD IV” in 2008.\(^2\) TICAD – the Tokyo International Conference on African Development – held its inaugural meeting in 1993 and through these conferences Japan has launched a significant number of joint African-Asian initiatives to increase African agricultural productivity and fulfill the Millennium Development Goals.\(^3\) TICAD is committed to creating a “full synergy between TICAD’s work and NEPAD’s own approaches”.\(^4\) Furthermore, Prime Minister Koizumi, in his keynote speech at the Asian-African Business Summit in April 2005, suggested a “productivity movement” be promoted in Africa. He also announced that Japan will be hosting the fourth Asian-African Business Summit in 2006 and will continue to provide support for the “entrepreneurial spirit” upon which Asia-African cooperation rests.

From 14-15 July 2005, Japan hosted the International Symposium on “Perspectives of Research and Development for Improving Agricultural Productivity in Africa”.\(^5\) The Japan Forum on International Agricultural Research and the Japan International Research Center for Arid Sciences jointly organized this symposium.\(^6\) Currently, the Japan International Cooperation Agency is helping to finance a program of growth in Zambia that will focus on fostering human security through rural development. This program, termed the “Zambia Initiative”, will require the cooperation of local residents, ten aid agencies, and the government.\(^7\) Apart from the “Zambia Initiative and a number of pledges toward future discussions, it is not yet clear that Japan has forwarded any new policies since the Gleneagles summit that might bring it into compliance with this commitment.

Analyst: Laura Hodgins

6. Russia: 0

Russia has demonstrated partial compliance with the promoting growth commitment. On the eve of his country’s assumption of the G8 presidency, Director of the Russian Finance Ministry's department for international financial relations, Mr. Sergey Storchak, announced that the Russian Federation planned to become more active in establishing and participating in international development initiatives.\(^8\) Minister

---


Storchak stated that "On the international scene we must be the same as other members of the G8.\textsuperscript{329} This runs counter to his comments from the last day of the Gleneagles Summit, when during the discussion of the US$55-59 billion aid pledge to Africa, he stated that Russia was not "ready to assume budgetary commitments to help the poor countries for several years into the future."\textsuperscript{330} According to Russian news commentators, President Vladimir Putin currently faces domestic resistance to the aid package discussed at Gleneagles since "most Russians do not understand why huge financial and political resources must be spent for this purpose [aid to Africa]."\textsuperscript{331}

Although Russia has endeavoured to strengthen ties with the African Union and has pledged to support the G8 African Action Plan, these efforts have not translated into specific contributions.\textsuperscript{332} Most of Russia's pledges to Africa do not mention contributions to help raise agricultural productivity, strengthen urban-rural linkages, or empower the poor; instead they emphasize an improvement in Russian-African trade relations.\textsuperscript{333} The development of technical ties with Africa could be construed as an indication of future compliance, as Russian-African cooperation in the field of high technologies is noted as a primary commitment in a release from the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.\textsuperscript{334} In July 2005 Moscow hosted the fourth session of the Commission on Scientific and Technical Cooperation between Russia and the Republic of South Africa, at which both sides affirmed their common interest in carrying out joint studies in the area of energy technologies, in the fields of physics, mathematics, radio astronomy, and astrophysics, and in the exploration and utilization of outer space for peaceful purposes.\textsuperscript{335} Hence, Russia receives a score of 0 for the promoting growth commitment, indicating work in progress.

Analyst: Laura Hodgins

7. United Kingdom: 0

The United Kingdom has taken important steps towards reaffirming and meeting its commitments for promoting growth in Africa from the Gleneagles summit. However, it has not yet achieved full compliance. Prime Minister Tony Blair has begun to establish mechanisms to ensure that the Gleneagles commitments to promoting growth in Africa be kept. At the September 2005 United Nations Summit, the United Kingdom and several other European nations ensured 191 countries’ full endorsement of the Millennium Goals, with a special emphasis on Africa.\textsuperscript{336} Britain also hosted the fifth meeting of the African Partnership Forum's Joint Action Plan on 4-5 October 2005 in London and worked towards the establishment of the Infrastructure Consortium for Africa.\textsuperscript{337} The meeting for the African Partnership Forum’s Joint Action Plan was hosted by Hilary Benn, the Minister of State for International Development, and addressed by both Prime Minister Tony Blair and the United Kingdom Chancellor of the Exchequer...
Gordon Brown. \(^{338}\) At this meeting the forum agreed to provide international monitoring to the implementation of the commitments to Africa.

On 6 October 2005 Britain also chaired the inaugural meeting of the Infrastructure Consortium for Africa. The Consortium seeks to build on partnerships between donors and stakeholders to deal with African infrastructure needs, in an effort to increase economic growth and development within the region. \(^{339}\) Britain agreed to commit US$20 million over three years to support the establishment of the Consortium and a Secretariat to be located in the African Development Bank. \(^{340}\) This Secretariat will work in cooperation with the African Union (AU), New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) and Regional Economic Communities (RECs) \(^{341}\) The establishment of the Consortium in January 2006 reaffirmed Britain’s "task of honoring the commitments [made] toward Africa’s future", \(^{342}\) and marked an innovative step in implementing an international forum for monitoring the commitments made towards Africa’s economic development in one place. The initiatives outlined above represent steps on the part of the British government towards complying with its commitment to promoting growth in Africa; however, the United Kingdom has yet to realize full compliance.

Analyst: Vaneet Sangha

8. United States: +1

The United States has registered its compliance with the obligations undertaken in the realm of promoting growth in Africa. As a member of the WTO, the United States helped to advance the Doha Development Round at the Hong Kong Ministerial Meeting, specifically agreeing to abolish agricultural export subsidies by the end of 2013. \(^{343}\) The United States has acted both multilaterally and bilaterally to increase trade capacity building, or ‘aid for trade,’ in African nations. Multilaterally, it participated in the December 2005 G7 Finance Ministers’ Meeting in London that produced a new commitment to increase aid for trade by US$4 billion. \(^{344}\) This commitment gave particular priority to infrastructure needs in Africa. \(^{345}\) On 19 July 2005, President Bush launched the African Global Competitiveness Initiative. This initiative expands existing USAID trade building efforts that have focused on Regional Trade Hubs; these hubs bring teams of experts to support trade capacity building. \(^{346}\) This specific program has a five-year funding target of US$200 million in additional resources. \(^{347}\) It will also fund the opening of a new regional trade hub in Dakar, Senegal. The African Global Competitiveness Initiative thus supports not only the Gleneagles commitments to help Africa integrate into global markets, but also aids in the development of continental trade.

In late 2005, the Bush administration renewed the eligibility of 37 countries to gain access to the U.S. market under the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA). Not only was the commitment to open
American markets for these countries maintained, but in July 2005, the Secretary of State Rice announced the creation of the AGOA Diversification Fund, through which several U.S. agencies will support the efforts of African governments to diversify their economies and capitalize on the opportunities afforded by AGOA. These efforts reinforce the G8 commitment to promote growth through the engine of trade.

In addition to the previously mentioned initiatives to open markets, and to build trade capacity and infrastructure in Africa, the United States government also announced its contribution to NEPAD’s CAADP, which aims to increase African agricultural output by 6% annually. On 15 September 2005, USAID announced a new US$200 million in programming that would be directed to support the CAADP for fiscal year 2006, as part of the Presidential Initiative to End Hunger in Africa. USAID expects similar outlays between 2006 and 2010. Finally, the U.S. made further progress towards meeting the Gleneagles commitments with USAID’s announcement that it had joined with private sector institutions to create the Global Commercial Microfinance Consortium to provide local currency financing to microfinance institutions. The above-outlined initiatives demonstrate that the United States is well on its way to meeting the Gleneagles commitments to promote growth in Africa. The United States therefore receives a score of +1 for the promoting growth commitment, indicating full compliance.

Analyst: Steven Masson

9. European Union: 0

The European Union has undertaken significant steps towards meeting its commitments concerning promoting growth in Africa at the Gleneagles summit, although full compliance has not yet been realized. The European Union has made several official reaffirmations and has taken several positive steps since the Gleneagles summit. At the United Nations Summit in September the European Union played a vital role in gaining unanimous endorsement from 191 countries to accelerate progress towards the Millennium Development Goals, with emphasis provided to the needs of Africa. Since Gleneagles, the EU has also developed and adopted the EU Strategy for Africa, which includes a formal and comprehensive framework on how EU member states will work with Africa’s regional organizations to enable African states to reach the United Nations Millennium Development Goals. EU Commissioner Louis Michel met with Africa’s regional organizations twice in September 2005 to discuss the EU Strategy and on 12 December 2005, the European Council endorsed the General Affairs and External Relations Council of the EU Strategy for Africa. This initiative will establish a long-term partnership between African states and the EU in an effort to increase Africa’s sustainable development. The Strategy aims to establish and formalize concrete projects between the European Union and Africa’s regional organizations that will further increase stability, promote economic growth, and reduce poverty within the region.

actions indicate that the European Union has made efforts to meet its commitment to promote growth in Africa, but it must increase its efforts if it is to achieve full compliance. The EU therefore receives a score of 0 for the promoting growth commitment, indicating work in progress.

Analyst: Vaneet Sangha
Education: Africa

“As part of this effort, we will work to support the Education for All agenda in Africa, including continuing our support for the Fast Track Initiative (FTI) and our efforts to help FTI-endorsed countries to develop sustainable capacity and identify the resources necessary to pursue their sustainable education strategies.”

- Africa (July 08, 2005)\textsuperscript{356}

Background

In 1990, at the World Conference on Education for All in Jomtien, Thailand, members affirmed to reduce adult illiteracy by the end of the decade.\textsuperscript{357} Ten years later in April 2000, the world community gathered in Dakar, Senegal for the World Education Forum in order to assess developments in basic education through the ‘90s and revive support for education. Here they adopted the Dakar Framework for Action, Education for All: Meeting Our Collective Commitments. At the July 2001 Genoa Summit, the G8 countries reaffirmed their commitment to help countries meet the goals of the Education for All agenda, superficially targeting the achievement of universal primary education and equal access for girls.\textsuperscript{358} Furthermore, they endorsed the results of the G8 Education Task Force that reported at the 2002 Kananaskis Summit.\textsuperscript{359} At the 2005 Gleneagles Summit, leaders of the G8 countries renewed their commitment to universal primary education, especially in Africa. They also committed to support the Education for All-Fast Track Initiative, a global partnership between donor and developing countries to guarantee progress toward the universal primary education under the Millennium Development Goals. FTI can support any low-income country that exhibits a serious commitment of achieving universal primary completion.\textsuperscript{360}

Team Leader: Sadia Rafiquddin

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown

1. Canada: 0

The Canadian government registered a moderate level of compliance with Gleneagles’ African education commitments. In December 2005, Canada’s International Development Research Centre (IDRC) announced plans to create an Open Archive. The Open Archive will provide full access to the IDRC’s research archive, making information more freely available to southern researchers and providing an outlet to showcase their work. The IDRC focuses on the generation and application of new knowledge to meet the challenges of international development.

The Honorable Aileen Carroll hosted a Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) Informal Roundtable on Basic Education and Development in Ottawa on November 21, 2005 to explore the four pillars of CIDA’s programming in education (the quality of basic education; the gender gap in schooling; preventative education for HIV/AIDS and education for girls and boys in conflict, post-conflict, and/or emergency situations, to help to ensure that Canada is aligned with global trends and best Practices; and to identify the practical needs of its development and transition partner countries).

Analyst: Mike Varey

2. France: +1

Recognizing that “education for all, throughout life, is a fundamental issue of social cohesion and international solidarity,” the French government demonstrated a high level of compliance with Gleneagles’ commitments to the Education for All agenda in Africa, both through its support of the Fast-Track Initiative (FTI) and structural aid geared to FTI-endorsed countries.

 Analyst: Mike Varey

---


On 4 December 2005, during the 23rd France-Africa Summit, French President Jacques Chirac issued a joint declaration with President Amadou Toumani Touré of Mali in which he reaffirmed his support for continental primary, secondary, and higher education so that Africa might occupy its rightful place in the knowledge economy.364

In late November 2005, the French government allocated €80 million in annual flows towards the financing of Education for All in developing countries; 90% of this aid is concentrated in sub-Saharan Africa. Further aid targets those countries that have acceded to the Fast-Track Initiative. In 2005, Niger received €7.5 million in budgetary aid, of which an additional €3 million destined specifically for education were attached; Mauritania received the final part of a three-year €14.7 million debt forgiveness/development contract geared towards education, while the bursary program allowing Malagasy students to pursue educational opportunities in France was increased by 38%. In Kenya, French language programs at the Alliances Françaises in Nairobi and Mombasa saw an infusion of €0.528 million; a €1 million project for the expansion of the French language in the Gambia was proposed for 2006; and a €1.2 million, 4 year support project for French language instruction in the Guebré Mariam lyceum continued in Ethiopia.

Analyst: André Ghione

3. Germany: 0

Germany is well on its way to reaching full compliance towards its Gleneagles commitment to upport the Education for All agenda in Africa, including continuing their support for the Fast Track Initiative (FTI) and its efforts to help FTI-endorsed countries to develop sustainable capacity and identify the resources necessary to pursue their sustainable education strategies.

Germany’s primary commitment consists of an increase of its education funds to an annual €120 million by 2007. This commitment is part of the Fast-Track-Initiative set out by the World Bank and its Millennium Development Goal of enabling all children to go to school until the age of 14 by the year 2015. A significant portion of these funds are the German pledge of 68.5 million euros for 2005 and 2006 to Mozambique.

Analyst: Jonathan Scotland

4. Japan 0

Japan has registered partial compliance regarding its commitments to provide educational aid to Africa, with a policy stating that “Japan will contribute actively to achieving the MDG’s, including through the effective use of ODA,” and targeting priority areas such as ensuring access to education, improving quality of education, and improving management of education. While the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA) has expressed its commitment to the goal of universal primary education as targeted by the Fast Track Initiative (FTI), the Japanese government is critical of the FTI and expresses more support for the broader goals of the Education for All (EFA) agenda. Japan has not contributed to the Catalytic Fund, which is a major source of funding for FTI initiatives. Japan has, however, supported education aid in Africa through organization such as UNESCO, UNICEF, and the Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA).

Analyst: G8RG Analyst

5. Italy: +1

In both word and action, the Italian government has demonstrated strong compliance with Gleneagles’ commitments to the Education for All (EFA) agenda in Africa, providing aid through contributions to funds sustaining the Fast-Track Initiative (FTI), non-governmental organisations acting to achieve the goals of the Millennium Development goals in the field of education, and bilateral community-based initiatives.

On 23 August 2005, in an address to the second meeting of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ committee for Cooperation for Development, Foreign Undersecretary, Mr. Alfredo Mantica, stressed the need for the international community to take responsibility for the recasting of the social environment and the reestablishment of education for adolescents who have lived, or continue to live, in conflict areas. On 4 October 2005, Mr. Giuseppe Drago, Undersecretary of Foreign Affairs, addressed the opening session of the 33rd General Congress of UNESCO in Paris, emphasizing that one must recognize education as “the
means by which individuals and societies become sensitized to, and tolerant of, one another. Mr. Drago underlined the importance of the International Centre of Theoretical Physics and the Academy of Science for the Third World, located in Trieste, for the educational pursuits of students and researchers from developing countries. In a side meeting on 23 August 2005 with UNESCO's Director General Koichiro Matsuura, Mr. Drago reaffirmed the Italian government’s pledge of continued support for UNESCO in several sectors, including education.

The Italian government’s financial contributions during the same period also demonstrate compliance. Through the EFA-FTI Catalytic Fund, the Italian government dispensed €2 million in aid to countries in urgent need of funding. In a 25 October 2005 meeting, the Directional Committee for Cooperation for Development approved €1,391,116.80 for education initiatives of non-governmental organizations. Two bilateral funding agreements were reached that aim to reinforce basic education and improve social conditions of infants and children in the marginalized areas of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, for an amount of €257,701.00 in 2006, as well as an integrated intervention plan for the improvement of the quality of education in Uganda, for an amount of €515,923.57 in 2006.

Analyst: André Ghione

6. Russia: -1

Russia has had a minimal degree of compliance with respect to G8 commitments to support education in Africa reached at the Gleneagles Summit. While Russia does provide assistance to research programs in Africa, offering 700 scholarships a year for Africans to study in Russian institutions of higher education, Russia is not listed as a donor of Official Development Assistance (ODA) in Africa. Russia is currently receiving World Bank loans to help develop e-education, and due to an economic crisis in mid-2004, Russia’s ability to act as an aid donor has been compromised. Russia has targeted education as one of three primary issues to be discussed at the 2006 G8 Summit in St Petersburg however; Russia has yet to take any considerable actions towards improving education in Africa.

Analyst: Nathan Weatherdon
7. United Kingdom +1

The United Kingdom has shown support towards furthering education opportunities in Africa since the Education for All (EFA) and Fast-Track Initiative (FTI) was introduced in Dakar, Senegal. In September 2005, Ms. Hillary Benn, Secretary for International Development, announced that the government will make a commitment of £40 million to help fund the US$500 million gap FTI faces for 2006. The £40 million investment in FTI is part of their overall £1.4 billion education funding. According to the EFA Global Monitoring Report, there is a financing gap that falls short of at least US$5 billion per year. In December 2005, at the High Level meeting convened in Beijing by UNESCO and the Fast Track Initiative (FTI), Mr. Gareth Thomas, UK International Development Minister, encouraged donors to double their contributions. On October 3, 2005, the UK announced that £200 million of the £250 million pledge announced at the 14th Replenishment of the International Development Association of the World Bank would be donated to the "Catalytic Fund" of the FTI.

The UK's commitment to supporting education for all is also noted in the Department for International Development's (DFID) bilateral agreements with developing countries. In a press release dated 6 October 2005, DFID announced a pledge of £2 million in support of Burundi's plan to eliminate school fees for primary education.

In addition, the release of a paper sponsored by DFID and the Treasury, titled From Commitment to Action, in November 2005, illustrates the UK's commitment to achieving the Education for All commitment set forth at the Gleneagles Summit.

Analyst: Evelyn Chan

7. USA: +1

The United States upheld a high level of compliance in 2005 towards the Education in Africa commitment proposed at the Gleneagles Summit. This has been achieved through support for the Fast Track Initiative (FTI) and Education for All agenda. In July 2005, US President George W. Bush announced an increase of US$400 million in funding for the African Education Initiative (AEI) from 2007-2010. AEI aims to train 500,000 teachers and administrators, emphasize educational opportunities for girls by giving 300,000 scholarships under the Ambassador's Girls Program and develop and distribute 10 million textbooks and teaching materials. The AEI further aims to improve access for marginalized students and teachers, improve access to education for orphans and out-of-school youth, as well as improve access to productivity-increasing job skills training and development. The AEI is the United States premier program intended to accomplish the goals set forth in the Education for All agenda and the Millennium Development Goals related to education by 2015. In November 2005, Mr. Frederick Schieck, Deputy

---

Administrator for USAID, said the U.S. will allocate US$65 million in 2006 to FTI developing countries of which African states will benefit in order to address school fee barriers.  

Analyst: Sadia Rafiquddin

9. European Union + 1

The European Union registered successful compliance of the Education in Africa commitments through their support of the Education for All and the Fast-Track Initiative. Overall the European Commission (EC) is currently allocating €1.3 billion to education, over a period from 2002-2007. Approximately €464 million from the 9th European Development Fund has been designated for education in 20 countries including those in Africa.

Mr. Stefano Manservisi, Director General of the European Commission’s DG Development Bank reiterated support for the EC’s contribution to EFA-FTI initiatives in a speech delivered on 30 November 2005 in Beijing at the EFA-FTI Partnership meeting. The EC’s contribution to FTI currently totals €100 million. €63 million has been allocated toward the "Catalytic Fund" of the FTI. The remaining €100 million will assist funding for primary education in the form of bilateral agreements with Niger, Burkina Faso and Mozambique. In his speech, Mr. Manservisi encouraged members to scale up contribution in light of the growing number of countries that are eligible for FTI aid and stressed that a significant portion of the UN target of 0.7% of GDP towards development assistance should help fund primary education. The EC is also funding the National Statistical Capabilities for the monitoring EFA project which aims to reinforce national capacity to observe progress towards EFA and educational sector goals of member states.

In November 2005, Mr. Manservisi emphasized in a speech on the Strategy for Africa at the Institut Français des Relations Internationales that in addition to financial assistance, the EC has also shown support for advancing education opportunities in Africa through the Nyerere-Erasmus programme and Twinning Partnerships. The Nyere-Erasmus programme aims to facilitate student exchanges within Africa and between Europe and Africa. Similarly, the Twinning Partnerships will foster relationships

---


410 Speech by Mr. Stefano Manservisi at the Institut français des relations internationals, (Paris), 8 November 2005. Date of Access 30 December 2005.

411 Speech by Mr. Stefano Manservisi at the Institut français des relations internationals, (Paris), 8 November 2005. Date of Access 30 December 2005.
between universities and other institutions. The EU's Strategy for Africa which was adopted on 12 October 2005 is a significant highlight in the EU's commitment to African development with a series of initiatives including those on education.

Analyst: Evelyn Chan

---

Trade: Africa

Commitment

“The G8 in return agreed to a comprehensive plan to support Africa’s progress. This is set out in our separate statement today. We agreed: to stimulate growth, to improve the investment climate and to make trade work for Africa, including by helping to build Africa’s capacity to trade and working to mobilize the extra investment in infrastructure which is needed for business.”

- Chair’s Summary (final press conference)\textsuperscript{413}

Background

It is estimated that Africa needs a growth rate of approximately 8% per year in order to reach the Millennium Development Goal of decreasing poverty by one half in 2015.\textsuperscript{414} Africa accounts for 2% of world trade and has insignificant shares in global manufactured exports despite some improvements in economic performance.\textsuperscript{415} The Commission for Africa set recommendations for the achievement of growth and development in Africa to the G8, EU, and partner organizations on 11 March 2005.\textsuperscript{416} The Commission stressed the need to make the investment climate stronger through public/private partnerships, increase the investment in infrastructure enormously such as rural roads, small-scale irrigation, regional highways and Information and Communications Technology (ICT).\textsuperscript{417} In order to improve the capacity for trade, internal changes such as transport technology would be necessary. In light of these recommendations, the G8 countries set forth specific commitments to improve Africa’s capacity to trade. Specific to this commitment was the pledge by G8 leaders to accept three initiatives: stimulate growth and improve the investment climate in Africa, build Africa’s capacity to trade, and mobilize investment in infrastructure for business.

Team Leader: Sadia Rafiquddin

\textsuperscript{413} Chair’s Summary, G8 Gleneagles Summit, (Gleneagles), July 2005. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2005gleneagles/statement.html.


Assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown

1. Canada: +1

Canada demonstrated successful compliance with the Gleneagles commitment to promote trade and investment in Africa. In particular, Canada launched the Canadian Investment Fund for Africa (CIFA) in Accra, Ghana on 12 October 2005.\(^{418}\) CIFA is a significant component of the Canada Fund for Africa and a key response to Canada’s commitment to the G8 Africa Action Plan and the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD). CIFA aims to attract foreign direct investment in Africa by providing risk capital for private companies. The Canadian government is matching all investment dollar for dollar.\(^{419}\) CIFA also endeavours to expand Africa’s infrastructure, create jobs, and provide better access to technology. At its launch, CIFA announced that it will channel US$162-million into Africa.\(^{420}\)

At the WTO ministerial conference in Hong Kong from 13-18 December 2005, Mr. Jim Peterson, Canada’s Minister of International Trade, stated that Canada’s goal is “to rein in subsidies and to achieve major improvements in market access.”\(^{421}\) However, Canada failed to open its market to African countries during the conference, though it did confirm that it will eliminate export subsidies on agricultural goods by 2013.\(^{422}\)

Analyst: Laura Yau

2. France: 0

France receives a grade of ‘0’ for its achievements toward improving trade in Africa as identified at the Gleneagles Summit. While France has reaffirmed its commitment to this issue and has identified


\(^{422}\) Tom Grimmer, WTO averts talk breakdowns, Globe and Mail, (Toronto), 18 December 2005.
infrastructure development as one of its seven priority sectors for African development, there is currently little evidence of new independent funding allocated to fulfilling this commitment.

Citing Africa as one of its top three priorities for international action, France reiterated its support for the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) in order to “spur regional integration and infrastructure development in a spirit of partnership with developed countries.” France participated in the fifth meeting of the Africa Partnership Forum (APF) in London on 4-5 October 2005, which aims to “record, monitor and report on delivery of all financial and policy commitments to Africa…[and] set clear, time-bound benchmarks against which progress can be measured and monitored.” France also took part in the inaugural meeting of the Infrastructure Consortium for Africa, held on 6 October 2005. The Consortium seeks to work as a partnership between donors and stakeholders “to accelerate progress to meet the urgent infrastructure needs of Africa in support of economic growth and development”.

At the 23rd Conference of Heads of State and Government of Africa and France, held in Bamako on 3-4 December 2005, France stated its commitment to African development and its support for the Doha round of trade negotiations in dealing with development. In a statement made by HE Mrs. Christine Lagarde, Minister Delegate for Foreign Trade, at the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference this December, France said “we must put development back at the heart of the Round” and confirmed French “support [for] an increase in aid for trade” for the poorest countries. As a member of the WTO, France was represented in the Hong Kong round’s Ministerial Declaration which discussed expanding aid for trade and created a task force to offer recommendations on how to ‘operationalize’ aid for trade.

Analyst: Melissa Molson

3. Germany: +1

The German government registered a high level of compliance with the Gleneagles’ trade in Africa commitment as they sought ways to make trade work for Africa as well as successfully build Africa’s capacity to trade. A Ministerial Declaration released by Germany on 19 December 2005 committed to eliminating all export subsidies on cotton to Africa by 2006, thereby benefiting African cotton farmers and making trade work for Africa. There was also progress in Germany’s commitment to build Africa’s infrastructure. On 21 October 2005, the governments of Germany and Burkina Faso announced a comprehensive plan which would see Germany provide €54 million between 2005 and 2007 for economic development with a focus on market oriented agricultural goods and their production. In addition, in a press release dated 20 December 2005, the German government pledged the government of

---

Mozambique €68.5 million between 2005 and 2006 to develop education, rural areas, and the private sector.\(^\text{432}\)

Analyst: Adrian M.T. Roomes

4. Italy: 0

Italy registered partial compliance for its achievements toward improving Africa’s human, technological, and institutional capacity to trade. Since the Gleneagles Summit, Italy made a few contributions that promote trade in Africa. In December 2005, the Italian Cooperation (IC) under the Government of Italy announced that it will provide aid of over €4 million to be used in agricultural projects in Angola.\(^\text{433}\) IC also gave €1.1 million towards two projects that intend to promote computer literacy and increase technological development in Mozambique.\(^\text{434}\) However, Italy has yet to make any significant contributions and actions towards improving trade in Africa.

Analyst: Laura Yau

5. Japan: +1

Japan registered a high degree of compliance with respect to its commitments to improve the investment climate in Africa and to help build Africa’s capacity for trade. Japan has taken and continues to take a leadership role in promoting efforts to develop trade in Africa. It will be involved in the Fourth Asia-Africa Business Forum (AAF) to take place in 2006,\(^\text{435}\) and will host the Fourth Tokyo International Conference on African Development (TICAD IV) in 2008.\(^\text{436}\) The TICAD conferences actively promote Asia-Africa business relations and provide “one of the largest international platforms for global cooperation for African development.”\(^\text{437}\) While Japan’s official trade policy has no significant discussion of trade in Africa,\(^\text{438}\) the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has outlined specific measures that it will take to promote trade, business development and investment in African countries.\(^\text{439}\) These include promoting trade and investment between Africa and Japan by “facilitating trade investment, enhancing business exchanges and promoting product development and export to Japan.”\(^\text{440}\)

Japan’s support of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) has helped develop income generating projects and upgrade skills though developments such as the Community Based Production Centres in Guinea.\(^\text{441}\) The $300 million annually that Japan makes available for overseas investment loans,\(^\text{442}\) commitments to share Japanese technology and expertise through UNIDO,\(^\text{443}\) and


the existence of the UNIDO Tokyo office which acts as a source of information to facilitate private investment into Africa, shows that Japan is creating the conditions necessary to make their African investment promotion centres effective.

Analyst: Nathan Weatherdon

6. Russia: 0

Russia receives a score of '0' regarding its commitment to improving Africa's capacity to trade. Russia reaffirmed its commitment to this issue and played an active role in the international arena in support of African infrastructure initiatives. However, there is currently little evidence of new funding allocated towards fulfilling this commitment.

At a statement made to the Joint World Bank IMF Development Committee on 25 September 2005, Minister of Finance Mr. Aleksei Kudrin noted that Russia "strongly support[s] World Bank's Africa Action Plan...[and] welcome[s] the renewal of attention to investments in infrastructure".444 Russia also participated in the fifth meeting of the Africa Partnership Forum (APF) in London on 4-5 October 2005, which aims to “record, monitor and report on delivery of all financial and policy commitments to Africa...[and] set clear, time-bound benchmarks against which progress can be measured and monitored”.445 Russia was an active participant of the APF meeting, assisting with the preparation of the APF's Draft Joint Action Plan and other documents relating to the functioning of the APF.446 Russia also took part in the inaugural meeting of the Infrastructure Consortium for Africa, held on 6 October 2005 in London. The Consortium seeks to work as a partnership between donors and stakeholders "to accelerate progress to meet the urgent infrastructure needs of Africa in support of economic growth and development".447

Analyst: Melissa Molson

7. The United Kingdom: +1

The UK has achieved successful compliance through financial support that intends to improve Africa's investment climate, capacity to trade, and infrastructure for business. Prime Minister Tony Blair and Hilary Benn, Secretary of State for International Development announced in a press release dated 17 November 2005 that the UK government will donate US$30 million annually to the Investment Climate Facility (ICF) over three years.448 The British Prime Minister stated, "The ICF's activities will address both the real and perceived obstacles. It will be vital for investment, growth, jobs and sustainable poverty reduction in Africa".449 Supported by the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) and African Heads of State, the ICF is the vehicle that the G8 and Commission for Africa proposed as necessary in order to

---

improve investment in Africa. In a press release dated 3 October 2005, the UK announced it will donate £200 million to the World Bank’s Africa Catalytic Fund of which a portion will be allocated towards improved infrastructure on the continent. Officials from the Department for International Development chaired the first meeting of the Infrastructure Consortium for Africa held on 6 October 2005 in London. Finally, in a speech on 14 November 2005, Prime Minister Blair committed to increasing “aid for trade” with a donation of £100 million a year until 2010. The money will help developing countries raise exports to the rest of the world, African countries are expected to significantly benefit.

 Analyst: Sadia Rafiquddin

8. United States of America: +1

The United States’ government registered a high level of compliance with the Gleneagles’ trade in Africa commitment, with attempts to stimulate growth in Africa’s economy by improving Africa’s business infrastructure and investment climate. The United States Department of the Treasury reaffirmed this commitment in a press release dated 2 December 2005. It stated, “In the context of our shared commitments to double aid for Africa by 2010, we agree to give priority to the infrastructure necessary to allow countries to take advantage of the improved opportunities to trade”.

The United States went further towards improving African infrastructure when on 8 November 2005, Mr. Lloyd O. Pierson, Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) formally opened a new West Africa Trade Hub in Dakar, Senegal. USAID has opened three other hubs in Kenya, Ghana, and Botswana since President George W. Bush instated the Trade for Africa Development and Enterprise (TRADE) Initiative in 2001.

The United States also took strides toward improving the climate for investment in Africa. On 22 December 2005, President Bush made a proclamation which added Burundi to 36 other African countries eligible for benefits under the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA). The AGOA was signed into U.S. law on 18 May 2000, and was intended to provide incentives for African countries to continue to open their borders to free trade. In addition, on 2 November 2005, USAID announced the creation of a new World Bank Fund for Africa, a portion of which will be allocated towards improving infrastructure on the continent.
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globally, and an undisclosed portion of USAID’s initial US$75 million endowment was set aside for Mozambique.461

Analyst: Adrian M.T. Roomes

9. European Union: +1

The European Union has successfully fulfilled the trade in Africa commitment as outlined at the 2005 Gleneagles Summit. In a report titled “EU Strategy for Africa: Towards a Euro-African Pact to Accelerate Africa’s Development” the EU set forth its commitment to help meet Africa’s growth potential, foster integrated markets, and improve infrastructure on the continent. In a press release dated 12 October 2005, the European Council adopted the “European Union Strategy for Africa” which will launch the new Partnership for Infrastructure initiative.462 Under the Partnership for Infrastructure, “the EU will support programs that facilitate interconnectivity at the continental level to promote regional trade, integration, stability and development.”463 In order to have more integrated markets, the EU is currently negotiating with four Sub-Saharan African countries through the Economic Partnerships Agreements (EPAs).464 The EU’s most significant donation thus far, announced December 2005, is an increase in its annual contribution to “Aid-for-Trade” by €1 billion to a total of €2 billion per year by 2010.465

Analyst: Sadia Rafiquddin

---

Trade: Export Subsidies

Commitment

“We reaffirmed our commitment to open markets more widely to trade in agricultural goods, industrial goods and services, and in agriculture to reduce trade distorting domestic subsidies and eliminate all forms of export subsidies by a credible end date.”

-Chairman’s Summary (final press conference)\(^{466}\)

Background

At the Doha Ministerial Conference held in November 2001, participants implemented the Doha Declaration launching a new trade round to establish a fair and market-oriented trading system by preventing restrictions and distortions in world agricultural markets. The Fifth WTO Ministerial Conference was held in September 2003 in Cancun, Mexico. The Ministerial ultimately collapsed after the QUAD countries (US, EU, Japan and Canada) failed to reach an agreement with the G-20 bloc of developing countries (including Brazil, India and China). Nevertheless, the leaders of the G8 countries understand the importance of assisting less developed countries in their trade capabilities in order to promote economic growth and alleviate poverty.

On 1 August 2004, WTO members adopted a General Council decision on the Doha Work Programme, informally known as the July Package which established a framework for placing the DDA back on track for completion by 2006. Under the package, industrialized countries agreed to major concessions that they had previously resisted in Cancun: wealthy states, in particular the EU, agreed to place all trade distorting agricultural subsidies on the table for discussion and committed to making significant cuts; wealthy countries agreed to a ‘down payment’ on this deal in the form of an immediate 20% reduction in total current trade distorting agricultural subsidies at the beginning of the implementation period for the Round; LDCs (including approximately 25 African states) received an agreement in principle to receive increased market access while maintaining the right to shelter their domestic industries; and three Singapore Issues (foreign investment, competition policy, and government procurement) were dropped from the DDA with the fourth (trade facilitation) kept on in the understanding it would only result in a clarification and simplifying of current agreements. In exchange, developing countries agreed to further open their markets to manufactured imports and agreed to continue negotiations on a deal in trade in services.

Reaffirmed at Gleneagles, the G8 commitment to open markets more widely to trade in agricultural goods, industrial goods and services, and in agriculture to reduce trade distorting domestic subsidies and eliminate all forms of export subsidies by a credible end date was carried out in part at the most recent WTO Ministerial in Hong Kong. Though the meeting was not considered a resounding success, a decision was reached committing to the end of Export Subsidies by 2013.\(^{467}\)

Background: Jonathan Scotland
Team Leader: Stanislav Orlov


Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown

1. Canada: 0

Canada has partially complied with its Gleneagles commitment on export subsidies. By publicly supporting the elimination of all forms of agricultural subsidies, and by signing the World Trade Organization (WTO) Ministerial Agreement, Canada made progress toward compliance with the Gleneagles commitment. Yet through its efforts to protect its own export state trading enterprise mechanism and its system of price and quota controls, Canadian officials resisted implementing important domestic reforms.

At the conclusion of WTO discussions held in Zurich, on 10 October 2005, Canadian Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada Minister, Andy Mitchell, and International Trade Minister, Jim Peterson, reaffirmed the long-standing Canadian objective of eliminating all forms of agricultural export subsidies. On 9 November 2005, following WTO discussions in Geneva, the same two ministers issued a statement in advance of the ministerial meeting in Hong Kong, confirming the Canadian government’s desire for the quickest possible elimination of agriculture export subsidies. They made it clear that Canada is working aggressively to negotiate for “fundamental change, real reform, not just modest improvements” in this round. As part of the Commonwealth meeting in Malta, on 26 November 2005 Canadian officials again called for a WTO agreement on “the elimination of all forms of export subsidies by 2010”.

At the World Trade Organization meeting in Hong Kong, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand were accused by European Union (EU) and United States (US) for unfair marketing practices. Canadian officials publicly responded to these criticisms prior to the Hong Kong meeting. For example, in the statement issued by Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Peterson on 10 October 2005, the Ministers explained that

471 Status quo not good enough; Commonwealth leaders send out a clear message to EU ahead of next month’s WTO talks, TODAY, (Singapore), 28 November 2005. Date of access: 15 January 2006. http://global.factiva.com/ha/default.aspx
Canada believes that such fair export state trading enterprises as the Canadian Wheat Board should not be disciplined.

According to Canadian Wheat Board (CWB) Chairperson, Mr. Ken Ritter, the Board is a “single desk that does not distort trade” and should not be part of negotiations. Although the CWB and its practices were not on the agenda of the Hong Kong meetings, Mr. Ritter expressed concerns that Canadian farmers might lose their government guarantees of initial payments, resulting in the need for a new deal between the CWB and farmers. Canadian officials, therefore, both challenged farm subsidies within other countries, while fighting to maintain its own system of price and quota controls on dairy, eggs and poultry products during the Hong Kong negotiations.

Analyst: Stanislav Orlov

2. France: -1

France has resisted compliance with the Gleneagles commitment to open markets more widely and to reduce domestic and export subsidies. It created substantial obstacles to European Union (EU) commitments to reduce agricultural subsidies, thereby delaying the process of liberalizing trade.

The French government strongly opposes efforts to reduce agriculture subsidies by the EU. During talks in Geneva on October 20, 2005, French officials expressed the government’s refusal to permit new cuts in European farm supports needed to advance global trade talks, creating serious obstacles to completing a blueprint to lower trade barriers around the world. The French stance put Peter Mandelson, the EU’s chief trade negotiator, under pressure to find a way to open European farm markets after the U.S. offered to cut agricultural subsidies to restart the round of trade talks known as the Doha round. French officials repeatedly caused problems for Mr. Mandelson, accusing him of overstepping his negotiating mandate and demanding that his negotiations be overseen by a supervisory committee. These actions drew strong rebuke from U.S. trade representative Rob Portman, while Australian trade minister Mark Vaile, lashed out at the French stance, expressing concern that it would cause the collapse of the trade talks.

The French government also played a vital role in the EU’s opposition to endorsing a 2010 date, proposed by the U.S. and Brazil, for ending farm export subsidies. This led to extending this date to 2013 as the date to end all farm export subsidies. While this result was welcomed by France, many say it fell short of expectations. For their part, French officials argued that the WTO proposals are counterproductive and do not really serve the interests of the countries most in need.

France's opposition to reducing agricultural subsidies also created problems in other areas of trade. This impasse between EU and U.S. negotiators over agriculture subsidies has prevented progress in negotiations to open up trade in manufactured goods and services.

Analyst: Farzana Nawaz

---

3. Germany: 0

The German government, under the leadership of the newly elected Chancellor, Ms. Angela Merkel, has partially complied with the trade commitments on export subsidies made at Gleneagles.

In the Chancellor’s policy statement presented to the German Bundestag on 30th November 2005, Ms. Merkel carefully points out the need to balance national interest with German trade commitments: “The need for freer global trade must be reconciled also with the interests of our agriculture.” Earlier in the year, in her address to the UN General Assembly in September 2005, Federal Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development, Ms. Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul, echoed these concerns, adding “external support will bear fruit only if it is accompanied by ownership and good governance in the developing countries.”

Despite these concerns, Merkel has played a key role in the recently passed EU framework budget for 2007-2013. In particular, Merkel agreed review the Franco-German deal on agricultural subsidies in return for concessions on Britain’s £2.7 billion annual budget rebate.

In a renewed effort to fulfill the Doha Round mandate before its 30 April 2006 deadline, Germany, along with its EU partners and other members of the WTO, met in Hong Kong for a Ministerial Meeting. The Ministerial Declaration reaffirms the Doha Round commitments and stipulates an end to export subsidies in article 6: “We agree to ensure the parallel elimination of all forms of export subsidies and disciplines on all export measures with equivalent effect to be completed by the end of 2013.” Members also agreed to reduce tariffs on non-agricultural products.

In his statement at the Ministerial Conference, Mr. Bernd Pfaffenbach, German State Secretary for the Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology, highlighted Germany’s key role in EU agricultural reform, but cautioned: “The intensive discussion of our offer within the European Union shows that the EU’s threshold of pain has been reached. And we hope that this is acknowledged by our partners.” He warned that the Doha agenda cannot be reduced to agricultural reform, but required an equivalent and parallel opening of markets for industrial goods and services. Although he maintains that Doha should above all benefit least developed countries, he argues that the Round’s most important contribution toward development can be achieved through progress on market access topics.

Ms. Wieczorek-Zeul welcomed the elimination of all agricultural export subsidies, but was unsatisfied with the decisions on cotton: “the decisive point is to eliminate internal subsidies for cotton farmers in

484 The Ministerial Declaration reaffirms the Doha Round commitments and stipulates an end to export subsidies in article 6: “We agree to ensure the parallel elimination of all forms of export subsidies and disciplines on all export measures with equivalent effect to be completed by the end of 2013.” Members also agreed to reduce tariffs on non-agricultural products.
485 In his statement at the Ministerial Conference, Mr. Bernd Pfaffenbach, German State Secretary for the Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology, highlighted Germany’s key role in EU agricultural reform, but cautioned: “The intensive discussion of our offer within the European Union shows that the EU’s threshold of pain has been reached. And we hope that this is acknowledged by our partners.” Although he maintains that Doha should above all benefit least developed countries, he argues that the Round’s most important contribution toward development can be achieved through progress on market access topics.
486 Earlier in the year, in her address to the UN General Assembly in September 2005, Federal Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development, Ms. Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul, echoed these concerns, adding “external support will bear fruit only if it is accompanied by ownership and good governance in the developing countries.”
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industrialized countries [for which] no date has been set". The comment was clearly directed at the United States, which pays some 4 billion US dollars a year in subsidies to 25,000 large-scale cotton farmers while millions of African countries farmers are on the verge of bankruptcy. Ms. Wieczorek-Zeul concerns are echoed by the comments of EU trade commissioner, Mr. Peter Mandelson, who ruled out unilateral concessions on the part of the EU and which accused the United States, Canada, and Australia of dragging their feet in the talks on ending agricultural subsidies.

While Germany has partially complied with its Gleneagles commitments by signing on to the WTO Ministerial Agreement, critics have argued that this agreement was largely symbolic as export subsidies, one type of agricultural subsidies, make up less than 2% of total subsidies. These figures show that while progress has been made, Germany is far off from its goal “to open markets more widely to trade in agricultural goods.”

Analyst: Jelena Madunic

4. Italy: 0

The Italian government has partially complied with its Gleneagles commitments on export subsidies. The Italian Republic, together with the United Kingdom, Germany and France, has delegated most of its trade policy to the European Commission, which represents the 25 members of the European Union at the World Trade Organization (WTO). As such, the Italian government did not directly participate in the Hong Kong Ministerial of the WTO in December, 2005, but was represented by EU Trade Commissioner Mr. Peter Mandelson and the EC Representatives. The European Communities’ official policy on export subsidies is that the EU-25 will only begin to open their markets to freer trade in agricultural and industrial goods when other nations, specifically Canada, the US, Japan and Australia, do the same. Commissioner Mandelson believes that any form of unilateral action on the subsidies would be “pointless.” His statement was made after the American rejection of the European Union’s original offer to slash “trade distorting subsidies” to agriculture by 70% and to reduce the average agricultural tariff level from 23% to 12%, the current average tariff in the United States. Action on these issues, however, had been tied to an agreement on industrial goods that would reduce applied tariffs prior to the Ministerial in Hong Kong. Such an agreement was not reached. All parties, however, did agree in Hong Kong to substantially reduce export subsidies by 2013. Commissioner Mandelson rejected an earlier proposal
for phase-out of subsidies by 2010, categorizing such an agreement as not being "economically sustainable".498

Despite the European Union’s mandate at the World Trade Organization, the Italian government has also been somewhat active in pursuing global agreement on export subsidies. In December 2005, Finance Minister Tremonti joined other G7 Finance Ministers in their declaration that “urge[d] all participants to maintain a high level of ambition and to make significant progress on market access in agriculture, industrial products and services; reducing trade distorting domestic support; eliminating all forms of export subsidies in agriculture; making significant progress on services, including financial services as liberalisation in financial services is linked to increased growth.”499 Earlier, Productive Activities Vice-Minister Mr. Adolfo Urso noted the importance of not allowing agreement on agriculture to eclipse discussions on other aspects of market access.500 In particular, while speaking to the Committee of Commercial Agreements in Geneva, he called on the negotiating parties to focus not only on agriculture, but also on industrial goods, geographical denominations and sensitive goods.501 Italian persistence on the need for reform and liberalization in non-agricultural sectors is not, however, mirrored in the opinions of the Minister of Agricultural and Forestry Policies, Mr. Gianni Alemanno. On 16 December 2005, Minister Alemanno called on non-EU parties to the WTO to work towards an agreement on agriculture on their own, as it was not the prerogative of the EU to destroy a "painstakingly" constructed proposal.502 Nevertheless, the Vice-Minister of Agricultural and Forestry Policies, Mr. Paolo Scarpa, qualified the final deal reached by the parties at the Hong Kong Ministerial as “positive”, as it phased-out Europe’s, and specifically Italy’s, ability to support agricultural producers with subsidies while not placing restrictions on the more controversial Common Agricultural Policy of the EU-25.503 Therefore, despite concrete steps taken at the European level, Italy has earned a score of 0 for its lack of enthusiasm in pursuing solid progress on market access for agricultural and industrial goods.

Analyst: Michael Erdman

5. Japan: 0

While World Trade Organization (WTO) negotiations leave room for Japan to exclude “sensitive products” such as rice, a lack of some concession in this area does not reflect full compliance with the commitment made at Gleneagles in July 2005.504 The Doha Development Agenda, a key component of the WTO negotiations, specifically seeks to minimize the use of such special status provisions.505 Japan, however, faces a great deal of domestic pressure to resist the elimination of export subsidies and has thus made limited progress on this commitment.506 Japan has, therefore, registered only partial compliance with its Gleneagles commitment to trade export subsidies.

Some progress was made at the WTO Ministerial Meeting when a deadline of 2013 was agreed upon for the elimination of agricultural export subsidies. This may be considered a step toward fulfilling the commitments made in this issue-area, as one of the goals was to eliminate export subsidies by a “credible end date.” Japan, however, did not concede in some key industries, and was reluctant to take the lead in eliminating trade-distorting subsidies.

Taking these factors into account, Japan registers only partial compliance with its Gleneagles commitment on export subsidies.

Analyst: Kristin Eberth

6. Russia: 0

The Russian Federation has partially complied with its Gleneagles commitment on export subsidies. As the only member of the G8 not currently party to the World Trade Organization (WTO) Agreements, the Russian Federation has thus far been excluded from the Doha Round of negotiations between WTO members. Nevertheless, given that the Russian Federation is currently negotiating the terms of its accession to the WTO, it is keenly following developments in the sphere of trade in agricultural goods and industrial goods and services. Russia is also excluded from meetings of the G7 Finance Ministers and Central Bankers, and thus did not participate in the 3 December 2005 statement urging all parties to the WTO Hong Kong Ministerial to take concerted action on subsidies and liberalization.

The Russian Federation's exclusion from negotiations at the WTO level (it has observer status), in addition to its current concentration on reforming its own economic structures to meet the definition of a “market economy”, have left it few means of making a concerted effort to pursue market opening policies in the same manner as the other members of the G8. Furthermore, the Ministry for Agricultural Production has announced that it will seek to provide greater subsidies for agricultural producers in the coming year in order to: (1) mitigate the effects of volatile fuel prices; and (2) cheapen credit and encourage the modernization of farming techniques and animal husbandry. The Russian Federation hopes to increase private investment in the agricultural sector by employing these methods. The preservation of subsidies to agriculture, according to the International Monetary Fund, remains a source of discord with current trends in international trade and may negatively influence the accession of the Russian Federation to the World Trade Organization. Thus far, Minister of Finance Aleksei Kudrin has only suggested that reduction in subsidies on agricultural products be linked to increased development aid, but has made no specific proposals with respect to implementation of such schemes within the Russian Federation.

---

Thus, the Russian Federation has been awarded a score of zero for its timid steps on joining the global movement to reduce subsidies and its relative inability to take significant actions on the matter while negotiating accession to the WTO.

Analyst: Michael Erdman

7. United Kingdom: +1

The British government has publicly maintained a strong commitment to the goals laid out at the Gleneagles summit in July 2005, and has presented a strong policy agenda to register full compliance with its Gleneagles commitment to export subsidies. Prime Minister Tony Blair, on 14 July 2005, expressed that the British government hoped that the World Trade Organization (WTO) would agree upon an end date of 2010 for agricultural export subsidies. On 17 November 2005, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Gordon Brown, denounced the European Union's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), calling for the reduction of "agricultural protectionism in Europe". Mr. Brown also said that "the test of success at Hong Kong will be substantially cutting tariffs and trade-distorting subsidies, and fulfilling our commitment of setting a timetable to end agricultural export subsidies". European Union Trade Commissioner Peter Mandelson criticised Mr. Brown's demands, calling them "over the top".

Britain held the presidency of the European Union in 2005, and from this position Mr. Blair sought a "fundamental review of EU farm policy." However, the British government faces opposition in the EU regarding the CAP, particularly from France. British officials were, nevertheless, successful in completing a deal in Brussels on 17 December 2005 that calls for a review of the EU budget, including "farm policy.

At the WTO Ministerial Meeting in Hong Kong, British ministers continued to urge the EU to increase access to its agricultural markets. The WTO also requested that political leaders work together to move negotiations along, with a view to making further progress by the end of next April. Commonwealth Secretary, General Don McKinnon, stated that he "strongly support[s]" this action.

Analyst: Kristin Eberth

8. United States: 0

Since the Gleneagles G8 summit the United States (US) government has partially complied with its commitment regarding export subsidies by extending concessions in trade of agricultural goods: including

---

the provision of broader market access, and the elimination of some export subsidies. At the Hong Kong meeting of the World Trade Organization (WTO), American officials also attempted to persuade other members to offer greater concessions for developing nations. The US government was, however, less successful in fulfilling its commitment regarding in manufactured goods and services.

US negotiators took substantial measures to end subsidies in agricultural goods at the Hong Kong meeting of the WTO. They supported a measure to end all export subsidies to farmers by 2010; a position which was rejected by EU officials resulting in an end date of 2013. This demonstrates a real commitment on the part of US officials to end export subsidies in agriculture by a credible end date. The US government has also urged the EU to go further in cutting food import tariffs.

The biggest concession of the US government was deemed, by US officials, to be in the cotton sector, offering duty-free access for West African states to the US cotton market. Under this agreement, free market access would be provided for 97% of all goods from the poorest nations by 2008. The US also agreed to end all export subsidies on cotton by 2006, although this is not a mandatory commitment.

In spite of these concessions, some US representatives continue to obstruct efforts to lower barriers to textile imports for some less developed countries. US Trade Representative Rob Portman indicated that his government was not yet willing to allow textile producers in countries like Bangladesh full access to the US market; that such concession would only come as part of an overall trade package. For the same reason, US officials have expressed some concern with "Trade for Aid", which aims to give money to less developed countries to help them improve their trade infrastructure and to compensate them for losses from free trade. American officials have, however, signalled a willingness to accept the package in principle, and have announced an increase in the American own "Trade for Aid" package.

The concessions themselves have also faced criticism. While the ending of export subsidies in cotton is seen as a big step, some have argued that this measure is not a concession by the US, but simply a response to a WTO cotton panel ruling. Some also suggest this concession falls well short of the WTO ruling. This impasse between EU and US negotiators has also inhibited progress on issues relating to trade in manufactured goods and services.

The US government has been, therefore, less successful with regards to liberalizing trade in services and manufactured goods at Hong Kong; only commitments for further negotiations were secured. A commitment was made to intensify market access negotiations to achieve higher levels of liberalization in key service sectors such as financial services, telecommunications, and computer services with several deadlines established for further rounds of negotiations on these issue areas.

Analyst: Farzana Nawaz

---


8. European Union: +1

The European Union (EU), having made a sustained effort to open markets and to eliminate export subsidies; and, having assuming a leadership role in trade negotiations relating to export subsidies, has registered a high level of compliance with the trade commitment made at Gleneagles.

Ahead of the World Trade Organization’s (WTO) Ministerial Conference in Hong Kong, EU officials announced a willingness to reduce agricultural subsidies by as much as 70%, and import tariffs on agricultural products by between 35 and 60% if, in exchange, industrial tariffs are reduced and market access for services improved. However, EU trade commissioner, Mr. Peter Mandelson, ruled out any “unilateral concessions”, accusing the United States, Canada, and Australia of failing to carry out significant reform to their current policies on agricultural subsidies. His statement was made after the American government rejected the EU’s original offer to slash “trade distorting subsidies” to agriculture and to reduce the average agricultural tariff level from 23% to 12%, the current average tariff in the United States. No agreement on industrial goods that would reduce applied tariffs was made prior to the Ministerial in Hong Kong.

In Hong Kong, however, the EU along with other WTO members, agreed to eliminate farm export subsidies by 2013. Members also agreed to reduce tariffs on non-agricultural products. In his address to the Ministers, Mr. Mandelson reaffirmed the EU’s commitment to the Doha Development Round. Highlighting the importance of agriculture, Mr. Mandelson maintains that “trade distorting subsidies must be cut back”, and that “substantial improvements in market access must take place”. Although some critics have cautiously praised the agreement on farm export subsidies, most have called it the Ministerial Conference as a whole, disappointing. Mr. Phil Bloomer, Head of Oxfam International’s Make Trade Fair campaign, stated that “small progress on some aspects of agriculture is more than cancelled out by extremely damaging proposals on services and industry.” Oxfam points out that the pledge to eliminate export subsidies and equivalent payments by 2013 is three years later than originally proposed, and that EU export subsidies account for only 3.5% of its overall agricultural support.

In addition to commitments made in Hong Kong, however, the EU has made significant progress in other aspects of its trade policy. On 12 September 2005, the European Commission announced new regulation to clear blocked Chinese textile imports. On 23 December 2005, the European Commission additionally adopted regulations to eliminate export refunds for live cattle for slaughter. The EU has also lead the way on the issue of cotton, offering duty and quota free access to all cotton imports from West Africa. The EU called on others, in particular the United States, to make similar commitments in Hong Kong. EU Commissioner Mandelson has also called for progress in trade in services, urging the creation of "a platform for genuine multilateral negotiation." On 13 December 2005, the EU announced further substantial commitments to providing Trade Related Assistance (TRA) to developing countries, earmarking €1 billion a year in TRA from 2010. This represents a substantial increase from the €400 million per year currently provided and matches the €1 billion per year from 2007 pledged by the European Commission at the Gleneagles summit this year. It means that total EU Trade Related Assistance will increase to €2 billion from 2010.

Analyst: Jelena Madunic

---
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Trade: Least Developed Countries

Commitment

“We also committed to address products of interest to Least Developed Countries in the negotiations, and to ensure Least Developed Countries have the flexibility to decide their own economic strategies.”

-Chairman’s Summary (final press conference) 547

Background

At the Doha Ministerial Conference held in November 2001, participants implemented the Doha Declaration, which reconfirmed the objective of the WTO Agreement to establish a fair and market-oriented trading system by preventing restrictions and distortions in world agricultural markets. The Fifth WTO Ministerial Conference was held in September 2003 in Cancun, Mexico. The Ministerial ultimately collapsed after the QUAD countries (US, EU, Japan and Canada) failed to reach an agreement with the G-20 bloc of developing countries (including Brazil, India and China). The G8 countries nonetheless understand the importance of assisting developing countries in their endeavour to create viable economic growth and to alleviate poverty. To this end, they have made the commitment to put the talks back on track and resume negotiations to meet extended deadlines – namely completion by the end of 2006. The minor agreements reached at the 2005 Hong Kong Ministerial were a step in this direction.

The G8 countries commitment to assist the Least Developed Countries (LDC) made during the Gleneagles Summit is a further example of this goal, and part of the July Package developed in August of 2004 to help get the Doha Development Agenda (DDA) back on track. Negotiated primarily by the US, EU, Australia (from the Cairns Group), Brazil (from the G20) and India, the package agreed to major concessions that they had previously resisted in Cancun: wealthy states, in particular the EU, greed to place all trade-distorting agricultural subsidies on the table for discussion and committed to making significant cuts; wealthy countries agreed to a ‘down payment’ on this deal in the form of a 20% reduction in total current agricultural subsidies at the beginning of the implementation period for the Round; LDCs (including approximately 25 African states) received an agreement in principle to receive increased market access while maintaining the right to shelter their domestic industries; and three Singapore Issues (foreign investment, competition policy, and government procurement) were dropped from the DDA with the fourth (trade facilitation) kept on in the understanding it would only result in a clarification and simplifying of current agreements. In exchange, developing countries agreed to further open their markets to manufactured imports and agreed to continue negotiations on a deal in trade in services. 548

Team Leader: Jonathan Scotland

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown

1. Canada: 0

Canada has yet to register a high level of compliance with the goal of ensuring that Least Developed Countries (LDCs) have the flexibility to pursue their own economic policies. The Government has made little progress beyond measures it developed at the G8 Summit in Kananaskis, which to date have had limited success.

In 2002 Canada expanded its LDC Market Access Initiative, which opened the Canadian market to goods from 48 LDC states. Only over-quota imports of these goods are excluded from the LDC Market Access Initiative. In July of 2005 the Ministry of Foreign Affairs published “Agenda 2006: A Progress Report 2004 – 2005” in which it stated that due to the LDC-MAI, Canadian imports of goods from LDCs have increased at an average annual rate of 32.5%. Many have critiqued that this is in fact a miniscule gain since it is compared to import levels from LDCs in 2002 which were less than one thousandth, 0.1%, of total Canadian imports. In a meeting of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs senators were told that this may be due to a lack of complementing programs to assist the trade program. Many African exporters do not consider Canada as a potential export market.

Canada supports broader multilateral trade programming which has an impact on Africa and LDCs. This includes support to the International Trade Centre, the Doha Global Trust Fund, and the Standards and Trade Development Facility.

Publicly the Canadian government continues to be an advocate of assisting LDC trade and development. In his address to the UN Summit in September, Prime Minister Paul Martin remarked, “How can we talk about development as we chase poor farmers from their land because of their inability to compete on their own agricultural export markets, which are over subsidized by rich countries”. Critics are quick to

charge that despite this dialogue the Canadian government has been slow to follow its statements with concrete actions. Recently prominent Martin ally and pop star Bono stated that he was “mystified” by Martin’s failure to boost Canadian foreign aid towards the goal of 0.7% of GDP. According to the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development, Canada ranks 14th of 31 industrialized countries in Official Development Assistance (ODA) per Gross National Income (GNI). Canada’s rate of contribution is 0.26 which corresponds to the statistical mean of the group.

Analyst: Christopher Yung

2. France: 0

France has not demonstrated a significant level of compliance with the goal of ensuring that the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) have the flexibility to pursue their own economic policies.

Although France has taken significant steps in the past, such as the International Conference on Financing for Development, held in Monterrey in 2002, where France proved it was eager to promote developmental funding through its actions with Great Britain to create an “International Finance Facility” and promote public private partnerships. As well as confirming its objectives through a pledge to increase its ODA to 0.5% of gross national income (GNI) and to 0.7% by 2012. France's primary involvement to date has been through the EU initiatives at the Hong Kong Ministerial.

On December 13, 2005 Ms. Christine Lagarde reaffirmed France’s intention to seek in Hong Kong measures for developing countries. “The poorest countries are expecting a message from us in Hong Kong. France is fully behind the Commission's goal which is to achieve during the conference, an ambitious and concrete package of development measures”. It should be noted, however, that France heavily criticised the reduction in EU farm tariffs by 38.9% as being too high, up from the previously proposed 24% cut.

Analyst: Constance Smith

3. Germany: 0

Germany has registered an acceptable level of compliance with the Gleneagles commitment to foster stronger economic growth, through trade, in the LDC’s, and is on its way to achieving full compliance.

In past efforts, Germany has taken a strong lead in helping LDCs develop their own economic strategies: Trade Africa, supported by German ODA of 332 000 Euros in 2004-2005, is a training program which gives promoters, coordinators of local economic promotion initiatives, small and medium-scale enterprises as well as junior export professionals practical know-how in export marketing at hand.

Trade-Related Technical Assistance and Capacity Building (TRTA/CB), financed for the most part by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) is delivered on demand of developing countries mainly as part of bilateral activities in the field of “economic development and

---

employment”, one of the priority areas of Germany’s Official Development Assistance (ODA) but also as part of activities in the fields of “Agriculture” and “Institution Building”. Germany emphasises the importance of embedding developing countries’ trade policies in comprehensive national development and poverty reduction strategies. German Trade-Related Technical Assistance and Capacity Building’s longer-term aim is to reduce poverty by integrating developing countries into the global economy, enabling the latter to fully benefit from the advantages of globalization, while being able to respond to its risks effectively.

The German government has repeatedly voiced its support for developments at the Hong Kong Ministerial this December. German Development Minister Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul said the results of the conference - which included an agreement to end EU agricultural export subsidies by 2013 and grant all LDCs duty-free and quota-free access to developed country markets no later than 2008 - will lead to “fairer trade relations.” Minister Wieczorek-Zeul was adamant however that the agreements reached at the Ministerial were merely first steps and that further action is needed to ensure even “fairer trade relations and justice in globalisation.”

Analyst: Jennifer Hodgins

4. Italy: 0

Italy has demonstrated moderate support for its commitments made in Gleneagles, and is on its way to achieving full compliance in addressing products of interest to Least Developed and to ensure Least Developed Countries have the flexibility to decide their own economic strategies.

Italy’s primary contribution consists of a €1,000,000 donation bestowed by the Government of Italy for WTO technical assistance for the year of 2005. The donation will be split between the Doha Development Agenda Global Trust Fund, as well as the Integrated Framework (IF), and Trade Development Facility (STDF). The decision to donate funds to these three bodies reaffirms Italy’s support for LDCs “to participate fully in the world trading system and in the current trade negotiations”. The Doha Fund, for instance, aims to improve the participation of LDCs in WTO negotiations. Similarly, the IF is key for the enhancement strategies regarding LDCs economic growth and poverty reduction, and the STDF aids developing countries ensure their goods meet international sanitary and phytosanitary standards.

Evidence of Italy’s continued support includes the statements made at the UN Conference on Trade and Development in 2004. In his speech, Ambassador Petrone explained that Italy supports the strategy to “promote, through trade negotiations and technical assistance, a deeper regional integration of these Countries to exploit internal and external economies of scale”. Moreover, Italy believes that all LDCs that are dependent on the export of a few commodities must be helped by the international community and that “it is critical to help LDCs to diversify their patterns of productions” in order to improve and increase trade. Finally, Mr. Petrone stressed Italy’s support for economic growth and development of LDCs by asking the more advanced developing countries (i.e.: G-20) to grant trade preferences to LDCs.

Analyst: Constance Smith

---

5. Japan: +1

Japan has demonstrated a high level of compliance with its G8 commitment to address products of interest to Least Developed and to ensure Least Developed Countries have the flexibility to decide their own economic strategies.

With regards to the Doha Declaration and the current round of WTO negotiations, Japan has committed to comprehensive participation. In an attempt to build momentum for the WTO negotiations in Hong Kong during December 2005, the Japanese government has agreed to provide US$10 billion in trade-related aid to LDCs over three years. In an aid package that was presented to the WTO, the Japanese government also committed to provide duty-free and quota-free market access for “essentially all products” originating from LDCs. Increasing market access to LDCs was part of the commitment made in the Doha Declaration and continues to be negotiated with a conclusion expected in 2006. As of December 2005, the number of LDC products Japan provided duty-free preferential treatment amounted to 86%. This package was part of a previous commitment made in July in Gleneagles, Scotland for US$10 billion in overseas aid over the next five years.

Japan’s aid package also outlined Japan’s emphasis on soft loans, grant aid, and technical assistance to improve trade. Further, Japan committed to exchange a total of ten thousand trainees and experts in the fields of trade, production and distribution infrastructure.

In Hong Kong, Japanese Foreign Minister Taro Aso outlined his country’s measures to fully integrate all WTO members in the multilateral trading system.

In April 2005, at the Asia-Africa Business Summit, Japan sought a conclusion of a free trade agreement with neighbouring Asian countries and committed to a comprehensive economic partnership for Africa. At this summit, the Prime Minister of Japan announced that his government will provide as much assistance as possible to develop human resources in an attempt to further facilitate trade and investment between Asia and Africa. They have done this with their recent aid package presented in Hong Kong.

Japan has been promoting the Tokyo International Conference on African Development process even prior to the Africa Action Plan commitments made in Kananaskis. Japan has also facilitated continued cooperation with African countries, has been supporting Africa’s development efforts as a partner, while emphasizing the importance of trade.

Analyst: Ani Kevork

6. Russia: -1

Russia has demonstrated a low level of compliance in its commitment to address products of interest to Least Developed Countries and to ensure Least Developed Countries have the flexibility to decide their own economic strategies.
Speaking as an observer at the Hong Kong Ministerial, the Russian Federation trade representative, Mr. Maxim Medvedkov, stated Russia’s support of “efforts of all parties of multilateral trade talks aimed at achieving substantive agreements within the Doha Development Round.” Furthermore, he reiterated Russian support of a “balanced and evolutionary approach to trade liberalization.” According to Medvedkov, the Russians are working towards membership in the WTO, and as Chair of the G-8 they will do their “best to promote ambitious and balanced results of the Doha Round.” While they have concluded bilateral negotiations, they are currently focused on finalizing the Working Party Report. The Russian Federation emphasizes that they will only “undertake commitments which reflect the specific character and the actual level of development of its economy.”

A Russian commitment to trade goals that will affect LDC’s is not evident however, as most of their advancements in trade has been through bilateral agreements with non-LDCs.

Analyst: Jennifer Hodgins

7. United Kingdom: +1

The United Kingdom is on its way to achieving a high level of compliance in meeting the goals laid out at Gleneagles to address products of interest to Least Developed Countries and to ensure Least Developed Countries have the flexibility to decide their own economic strategies.

In October 2005 the UK co-chaired the fifth meeting of the Africa Partnership Forum with Nigeria. At this meeting, the UK reaffirmed its Gleneagles commitments made at Gleneagles with the introduction of a draft paper outlining the UK’s willingness to monitor and report on its joint ventures with the AU/NEPAD bodies, “[focusing] on policies and outcome … [with] time-bound benchmarks against which progress can be measured and monitored.” The plan also called for an annual report, beginning in October 2006, to measure progress against some or all elements of the Plan.

The UK was also a supporter of the WTO’s move to eliminate all export subsidies and considered the agreed date of 2013 disappointing. Concerned that its development agenda was lagging, the UK’s Finance Minister Gordon Brown issued a five point plan calling on, among other initiatives, to expand the number of Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) eligible for debt relief from 38 to 67 (only 19 of those 38 have been granted clemency thus far). In recognizing the impact of rising oil prices on the LDC’s, the UK also proposed the consideration of a new $20 billion World Bank loan and grant fund for investment in alternative energy sources.

Other UK led initiatives include: the Infrastructure Consortium for Africa, designed to accelerate progress to meet the urgent infrastructure needs of Africa in support of economic growth and development, the

Africa Enterprise Challenge Fund, a multi donor fund encouraging job creation with a commitment of US$20 million over the initial three year period\textsuperscript{581}, and the new Jamaica Country Assistance Plan (CAP) launched in Kingston on 30 November 2005.\textsuperscript{582}

Analyst: Jonathan Scotland

8. United States: +1

The United States has demonstrated a high level of compliance with its commitment to address products of interest to Least Developed Countries, and to ensure Least Developed Countries have the flexibility to decide their own economic strategies.

A leading provider of trade-related assistance, including trade-related physical infrastructure, U.S. assistance totalled US$1.34 billion in 2005 - up 46% from 2004 and more than double since 2001.\textsuperscript{583} On 14 December 2005 the U.S. announced a commitment to double its contribution for trade-related aid from its current levels to an annual total of US$2.7 billion by 2010.\textsuperscript{584} Specific LDC initiatives include the West Africa Cotton Improvement Program, designed to offer poor African countries a $7 million plant to boost their cotton sales and limit the damage done to their farmers by U.S. cotton subsidies.\textsuperscript{585} In addition to this, the elimination of trade distorting subsidies is one of the topics currently being negotiated in the Doha round which is expected to be finalized in 2006.

With the U.S. Proposal for Bold Reform in Global Agriculture Trade, released in December of 2005, the U.S. government is building on WTO Uruguay Round commitments and the July 2004 Framework agreement for agricultural modalities. This package has been presented to further WTO negotiations for the development of the Doha Development Agenda. The U.S. government proposes a reduction of trade distorting support by 53% and a cut of Aggregate Measurement of Support by 60% in the U.S., as well as an elimination of trade-distorting subsidies and tariffs in agriculture. This latter would have a five-year phase-in period.\textsuperscript{586}

On December 2\textsuperscript{nd}, the U.S. Department of Agriculture increased the quantity for 2006 tariff rate quota for raw sugar to 1.5 million metric tons and the quota for refined sugar to 211, 207 metric tons for African and Caribbean countries. LDCs that would be affected include Mauritania and Mozambique.\textsuperscript{587}

The US imports more textiles and apparel from LDCs than the rest of the world combined, with about $4.8 billion of imports in the last year alone. LDCs are eligible for duty free access on 83% of the products in the U.S. tariff schedule. Cambodia is second only to Bangladesh as the largest supplier of textiles and apparel to the U.S.\textsuperscript{588}

In July 2005 the US government also released the African Growth and Opportunity Act Competitiveness Report to support the African Action Plan, which was outlined in the Kananaskis Summit in 2002. This report provides information that will help African countries to develop their trade relationships with each other, the US and other markets.\ref{1}

Analyst: Ani Kevork

9. European Union: +1

The European Union registered a high level of compliance with the goal of ensuring that Least Developed Countries (LDCs) have the flexibility to pursue their own economic policies.

The cornerstone of the EU strategy is its “Everything but Arms” initiative, which seeks to eliminate duties and quotas on all LDC commodities, except weapons, within the EU.\ref{2} The initiative is seen as a “role model” strategy and the EU frequently refers to it when commenting on the trade arrangements of other states. The EU is also supporting trade liberalization measures for LDC states in economic forums such as the WTO.\ref{3}

The dilemma facing the EU lies within the conflicting interests of its member states. EU Trade Commissioner Peter Mandelson caused a political fervour in October when he proposed to cut farm tariffs by an average of 46% to rekindle the Doha round of talks.\ref{4} The issue has created a deep divide between agriculturally interested states such as France and Ireland, against pro-CAP-reform states such as Britain. Despite these political concerns, current signs indicate that the trade commissioner is pushing hard for the liberalization of agriculture and he was witnessed pressuring EU Agricultural Minister Mariann Fischer Boel on the EBA initiative at a December meeting in Brussels.\ref{5}

Externally preferential trade agreements with developing countries are also facing attacks from the WTO. Australia, Brazil, and Thailand recently won a challenge that EU guaranteed sugar prices to developing countries were in breach of trade rules. However the body did maintain that “the EU should keep its commitment to the sugar producers of the African Caribbean and Pacific nations.”\ref{6} This resulted in the creation of a $40 million fund to set aside by the European Union to fund sugar production in developing countries.\ref{7}

Currently the EBA gives unrestricted access to LDCs to the EU market with the exception of 3 agricultural commodities. Tariffs on Bananas have been gradually lowered since 2002 and are slated for full liberalization in January, 2006. Also that month liberalization will begin for rice and sugar. Currently only a quota amount of rice and sugar may be imported to the EU duty-free, full liberalization on all goods is scheduled for 2009.\ref{8}

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
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It should be noted however, that the EU pushed heavily to move the date of ending export subsidies from 2010 to 2013.\textsuperscript{597}
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Middle East Reform

Commitment

“We support Mr. Wolfensohn’s intention to stimulate a global financial contribution of up to $3bn per year over the coming three years. Domestic and international investors should be full partners to this process. We are mobilising practical support for Mr. Wolfensohn’s efforts and look forward to further development of his plans and their presentation to the Quartet and the international community in September.”

- Chairman’s Summary (final press conference)

Background

Consisting of Russia, the United States, the European Union, and the United Nations, the Middle East “Quartet” was established in 2002 for the purpose of developing and implementing “a comprehensive action plan for reform” in the Middle East. Mr. James Wolfensohn, as the Quartet’s Special Envoy for Gaza Disengagement, developed a plan that includes six key “make or break” issues “the parties must address for disengagement to work.” The plan further includes three key areas for support and reform “that will have the greatest impact and be most likely to foster hope for a new future” for the people of the region. Included in his proposal are calls for the opening of a border crossing at Rafah, and for significant financial assistance directed toward stabilizing and improving the economy in the Palestinian territory in both the short and medium terms. It is this package of proposals that the G8 members endorsed and pledged to support at the Gleneagles summit in July 2005.

Team Leader: Aaron Raths

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown

1. Canada: +1
The Canadian government has demonstrated a high level of compliance with its Gleneagles commitment to James Wolfensohn’s plan for Middle East reform through an increase in financial aid targeted at economic development, the deployment of Canadian officials in support of border management efforts, and the establishment of an institution devoted to the promotion of peace in the region.

On 15 September 2005, in response to Israel’s successful withdrawal from the Gaza Strip and parts of the Northern West Bank, Prime Minister Paul Martin pledged a further CAD$24.5 million in additional Canadian assistance to help strengthen the capacity of the Palestinian Authority. This funding will focus on facilitating economic development and good governance in four sectors, including safety and security, governance, economic development and the private sector, and the refugee issue. CAD$6 million of this commitment will go towards supporting the United Nations Relief and Works Agency’s efforts to provide up to 1,300 microcredit loans, 2,000 temporary jobs, and training for 1,800 entrepreneurs to improve the living conditions of Palestinian refugees in the Gaza Strip. Also in September, the Canadian government augmented to CAD$13.2 million a CAD$12.2 million package of enhanced assistance promised in May 2005, bringing the total figure for the government’s aid package to the Palestinian people to CAD$36.7 million.

On 15 November 2005, Foreign Affairs Minister Pierre Pettigrew announced, as part of Canada’s enhanced package of assistance to the Palestinians, the deployment of a high level border management expert in support of the work of Mr. Wolfensohn, Special Envoy for Gaza Disengagement. Canada Border Services Agency is also providing additional expert assistance to the Palestinian Authority in the

---

Finally, on 28 November 2005, Foreign Affairs Minister Pettigrew announced plans for a centre to support peace and democracy in the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, and throughout the Middle East. The Canadian government intends to use the Canada Centre for Peace and Democracy to introduce innovative technologies and solutions to facilitate governance, democratic dialogue, and capacity building enhancement.

Analyst: Kyle D’Souza

2. France: +1

Since the Gleneagles Summit, the French government has complied with its commitment to Middle East reform, most notably through its increased financial assistance to the Palestinian territories, its committed expertise to the Palestinian Authority (PA) in matters of law and order through the European Union (EU), and its willingness to contribute to infrastructural projects in the Gaza Strip. Furthermore, the French government has repeatedly reiterated its support of Mr. Wolfensohn’s plan to regenerate the region’s economy following the Gaza disengagement.

On 21 December 2005, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs announced that it would double its financial contribution to the World Bank fiduciary fund for the Palestinian territories for 2005 to €5.5 million. The initiative intends to reinforce the French government’s support for the PA following the Gaza disengagement and to ease the current economic hardship in the territory. The French government committed additional financial aid to the Palestinian territories as a member of the EU.

The French government also committed to missions to reform the Palestinian territories’ internal law and order, and signaled its availability to contribute to infrastructural projects to support economic regeneration. On 25 November 2005, the French government deployed ten people, and made a financial contribution of €250,000, as part of the EU third-party mission at the Rafah crossing through the end of 2005. Beginning in January 2006, the French government will play a role through the EU in assisting with the reform of the Palestinian police force. In addition, during a meeting with Palestinian authorities on 7 September 2005, Foreign Minister Philippe Douste-Blazy signaled French willingness to contribute to vital projects such as the construction of water treatment facilities and a port at Gaza.

President Jacques Chirac reiterated his support for the regeneration of the Palestinian economy and for the creation of “two viable states, living in peace” when he hosted Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, on 26 July 2005, and Mahmoud Abbas, President of the PA, on 17 October 2005. The French...
government has additionally proposed that an international conference on the Middle East peace process be convened.  

Analyst: Hughes Letourneau

3. Germany: +1

Since the July 2005 Gleneagles Summit, the German government has registered an acceptable level of compliance with regards to mobilizing financial and practical support for the Palestinian Authority, as outlined by the recommendations of James Wolfensohn.

On 23 August 2005, German Federal Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer acknowledged the crucial role played by the Quartet’s Disengagement Envoy, James Wolfensohn, indicating that the German government “wholeheartedly supports his work.”  

Fischer also urged Israel to “make a decisive contribution to the economic development of the Gaza Strip and the West Bank and thus to stability and security.”  

On 25 November 2005, in a statement on the opening of the Rafah border crossing, Fischer’s successor as Federal Foreign Minister, Frank-Walter Steinmeier, noted that the “Federal Government remains fully committed to the international road map.”

The German government has also demonstrated its commitment to Mr. Wolfensohn’s reform package through its partnership in the €14 million financial aid package announced by the European Commission on 13 December 2005.

Additionally, the German government has demonstrated its commitment through its support of the European Union’s (EU) efforts to ensure safety and security at the Rafah border crossing between Egypt and the Palestinian Territory, providing a number of experts to serve within the planned EU border protection and customs mission. Moreover, the German Federal Foreign Office has contributed €500,000 in funding for the mission.

Analyst: Kyle D’Souza

4. Italy: +1

The Italian government has complied with the Gleneagles’ commitment to Middle East reform, particularly in accordance with the plan presented by the Quartet’s Special Envoy for Disengagement, Mr. James Wolfensohn. The Italian government’s compliance consists of repeated declarations of support for the recommendations of Envoy Wolfensohn and participation in European Union (EU)-led initiatives for elections monitoring and for the monitoring of the border crossing between the Gaza Strip and Egypt at Rafah.

On 22 September 2005, in a meeting with American Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, Undersecretary of State Giampaolo Bettamio reinforced the Italian government’s commitment to
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democratic reform in the Middle East, particularly under the auspices of the EU. On 31 October 2005, Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Gianfranco Fini stated that "Italy, along with the countries of the G8 and within the broader framework of the European Union, actively supports the efforts and strategies for the economic reconstruction of the Palestinian Territories outlined by James Wolfensohn." He then articulated the Italian government’s intention "to make a concrete contribution" to the implementation of Mr. Wolfensohn’s recommendations for economic development in the Palestinian territories. Minister Fini also reaffirmed the Italian government’s commitment to the EU’s mission to monitor the border crossing at Rafah, which is led by Italian General Pietro Pistolese, and its support for Palestinian legislative elections scheduled to take place on 23 January 2006. These policy commitments followed his “active promotion” of the EU’s involvement in the Rafah border mission to the EU’s High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy, Javier Solana, and to his counterparts in the EU Member States.

Analyst: Marie-Adele Cassola

5. Japan: +1

The Japanese government has demonstrated a high level of compliance with its commitment to the Middle East peace process, notably through its emergency contributions through multilateral organizations for the revival of the Palestinian territories’ economy following the Gaza disengagement. Furthermore, the Japanese government has expressed its willingness to provide technical cooperation in the context of the Palestinian Authority’s (PA) reforms, and reiterated its support for a peaceful, two-state solution in the region.

On 6 September 2005, the Government of Japan extended emergency grant aid totaling about US$49.7 million to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for the Palestinian Refugees in the Near East (UNWRA) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) for Palestinians in the Gaza strip. This funding will be directed to projects involving the construction of roads and water treatment facilities, the re-housing of non-refugee families, the rehabilitation of Palestinian refugees’ shelters in the Gaza Strip, and the construction of a court house in the Jenin Governate. These projects are expected to create approximately 1,670 jobs per day for Palestinian workers, in line with the Palestinian economic revival plan presented by Mr. Wolfensohn.

---

On 20 December 2005, the Government of Japan granted an additional US$720,000 in emergency aid to the Central Election Committee of the Palestinian Authority and the UNDP in support of the Palestinian Legislative Council elections to be held on 25 January 2006. The Japanese government’s support for the PA extends to its willingness to “expand technical cooperation for the legislative, the judiciary, and the administration”, notably in the form of training and the repair of facilities.

Finally, in planning a visit to Israel and the Palestinian territories in the first half of January 2006, Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi has reiterated his commitment to advance the Middle East Peace process and indicated the Japanese government’s willingness to continue assisting such efforts.

Analyst: Hughes Letourneau

6. Russia: +1

The Russian government has fully complied with the commitment to Middle East reform made at the Gleneagles Summit. As a member of the Middle East Quartet, its compliance has been achieved primarily through participation in group-related activities. At the Quartet’s meeting at the United Nations (UN) on 20 September 2005, attended by Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov, a Russian proposal for a high level international conference in Moscow to discuss the Middle East peace process after Israel’s withdrawal from Gaza was discussed.639

On 18 August 2005, President Vladimir Putin reiterated the commitment made by the G8 at Gleneagles, stating that the Russian government was involved in “James Wolfensohn’s efforts to restore the economic potential and infrastructure” of the Palestinian territories.640 More specifically, President Putin committed Russia to helping the PA reinforce its security as a step towards strengthening the Road Map and normalizing the Middle Eastern situation. Improvements in Palestinian security are preconditions to the achievement of Mr. Wolfensohn’s goals of rebuilding the Palestinian economy, as free movement of goods and people within the Palestinian territories and to third parties are essential for Palestinian trade.

President Putin’s commitment was followed by talks on 25 August 2005 between Minister Lavrov and his Palestinian counterpart, Mr. Naser al-Qidwa. After the talks, the foreign minister stated that Russia “will provide support for Palestinian security services, training personnel and education”.641 Russian Foreign Ministry spokesperson Mikhail Kamyin noted that Russia would also continue to aid with the development of Palestinian statehood, governance reforms, and socioeconomic problems.642 Each of these establishes a framework for Mr. Wolfensohn’s efforts to revive the Palestinian economy and to further governance reform in the Palestinian territories.

Russia’s compliance was further demonstrated in Minister Lavrov’s working visit to Israel and the Palestinian territories on 26-27 October 2005 as a member of the Quartet. According to the Foreign
Ministry, one of the priorities for the trip was the implementation of Mr. Wolfensohn’s program for Palestinian economic development.\textsuperscript{643}

Analyst: Rosita Lee

\textbf{7. United Kingdom: +1}

The government of the United Kingdom (UK) is in compliance with its commitment to Middle East reform made at the Gleneagles summit in July 2005. As a member of the European Union (EU), the British government has demonstrated significant support for Mr. Wolfensohn’s reform plan by participating in a number of EU missions in the region, and has made financial contributions and commitments to further stabilize the economy of the Palestinian territory.

UK government officials have offered unqualified support for the reform process and have publicly encouraged others to offer support for reform in the region. UK Foreign Secretary Jack Straw, speaking in London at the Ad Hoc Liaison Committee Meeting on 12 December 2005, explained that planning was underway for an International Pledging Conference in support of reform efforts for early 2006.\textsuperscript{644} One month prior to that address, Secretary Straw confirmed his government’s support for the reform process and called upon others to embrace this commitment by explaining that reform in the region “must be driven by all”, and calling on others to “share their experience of reform and to provide practical assistance” to the reform effort.\textsuperscript{645}

The most important contribution made thus far to the realization of Mr. Wolfensohn’s reform plan is the mission to monitor and administer the Rafah border crossing into Egypt. This action, taken in concert with the other members of the EU, represents a significant development in the region and speaks to the political commitment of the British government to the reform process and Mr. Wolfensohn’s proposal for reform. As holder of the EU’s rotating presidency at the time of the agreement, Prime Minister Tony Blair was a key figure in the negotiations that resulted in the Agreement on Movement and Access.\textsuperscript{646}

The British government has also, through the EU, committed financial resources in partnership with other investors to the furtherance of reform efforts in the region. On 13 December 2005, for example, the European Commission announced a €14 million contribution to the new European Palestinian Credit Guarantee Fund.\textsuperscript{647}

Analyst: Aaron Raths

\textbf{8. United States: +1}

The government of the United States (US) is in full compliance with the Gleneagles commitment on Middle East reform and peace. Blending multilateral action as a member of the Quartet, as well as unilateral action, the US has undertaken extensive activity to forward James Wolfensohn’s efforts on


Gaza Disengagement, Palestinian economic revival and governance reform. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice attended a ministerial-level meeting of the Quartet on 20 September 2005. In a subsequent statement, the Quartet supported Wolfensohn’s work in facilitating communication between the Palestinian Authority (PA) and Israel, and reiterated a commitment to lead international efforts in developing the Palestinian economy and democratic reform within the PA.648

On 20 October 2005, President George W. Bush welcomed PA President Mahmoud Abbas to the White House. In his welcome speech, President Bush reaffirmed that the goal of rebuilding the Palestinian economy had the support of the Quartet, including the government of the United States. President Bush also lauded the work of Mr. Wolfensohn, and stated his intentions to consult with the Quartet to extend Mr. Wolfensohn’s time as Special Envoy.649 Moreover, President Bush spoke on his agreement with Mr. Wolfensohn concerning the most crucial issues for the Palestinian economy, including the opening of the Rafah border crossing, connecting the Gaza Strip and the West Bank, freedom of movement in the West Bank, and the construction of air and sea ports in the Palestinian territories.650 He also indicated his agreement with Mr. Wolfensohn’s assessment that these issues were crucial for rebuilding the Palestinian economy, and encouraged Arab states to help in the efforts.651

With the support of President Bush, Secretary Rice played a key role in the agreement between Palestinian and Israeli officials on the opening of the international border crossing at Rafah, consistent with Mr. Wolfensohn’s recommendations regarding the need for “smoothly functioning border points” between the Gaza Strip and Israel.652 As Mr. Wolfensohn warned that the lack of open border crossings could destabilize the situation in the Gaza Strip by increasing unemployment, Secretary Rice delayed her departure from the region during a trip to the Middle East in an effort to mediate a breakthrough.653 In this situation, her presence and pressure gave strong support to Mr. Wolfensohn, who had been working on the negotiations for the previous six months. According to Mr. Wolfensohn, Secretary Rice provided the final push needed to broker a solution.654 The result was the agreement, announced 15 November 2005, to open the Rafah border crossing between Egypt and the Gaza Strip, giving Palestinians control over entry and exit from their territory for the first time since 1967. As well, American officials agreed to work with the Israeli government to lift or reduce obstacles to movement within the West Bank and encourage the construction of a Palestinian seaport and airport, both important issues to Wolfensohn’s work.655

Finally, the US government complied with its Gleneagles commitment by signing a US$50 million agreement on scanning equipment with Israel. The equipment, including state-of-the-art scanners, will be financed by the American government through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The new technology will help facilitate the movement of people and goods at border crossings between Israel, the West Bank, and the Gaza Strip and is expected to contribute to the rebuilding of the

Palestinian economy. The US-Israel agreement builds on both an existing USAID border-crossing assistance program and the 15 November ‘Agreement on Movement and Access’ reached by the Israeli Government and the PA that was brokered by Mr. Wolfensohn and Secretary Rice.

Analyst: Rosita Lee

9. European Union: +1
The European Union (EU) has complied fully with its commitment to Middle East reform, in line with the recommendations of the Quartet’s Special Envoy for Disengagement James Wolfensohn. The EU’s compliance has been achieved through allocations of financial assistance for economic revival in the Palestinian territories, the deployment of an election mission to monitor the upcoming Palestinian legislative elections, and the launching of a mission to operate the border crossing between Egypt and the Gaza Strip at Rafah.

On 20 September 2005, the European Commission announced the allocation of €280 million in economic assistance to the Palestinian Authority. The Commission directed €60 million of this package specifically to infrastructure-building, institution-building, and social services in the Palestinian territories following disengagement. On 13 December 2005, the Commission responded to Mr. Wolfensohn’s recommendations for economic revival in the Palestinian territories with a €29 million contribution to the European-Palestinian Credit Guarantee Fund, which is intended to support small and medium-sized Palestinian enterprises through soft loans and grants.

The EU has made a firm commitment to the promotion of democracy and the strengthening of civil society in the Palestinian territories. In November 2005, the European Commission announced the deployment of an Election Mission of 172 observers for the January 2006 elections to the Palestinian Legislative Council.

The European Council also launched a Police Mission in the Palestinian territories with a focus on the establishment of a sustainable policing infrastructure. Finally, in November 2005, the Commission agreed to a request from Mr. Wolfensohn on behalf of the Palestinian Authority and the Israeli government, for an EU team to monitor the operation of the Rafah border crossing. The crossing at Rafah was identified specifically by Wolfensohn as one of six issues which could ‘make or break’ the peace process.

Analyst: Marie-Adele Cassola

---

Debt Relief: Iraq

Commitment

“We reaffirm our intention to reduce Iraq’s debt by implementing the terms of the November 2004 Paris Club agreement. We call on other creditors to provide debt relief on generous terms comparable to or even better than those agreed by the members of the Paris Club in November 2004”

- Iraq

Background

As of December 2004, debt accumulated by Iraq’s Saddam Hussein and owed mostly to Gulf States and Paris Club countries and commercial lenders was estimated at US$120 billion. With reconstruction efforts underway in Iraq following the US invasion, the massive debt burden would hamper both economic and social progress in Iraq. The Bush administration in the US, in particular, has led the effort to relieve Iraq’s debt and appointed former US Secretary of State, James A. Baker III, as a special presidential envoy to coordinate debtors and negotiate this issue among creditors.

The Paris Club is an informal group of 18 countries that meet monthly in Paris, France, to collectively reduce or reschedule official debts they are owed by debtor nations. During a meeting held from 17 November to 21 November 2004, Paris Club countries including Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, negotiated a 3 stage plan to reduce debt owed by Iraq by 80%. This was a major accomplishment on the part of the US, since the Paris Club countries were initially only willing to cancel only 50% of Iraq’s debt. The first stage involved the immediate cancellation of 30% of debt owed by Iraq to each Paris Club country. The second stage involves the implementation of an International Monetary Fund (IMF) program, following which another 30% was to be cancelled. The remaining 20% of the initial stock would be abated upon completion of the last IMF Board review of three-years of implementation of standard IMF programmes.

G8 members, all of which belong to the Paris Club, are owed nearly US$40 billion of Iraq’s debt. At the Gleneagles Summit in June 2005, the G8 leaders reaffirmed their support of the Paris Club agreement to reduce Iraq’s debt by at least 80% to aid in the rebuilding of Iraq and to encourage non-Paris Club Gulf States, to which most of Iraq’s debt is owed, to also cancel their debts.

Team Leader: Barbara Tassa

---

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance -1</th>
<th>Work in Progress 0</th>
<th>Full Compliance +1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown

1. Canada: 0

The Canadian government has registered only partial compliance with the Gleneagles commitment to Iraqi debt relief. To date, the Canadian government has not provided a formal announcement to confirm the initial 30% of the total outstanding debt owed by the government of Iraq has been forgiven under the terms of the November 2004 Paris Club agreement. The total amount outstanding is approximately CAD$750 million due entirely to the Canadian Wheat Board. Nevertheless, the Canadian government supports a G7 led international debt-reduction program for Iraq. This initiative is, however, a work in progress as determined by the Canadian governments’ ongoing commitment to reconstruction endeavours presently underway in Iraq. The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) has contributed CAD$300 million to the International Reconstruction Fund Facility Donor Committee (IRFFI) which is chaired by Canadian Ambassador Michael Bell. The participation of the Canadian government in the Iraqi crisis is within the context of a multilateral endeavour. The debt relief commitment is in fact a concerted pledge by the Paris Club on a shared burden basis. It is further contingent upon Iraq’s other creditors granting similar or indeed more generous concessions of debt relief. To this end, the intention to reduce Iraqi debt under the Paris Club agreement was reaffirmed by participants at the Iraq International Conference held in Brussels on 22 June 2005. Therefore, the November 2004 Paris Club agreement may be enacted en masse to coincide with formalization of debt relief by the Gulf States, being Iraq’s largest creditors.

Analyst: Kathrine Kotris

---

2. France: 1

The French government has shown progress towards cancelling nearly $5.6 billion of debt owed by Iraq. On 21 December 2005, the French government signed a bilateral agreement with Mawafak Abboud, Ambassador of Iraq. In this treaty the French government agrees and sets the conditions for canceling 80% of the Iraq debt in accordance to the Paris Club agreement. France will cancel about 4 billion euros in the period from 2005 to 2008.

Analyst: Barbara Tassa

3. Germany: -1

Since the 2005 Gleneagles Summit, Germany has not announced new plans to cancel nearly US$6 billion in debt as agreed in the Paris Club meeting in November 2004. Like France, Germany had announced its commitment to reducing Iraq’s debt burden by an unspecified amount in December 2003, but has not made any bilateral agreements with Iraq to carry through its plan. In that statement, Mr. Gerhard Schroeder, Germany’s previous Chancellor, had indicated the debt reduction would be “substantial.” Although Germany has been helpful in the Iraq reconstruction effort since that agreement, the absence of direct financial commitment to Iraqi debt relief since the Gleneagles Summit in June 2005 indicates a low level of compliance with the specific Iraq debt relief commitment.

Analyst: Attila Kovacs

4. Italy: +1

Italy has fully complied with the 2005 Gleneagles Summit commitment to reducing Iraq’s debt by implementing the terms of the November 2004 Paris Club agreement. On 05 October 2005, Italy’s Undersecretary Alfredo Mantica signed the Iraqi Debt Cancellation Agreement with Iraqi Ambassador Mowafak Abboud. The bilateral agreement follows the terms of the Agreed Minutes concluded in the November 2004 Paris Club accord and will be implemented along three stages. By signing this bilateral agreement, Italy agrees to cancel 80 percent of the debt owed by Iraq, which totals the equivalent of $2.4 billion Euro. Immediately effective is the writing off of US$900 million of the total US$3 billion claim Italy has on Iraq, with the following US$1.5 billion to be cancelled gradually as Iraq fulfils conditions to be imposed by IMF for three years. The second phase of debt reduction, which will total another US$900 million, occurs when Iraq formally signs a Stand-By-Arrangement with the IMF. The final phase of debt...

---

cancellation by Italy will amount to US$600 million, and will come into effect once Iraq completes its Stand-By-Arrangement with the IMF.\footnote{687}

When Italy’s Iraqi Debt Cancellation Agreement is fully phased in, the residual debt stock of approximately US$600 million will be repaid over a twenty-three year period.\footnote{688} There will be no principal or interest paid in the first three years of repayment, as well as a six year grace period will be granted on principal payments.\footnote{689} Italy’s compliance with the Iraqi debt relief commitment makes it the third Paris Club country to sign a bilateral agreement with Iraq that constitutes debt reduction terms contained in the November 2004 Paris Club accord.\footnote{690}

Analyst: Claire Chow

5. Japan: +1

The Japanese government announced that it had reached a bilateral debt reduction agreement with the Republic of Iraq on 24 November 2005. The government of Japan provided a schedule for an 80% reduction of the debts owed to them by Iraq.\footnote{691} This agreement satisfies the guidelines set by the Paris Club group of nations in November 2004 to reduce Iraq’s debt. The current US$6.9 billion debt will be reduced to US$1.7 billion by the end of the 23 year term.\footnote{692}

Analyst: Jacky Stillman

6. Russia: -1

There was no action by the Russian government to fulfill the goals set by the Paris Club of nations in its November 2004 agreement, which were reaffirmed at the Gleneagles summit, on the cancellation of Iraqi debt. Sources cited pending IMF agreements as the barrier to a Russian debt reduction agreement, as the Paris Club agreement was contingent upon such an IMF-Iraq agreement.\footnote{693} This agreement was reached on 23 December 2005 and should generate prompt action.\footnote{694} The Russian government is expected to relive Iraq of 90% of the debt owed which is US$10.5 billion.

Analyst: Jacky Stillman

7. United Kingdom: 0

The United Kingdom agreed on 21 November 2004, along with 18 other Paris Club member countries to cancel 30% of their outstanding debt owed by Iraq by 1 January 2005.\footnote{695} The United Kingdom has not, however, officially declared compliance with this initiative. The multilateral effort is intended to allow participating members to coincide their debt relief policies with those of Iraq’s largest creditors, Saudi

Arabia and Kuwait. The commitment to reducing debt accumulated by Saddam Hussein’s regime prior to the first Gulf War is considered to be a work in progress. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) may have provided an important impetus for the collective action of all Iraqi creditors to move forward and officially comply with the initial stage of the Paris Club agreement. Due to improved fiscal management by the Interim Iraqi Government, on 23 December 2005, the IMF approved a Stand-By Arrangement credit facility of up to US$685 million which will serve to support the country’s economic rehabilitation over the next 15 months. This move is seen to be an endorsement of the fiscal management of the Interim Iraqi Government which is necessary to pave the way for implementation of the second stage of the Paris Club agreement, being the creation and approval of an IMF standard programme. Further endorsement of the debt relief initiative by the United Kingdom was reiterated along with other Paris Club member countries at the Iraq International Conference held in Brussels on 22 June 2005 together with encouragement of other creditor countries to follow suit. The consensus appears to be well established among the creditors, however, the timing of concluding the debt relief is undecided.

Analyst: Kathrine Kotris

8. United States: +1

Having already announced 100% debt relief of over US$4 billion owed by Iraq in December 2004, the US has been instrumental in negotiating debt relief from Paris Club and other creditors since the G8 Summit in June 2005. In December 2005, the IMF announced a loan worth US$685 million in the Stand-By Arrangement for Iraq, which is intended to facilitate the second stage of debt reduction negotiated among the Paris Club creditors. While this action was not financed by the US government, their ongoing involvement in achieving debt relief for Iraq, by encouraging Paris Club and other creditors to cancel Iraq’s debt will be a crucial step in its efforts at bringing economic stability to Iraq. Even though not all creditors have cancelled debt, continued progress in debt relief is evidence for US dedication to this G8 commitment.

Analyst: Attila Kovacs

9. European Union: n/a

The European Union (EU) has not been graded for its compliance with the commitment to debt relief for Iraq. The EU, as an institution, is not in a position to offer relief on behalf of its members. The EU, in its 2674th Meeting of the General Affairs and External Relations Council in Brussels on 18 July 2005, did, however, reaffirm the need for further assistance in debt reduction for Iraq.

More constructively, many member states of the EU have independently signed bilateral debt cancellation agreements with Iraq since the Gleneagles Summit. These agreements implement terms that are comparable to, or even better than, those contained in the November 2004 Paris Club agreement. Some of these non-G8 countries in the EU include Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Malta, Slovakia, and Spain. Austria signed an agreement on 13 December 2005 that cancels 80% of Iraq’s debt, which amounts to...

---


US$2.1 billion.\textsuperscript{703} Belgium’s agreement with Iraq also reduces 80% of debt, or US$390 million, and was signed on 7 November 2005.\textsuperscript{704} Denmark agreed to cancel 80% of Iraq’s debt, or US$42.6 million on 21 December 2005. Malta was the first non-Paris Club country to sign an agreement with Iraq that forgives 100% of debt, which amounts to US$8 million, and was signed on 26 September 2005.\textsuperscript{705} The Slovakian government announced a further debt cancellation of $145 million for Iraq on 21 December 2005.\textsuperscript{706} On 22 December 2005, Spain signed an agreement with Iraq that implements the Paris Club term of 80 percent of Iraqi debt reduction, which amounts to US$493 million.\textsuperscript{707}

Although the EU is institutionally incapable of directly implementing the debt relief terms of the 2004 Paris Club agreement, it has demonstrated a commitment to the principle of debt relief for Iraq. Moreover, many individual member states of the EU have already fully complied with the Gleneagles Summit commitment by signing bilateral debt cancellation agreements with Iraq.

Analyst: Claire Chow


Sudan

Commitment

"We commend and will continue to support the African Union’s Mission in Sudan (Darfur), just as we are contributing to UNMIS’s operation in southern Sudan."

-Statement by the G8 and African Union on Sudan

Background

Propelled by the crisis in Darfur, Sudan first appeared on the G8’s agenda at the 2004 Sea Island Summit. Approximately 2 million people have been displaced by the Darfur crisis, and the death toll is estimated at 200,000, though numbers vary. A joint statement with the African Union (AU) renewed the G8’s focus on Sudan at the 2005 Gleneagles Summit. The statement expressed a renewed commitment to see an end to the Darfur conflict and to support the work of the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) and the United Nations Mission in Sudan (UNMIS).

AMIS was established in February 2004 to monitor a ceasefire between the Sudanese government and two Darfur rebel groups, the Justice and Equality Movement and the Sudanese Liberation Army. Its mandate has grown to include providing security for humanitarian aid delivery and facilitating the return of refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs).

UNMIS was established in March 2005 to support the implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) between the Sudanese government and the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement/Army. The CPA, signed in January 2005, ended a twenty-one year civil war between the two sides that caused an estimated 1.5 million deaths. Beyond the CPA, UNMIS is mandated to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian aid and the return of refugees and IDPs. The G8-AU statement noted the potential for the instability in Darfur to undermine the work of UNMIS and the fragile CPA. On 23 September 2005, the United Nations Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 1627, which extended UNMIS’ mandate for another six months.

Team Leader: Mike Varey

---

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance -1</th>
<th>Work in Progress 0</th>
<th>Full Compliance +1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown

1. Canada: +1

The Canadian government has made few new commitments since the G8 Summit in Gleneagles and continues to register a high level of compliance with the G8’s pledge to end the crisis in Darfur and support the North-South peace process. On 28 July 2005, Ottawa announced that it would lend the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) 105 surplus armoured vehicles for one year. Canada’s Special Advisory Team, headed by the Prime Minister’s Personal Representative for Africa, Mr. Robert Fowler, was slated to visit the country. The Team aims to determine ways in which Canada can assist in reaching a peace agreement for Darfur, to observe the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) and assess Canada’s contribution to the mission, and to consult with the Government of Sudan.

Previous commitments from the Canadian government included the announcement of CAD$170 million for the peace process and increased assistance for AMIS, and a CAD$90 million aid package promised at the April 2005 Oslo Donors Conference on Sudan. At the May 2005 African Union conference on the expansion of AMIS, Ottawa made the single largest contribution of any country in support of the Mission’s expansion to 7700 personnel. The Canadian government has also contributed CAD$500,000 to the International Criminal Court to assist with the investigation of crimes committed in Darfur.

Analyst: Andrew Harder

---

2. France: +1

The French government registered a high level of compliance with Gleneagles’ Sudan commitment through logistical, financial, and public support of the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS). In mid-August 2005, Paris transported 104 civilian police officers from Nigeria to Sudan.714 The airlift was part of a NATO-led effort that provided AMIS with logistical support. On 29 July 2005, French Foreign Minister Philippe Douglas-Blazy announced that France would donate €3.5 million to AMIS’ peacekeeping forces.715 Finally, in January 2006, the French government announced an additional US$1 million in assistance to AMIS to cover the Mission’s operational expenses. The money was part of an international effort to compensate for AMIS’ predicted 2006 budget shortfall.716

The French government also gave AMIS vocal public support. On 2 September 2005, following an escalation of violence in Darfur, Paris reiterated its support for AMIS.717 The government also restated its support for AMIS in October 2005 following a violent attack on AMIS personnel that resulted in the death of two Nigerian soldiers.718 Finally, in his 10 January 2006 address to the French diplomatic corps, French President Jacques Chirac noted France’s active and continuing support for the African Union’s efforts in Darfur.

Analyst: Mike Varey

3. Germany: +1

The German government registered a satisfactory level of compliance with Gleneagles Sudan commitments through financial and vocal support for the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) and the United Nations Mission in Sudan (UNMIS). On 3 December 2005, the German parliament approved a cabinet decision of 29 November 2005 to extend support to AMIS for another six months.719 That support consists of logistical flights, which began on 16 December 2004. Addressing the 60th Session of the United Nations General Assembly on 20 September 2005, Dr. Klaus Scharioth, State Secretary of the Foreign Office, highlighted the positive work of both UNMIS and AMIS and called for a greater international commitment to Sudan.720

Analyst: Mike Varey

4. Italy: +1

The Italian government registered a satisfactory level of compliance with Gleneagles Sudan commitments through a material contribution to the United Nations Mission in Sudan (UNMIS). In December 2005, the Italian Embassy in Sudan supplied 40 metric tones of non-food aid to UNMIS for distribution to internally displaced persons.721 Also of note, Rome’s battalion of 220 soldiers with UNMIS

was due to leave in late-December 2005 after successfully completing their mission in Khartoum guarding UNMIS headquarters. They are to be replaced by a contingent of Rwandan troops.\textsuperscript{722}

Analyst: Mike Varey

5. Japan: +1

The Japanese government registered a high level of compliance with Gleneagles' Sudan commitments through material and financial support for the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) and the United Nations Mission in Sudan (UNMIS). On 19 October 2005, Tokyo donated 27 four-wheeled vehicles, 60 landmine detection devices, and 20 large tents to UNMIS.\textsuperscript{723} The donation was announced on 29 July 2005, and the equipment will mostly be used by UNMIS' African troops. The Japanese government also dispatched a diplomat to work with UNMIS. The diplomat will be analyzing regional information for an expected six month period beginning September 2005.\textsuperscript{724} Finally, on 25 October 2005, Tokyo extended roughly US$2.8 million to the Japanese Trust Fund for Human Security for a project titled Capacity Building for African Union Troops in Darfur.\textsuperscript{725} Among other things, the project provides international humanitarian and human rights law training to AMIS troops currently deployed in Darfur.

Analyst: Mike Varey

6. Russia: 0

The Russian government's professed commitment to ending the crisis in Darfur and supporting the missions in Sudan remains only vaguely supported by actions. Notably, in December 2005 Moscow offered up to 200 servicemen and four MI-8MT military transport planes for the United Nations Mission in Sudan (UNMIS). This contingent will give helicopter support to rapid-deployment forces, carry airborne reserves, perform medical functions, conduct aerial observation, and transport UN property and personnel.\textsuperscript{726} However, the Russian government has abstained from several UN Security Council Resolutions that imposed sanctions on human rights violators in Darfur and has not offered any new commitments since the previous Summit.\textsuperscript{727} Last year, the Russian government sold 12 MiG-29 planes, several helicopters, and an unknown quantity of firearms and ammunition to the Sudanese government, while 500 Russian military advisers were thought to be assisting the Sudanese army.\textsuperscript{728}

Analyst: Andrew Harder

7. United Kingdom: +1

The British government registered a high level of compliance with Gleneagles' Sudan commitments through renewed and new financial support for the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS). In the most recent pre-budget report, filed 5 December 2005, HM Treasury stated that the Government will continue


\textsuperscript{728} Marat Khairullin, Russia will send its Airborne Forces to Africa, Gazeta, 22 December 2005. LexisNexis.
its financial support of African led peacekeeping operations. On 20 September 2005, Armed Forces Minister Adam Ingram announced an extra £200,000 to be allocated to assist in the training of over 17,000 Nigerian troops. A large contingent of Nigerians currently serves with AMIS, and there is a strong likelihood that many of the troops in question will also serve with AMIS. Finally, in January 2006, The UK government also gave AMIS public support. On 5 January 2006, London’s United Nations envoy, Mr. Emyr Jones Parry, reiterated the British government’s support for AMIS and called on the world community to increase their involvement in Darfur.

Analyst: Mark A. Lavery

8. United States: +1

The United States government registered a high level of compliance with Gleneagles’ Sudan commitments through material and vocal support of the African Union mission in Sudan (AMIS) and the United Nations Mission in Sudan (UNMIS). On 17 July 2005, the United States began transporting 1800 Rwandan soldiers to Darfur. The airlift was part of a NATO-led effort to provide logistical support to African Union troops in Darfur. The Department of Defense allotted US$6 million to assist the project. In October 2005, the Office of Transition Initiatives’ Sudan Program, an arm of the United States Agency for International Development, helped to organize a series of meetings between Sudanese citizens and representatives of UNMIS. The meetings aimed to increase accountability among UNMIS personnel and community leaders and to encourage continued collaboration between peacekeepers and the community. USAID’s Office of Transition Initiatives provides short-term aid to countries undergoing a transition from violence to peace or from authoritarianism to democracy.

At the same time, in November 2005, the House of Representatives broke a previous pledge to AMIS of US$50 million by cutting the funding from the FY2006 Foreign Appropriations Bill. The State Department has been trying to raise funds for AIMS, though a personal appeal by Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice proved ineffective in preventing the cut from being made to the bill in question. Despite the cut, as of late-November 2005, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act, was working its way through Congress. Among other things, the bill calls for strengthening the size and mandate of AMIS.

Finally, the Washington publicly reiterated its support for both AMIS and UNMIS. On 10 October 2005, following attacks on AMIS personnel, including the detainment of one American citizen, the United States government strongly reiterated its support for AMIS. On 9 November 2005, speaking at the University of Khartoum, Mr. Robert B. Zoellick, Deputy Secretary of State, noted that the United States had already committed US$167 million to AIMS and reiterated Washington’s support for both AMIS and UNMIS.

Analyst: Mike Varey

9. European Union: +1

The European Union (EU) registered a high level of compliance with the Gleneagles’ Sudan commitments through financial and public support of the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) and the United Nations Mission in Sudan (UNMIS). On 18 July 2005, the Council of the European Union adopted a plan to provide AMIS with civilian and military aid. The military component included the provision of planning and technical assistance to all levels of AMIS’ command structure and the training of African troops and observers. The civilian component included the provision of senior EU police advisers and the training of local police officers. In December 2006, the EU and the African Union signed a Contribution Agreement to provide AMIS with an additional €70 million to cover operational costs. The funds were mobilized through the EU’s African Peace Facility, which is aimed at financing African peace support operations. Finally, in a press release on 12 December 2005, the Council of the European Union reiterated its support for both UNMIS and AMIS and encouraged member states to investigate ways to improve the latter’s efficiency.

Analyst: Mark A. Lavery

Terrorism

Commitment

“We have carried forward initiatives to prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction to terrorists and other criminals, reinforce international political will to combat terrorism, secure radioactive sources and - as announced at Sea Island - ensure secure and facilitated travel. Today we commit ourselves to new joint efforts. We will work to improve the sharing of information on the movement of terrorists across international borders.”

- G8 Statement on Counter-Terrorism

Background

At the 2003 G8 Summit, in Evian, the member states of the G8 committed to create a Counter-Terrorism Action Group (CTAG) to focus on building political will and capacity to fight global terrorism. At the 2004 G8 Summit, on Sea Island, the G8 continued to work to jointly combat terrorism, pledging to crack down on terrorist financing and take an active role in several non-proliferation initiatives. The commitment made by the G8 at the 2005 Gleneagles summit, to work together to share intelligence on the trans-national movements of terrorists, represents a further continuation of the trend toward multi-lateral efforts aimed at countering global terrorism.

Team Leader: Christopher Collins

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance -1</th>
<th>Work in Progress 0</th>
<th>Full Compliance +1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown

1. Canada: +1

The Canadian government has thus far complied with its Gleneagles summit commitment to improve the sharing of information on the movements of terrorists crossing international borders.

Canada is an active member of the Counter Terrorism Action Group (CTAG), a working group made up of the G8 member states and several other countries that meets three times per year. As a member of CTAG, Canada works to share information with other CTAG member states. 742

The Canadian Security and Intelligence Service (CSIS) is also publicly committed to sharing information about the movements of known or suspected terrorists. CSIS has officially stated that it believes sharing “intelligence and cooperation, both at the national and international levels, is essential to effectively gauge current and future threats to the security of Canada and to analyze terrorist trends”. Further noting that “CSIS works in close collaboration with Canada’s traditional allies and shares pertinent intelligence to counter the global threat of terrorism” 743

In its 2005 - 2006 Report on Plans and Priorities, written for the Treasury Board of Canada and detailing plans for the upcoming year, Foreign Affairs Canada committed to “continue to work through other appropriate forums to further advance international efforts to combat terrorism, including in the G8 process, in the Counter-Terrorism Action Group (CTAG), in the APEC Counter-Terrorism Task Force (CTTF), and through the OAS Inter-American Counter-Terrorism Committee (CICTE).” 744 The Department also committed to develop a security partnership within North America. 745

The Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs plans to spend CAD$738 million on Global And Security Policy (which includes anti-terrorism intelligence sharing initiatives) in 2005-06, CAD$695.6 million in 2006-07, and CAD$704 million in 2007-08. 746

Analyst: Christopher Collins

2. France: +1

The French government has thus far complied with its Gleneagles summit commitment to improve the sharing of information on the movements of terrorists crossing international borders.

The French legislative agenda has includes several items that directly address the commitments made at Gleneagles. The French National Assembly passed “The Law Pertaining to Transportation Security and Development” on 22 December 2005. This legislation created the office of Minister of Aviation Security, and charged the minister’s office with implementing many of the SAFTI (Secure and Facilitated Travel Initiatives) plan first agreed upon at Sea Island. 747 The National Assembly also passed “The Anti-Terrorism Law” on 22 December 2005. This law gives law enforcement and intelligence services in

France greater surveillance powers over suspected terrorists, airports, and on a twenty-kilometre perimeter of French territory.748

On 17 November 2005, the French government held “France in the Face of Terrorism,” a one day event that brought together intelligence services, politicians, journalists, and civil society representatives for consultation on the government’s counter-terrorist initiatives. At this event, French Prime Minister Dominique de Villepin outlined many facets of the government’s counter terrorism initiatives, including constant “contact with the international intelligence community in order to exchange information.”749 On 14 September 2005, the French government signed the Agreement on the International Suppression of Nuclear Terrorism.750

France is also an active member of the Counter Terrorism Action Group (CTAG), a working group made up of the G8 member states and several other countries that meets three times per year.

Analyst: Jeff Claydon

3. Germany: +1

Germany demonstrated a satisfactory level of compliance with respect to its counter-terrorism commitments. The German Federal Government has supported United Nations initiatives to prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction to terrorists, secure radioactive sources, and reaffirmed its intention to exchange information regarding the movement of terrorists across international borders.

On 15 September 2005, Federal Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer signed the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism.751 As a signatory to the United Nations Convention, the German government pledged its cooperation in preventing acts of terrorism that involve nuclear or radioactive material and to prosecute or extradite alleged offenders. The Federal Foreign Office continues to bolster United Nations counter-terrorism efforts by actively promoting the conclusion of a Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism.752

Federal Chancellor Angela Merkel reiterated her government’s commitment to improve the sharing of information on terrorist movements during her first speech to the German Bundestag on 30 November 2005. She stated that the German government “will use new technology and ensure improved exchange of information by creating anti-terrorism databases.”753 Chancellor Merkel further indicated that the Federal Criminal Police Office “will be given preventive powers to counter terrorist threats.”754 In addition, Federal Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier maintained that the exchange of information with Britain, France, Italy, Spain and the United States is an essential component in the efforts of federal security authorities observing the national and international movements of terrorist networks.755


Finally, the Federal Government enhanced its collaborative partnerships on counter-terrorism. At the summit meeting of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership or Barcelona Process on 27 and 28 November 2005, the European Union and its southern Mediterranean partners designed measures to counter terrorism, develop a common migration strategy and to improve cooperation in the fields of justice and security. Germany endorsed the summit’s adoption of a comprehensive five year work programme and code of conduct for practical cooperation in counter-terrorism efforts.  

Germany is also an active member of the Counter Terrorism Action Group (CTAG), a working group made up of the G8 member states and several other countries that meets three times per year. 

Analyst: Ashley Barnes

4. Italy: +1

Italy has thus far complied with its Gleneagles summit commitment to improve the sharing of information on the movements of terrorists crossing international borders.

In July 2005 the upper house of the Italian Parliament passed a new series of anti-terrorism laws, including measures to compile lists of mobile phone users to help police investigating suspected terrorist crimes and generally strengthening of measures to prevent terrorists from financing their operations.

According to the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Italy believes that when it comes to international cooperation against terrorism, “the trend toward reinforcing intelligence capabilities must be underlined, both at the national level and at that of international organisations.”

Italy was present at the summit meeting of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership on the 27 and 28 November 2005, where the European Union and its southern Mediterranean partners confirmed the Euro-Mediterranean code of conduct on Countering Terrorism. As part of this code of conduct, Italy and the other states declared they would "exchange information on a voluntary basis about terrorists and their support networks… and work bilaterally and […] to disrupt [those] networks."

Italy is also an active member of the Counter Terrorism Action Group (CTAG), a working group made up of the G8 member states and several other countries that meets three times per year. 

Analyst: Christopher Collins

5. Japan: +1

Japan has thus far complied with its Gleneagles summit commitment to improve the sharing of information on the movements of terrorists crossing international borders.

Japan is active at the regional and international levels in combating the spread of global terrorism. Following the attacks of 11 September 2001, Japan passed the ‘anti-terrorism special measures law’ committing Japan to “dealing with terrorism in unity with the countries in the world, giving firm support to

---

the U.S. as an ally." In October of 2005 the Government of Japan decided to extend the duration of this law.762

Japan is also an active member of the Counter Terrorism Action Group (CTAG), a working group made up of the G8 member states and several other countries that meets three times per year.

Analyst: Christopher Collins

6. Russia: +1

Russia has thus far complied with its Gleneagles summit commitment to improve the sharing of information on the movements of terrorists crossing international borders.

Russia is an active member of the Counter Terrorism Action Group (CTAG), a working group made up of the G8 member states and several other countries that meets three times per year. The Russian Interior Ministry is also an active participant in the Roma Group of G8 experts on international crime and terrorism.763

Additionally, the Russian government, engaged in its own struggles in the Caucasus, is of the position that divisions among world powers in the fight against terrorism only benefits the terrorists.764 Russia is, therefore, committed to an integrated and multinational anti-terrorism strategy.

Analyst: Christopher Collins

7. United Kingdom: 0

The British government has registered only a partial level of compliance to the commitments made at Gleneagles with regards to terrorism.

In July 2005, the British government launched the “Preventing Extremism Together” initiative, aimed at drawing on consultations with civil society to foster greater cross-cultural understanding, and discourage extremism, and terrorism across Great Britain.765 The British government also continued its commitment to the Counter Terrorism Programme of the Global Opportunities Fund initiative originally established by the Foreign Secretary in May 2003. This programme was implemented to help build international security capacity. In 2003, the British government committed twenty million pounds over the next three years, and fulfilled the final instalment of that commitment in 2005.766 Further, the British government was among the first signatories of the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism, signed at the United Nations on September 14 2005.767 Finally, British Prime Minister Tony Blair announced several changes to the grounds for expulsion and extradition with regards to terrorist activity, in an effort to restrict the mobility of both domestic and international terrorists through Britain.768

---

However, the British government has been unable to pass new counter-terrorism legislation through British parliament. The proposed legislation, introduced in October of 2005, gives greater provisions to law enforcement and intelligence agencies within the United Kingdom, by expanding search capabilities and extending the scope of terrorist laws beyond the borders of the United Kingdom.\(^{769}\) While the passing of this legislation would significantly raise the British government’s level of compliance with the commitments made at Gleneagles, the government was defeated in its attempt to pass this legislation, and as of 7 January 2006 the status of the Terrorism Bill remains unclear.\(^{770}\) No new major initiatives have been announced to improve transportation safety (as per the SAFTI Agreement), in the interim period.

The United Kingdom is an active member of the Counter Terrorism Action Group (CTAG), a working group made up of the G8 member states and several other countries that meets three times per year.

Analyst: Jeff Claydon

8. United States: +1

The United States has thus far complied with its Gleneagles summit commitment to improve the sharing of information on the movements of terrorists crossing international borders.

The United States is an active member of the Counter Terrorism Action Group (CTAG), a working group made up of the G8 member states and several other countries that meets three times per year.

According to the October 2005 edition of the *National Security Strategy of the United States of America*, published by the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, one of ten so-called “Enterprise Objectives” for the American intelligence community is to “Establish new and strengthen existing foreign intelligence relationships to help us meet global security challenges.”\(^{771}\)

Also in October 2005, the United States established the National Clandestine Service (NCS) within the Central Intelligence Agency. According to an official press release, The NCS will serve as the national authority for the integration, coordination, deconfliction, and evaluation of human intelligence operations across the entire Intelligence Community.”\(^{772}\)

The United States has additionally undertaken a series of bilateral initiatives to work with partner-states to develop counter-terrorist capacity and crack down on terrorist financing.\(^{773}\)

Analyst: Christopher Collins

9. European Union: +1

The European Union has thus far complied with its Gleneagles summit commitment to improve the sharing of information on the movements of terrorists crossing international borders.


A key priority of the EU Counter-Terrorism Strategy is "to pursue and investigate terrorists across our borders and globally" while continuing to "support the efforts of Member States to disrupt terrorists by encouraging the exchange of information and intelligence between them." Member states are encouraged "to move from ad hoc to systematic" cooperation among police and judicial authorities through Europol, Eurojust, and establish Joint Investigation Teams for cross-border terrorist investigations. In addition, the EU Strategy stresses the importance of enhancing border security to make it more difficult for terrorists to operate in the EU. It proposes to use improvements in technology for the capture and exchange of passenger data and risk assessments from the European Borders Agency (Frontex) to strengthen its external borders.

The EU has also improved the sharing of information regarding the movement of terrorists across international borders in conjunction with its Action Plan to Combat Terrorism. The EU's report on the Action Plan of 29 November 2005 indicates that cross-border cooperation has improved but recognizes the need to further increase the flow of information to Europol and Eurojust. National arrangements in the fight against terrorism have also been evaluated to identify best practices and enhance domestic efforts.

Finally, the EU has actively promoted international counter-terrorism efforts. In September 2005, all member states signed the UN Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism. Member states assumed obligations to cooperate in preventing acts of terrorism that involve nuclear or radioactive material.

The EU continues to work towards the adoption of a Comprehensive Convention on international terrorism. A political dialogue on counter-terrorism has been maintained with the United States to address issues of transport security, law enforcement cooperation and terrorist financing. This dialogue has also been expanded to partners such as Australia, Canada, Russia, Israel and Japan.

The European Union was also present at the summit meeting of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership on 27 and 28 November 2005, where the EU and its southern Mediterranean partners confirmed the Euro-Mediterranean code of conduct on Countering Terrorism. As a part of this code of conduct, the EU and the states present declared they would "exchange information on a voluntary basis about terrorists and their support networks" and will "work bilaterally [...] to disrupt [those] networks."

The European Union is also an active member of the Counter Terrorism Action Group (CTAG), a working group made up of the G8 member states and several other countries that meets three times per year.

Analyst: Ashley Barnes

---

Non-proliferation

Commitment

“We renew our pledge to raise up to $20 billion over ten years to 2012 for Global Partnership priorities, initially in Russia.”

-Gleneagles Statement on Non-Proliferation

Background

The Global Partnership Program was launched at the 2002 G8 summit in Kananaskis Alberta. The stated goal of the program was to address the proliferation threats posed by large, often poorly guarded, stocks of weapons of mass destruction, or the materials needed to develop those weapons, in Russia and the Former Soviet Union. Since its inception the primary objectives of the program have been: the destruction of existing chemical weapon stocks; the dismantlement of decommissioned nuclear submarines; securing nuclear and radiological sites; and the redirection and reemployment of former weapons scientists.

At the Kananaskis summit G8 member states pledged to collectively raise US$20 billion over ten years to fund Global Partnership program initiatives. At the Gleneagles summit the G8 member states renewed their commitment to their 2002 pledge.

The financial commitments of each G8 member state to the Global Partnership break down as follows (all figures in June 2004 U.S. Dollars):

United States – $10 billion; Russian Federation – $2 billion; Germany – $1.5 billion (according to Strengthening the Global Partnership, Germany’s original pledge of €1.5 billion euros was changed to 1.5 billion U.S. dollars at the 2004 Sea Island Summit); Italy – $1.21 billion; European Union – $1.21 billion; France – $909 million; United Kingdom - $750 million; Canada – $743 million; Japan - $200 million. (The remaining $1.5 billion is to be donated by a number of non-G8 member states).

Team Leader: Christopher Collins

---

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canada</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>France</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germany</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Italy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Russia</strong></td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United Kingdom</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>European Union</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown

1. **Canada: +1**

The Canadian government thus far complied with its 2005 Gleneagles summit pledge to continue providing funds to support the Global Partnership Program.

In October 2005, Canadian Foreign Affairs Minister Pierre Pettigrew announced that Canada would contribute a further CAD$55 million for the destruction of chemical weapons in the Russian Federation. The funds will be used at the Chemical Weapons Destruction Facility in Shchuch’ye, Russia, to destroy almost two million artillery shells filled with nerve agents.784 “Keeping chemical weapons—and other weapons of mass destruction—out of the hands of terrorists and those who would harbour them is a key element of Canada's international security agenda,” announced Minister Pettigrew. "This contribution, like all others under the Global Partnership, represents a tangible investment in our national and international security.... In this regard, Canada's cooperation at Shchuch'ye is part of an international effort with the United Kingdom, the United States, Russia and other smaller partners.”785

In November 2005, Minister Pettigrew further reaffirmed Canada’s "strong commitment to the Global Partnership," stating that "Canada has moved quickly in undertaking concrete projects and has been instrumental in furthering the initiative... The Global Partnership is another concrete example of an area in which Canada can make a real difference internationally.”786

Between 2003 and 2005 Canada spent a total of $90.8 million (all funds given in Canadian dollars) to Global Partnership Program activities, much of which ($42.6 million) was spent on initiatives assisting

with the dismantlement of decaying nuclear submarines in the Russian Federation.\(^{787}\) One report delivered to the United States House of Representatives by the Center for Strategic and International Studies in June of 2005 declared that “The Canadians merit special praise: starting with an almost non-existent nonproliferation assistance program in 2002, the Canadians have in only three years completed a legal framework with Russia, stood up an internal bureaucracy, and disbursed funds in a number of project areas.”\(^{788}\)

Analyst: Christopher Collins

2. France: 0

The French government has not yet complied with its G8 Gleneagles Summit pledge to continue providing funds to support the Global Partnership Program. Most of France’s spending figures beyond 2004 are not yet available.\(^{789}\) However, as a part of the €750 million Paris pledged to support the Global Partnership Program, €110 million is earmarked for ongoing, multi-year projects in plutonium disposition and nuclear safety/submarine dismantlement.\(^{790}\) Between 2003 and 2004 France spent €13.1 million on nuclear safety projects, €17 million on nuclear submarine dismantlement, €9 million on chemical weapons destruction, and €8 million on other projects.\(^{791}\)

Analyst: Christopher Collins

3. Germany: +1

The government of Germany thus far complied with its G8 Gleneagles Summit pledge to continue providing funds to support the Global Partnership Program. In late July 2005, the German Embassy in Moscow announced that Germany will provide further technical assistance to Russia for the construction of a chemical weapons destruction plant in Kambaroka, Udmurtia. Berlin will provide components and equipment for a total contribution of €150 million. Germany previously helped Russia build a similar facility in Gorny. The Kambaroka facility was scheduled to be operational by December 2005. In September 2005, the German Ambassador to Russia, Mr. Hans-Friedrich von Ploetz, announced that there is “extensive research underway” into Berlin’s likely participation in the construction of yet another chemical weapons elimination facility in Leondivoka.\(^{792}\) Finally, in September 2005, the Chief of Russia’s Chemical Arms Elimination Committee, Mr. Sergei Kiriyenko, praised Germany as Moscow’s “most stable partner in the process of the elimination of chemical warfare agents.”\(^{793}\)

Analyst: Vera Serdiuk


4. Italy: +1

The Italian government thus far complied with its G8 Gleneagles Summit pledge to continue providing funds to support the Global Partnership Program. In July 2005, the Russian news agency Interfax reported that Russian, Italian and French officials were negotiating to develop a plan to dismantle the Russian heavy missile-carrying nuclear cruiser Admiral Ushakov.795 In 2004, the Italian government had expressed its readiness to allot €60 million for that ship’s dismantling.795

More broadly, Italy has committed to spend €360 million from 2004 – 2013 to dismantle decaying Russian nuclear submarines; the first submarine dismantling funded by Italy is scheduled to be completed in 2006.796 Rome has also committed to spend €365 million from 2004 – 2008 on chemical weapons destruction, and €80 million for the disposal of plutonium.797

Analyst: Christopher Collins

5. Japan: 0

The Japanese government has not yet complied with its G8 Gleneagles summit pledge to continue providing funds to support the Global Partnership Program. Of all the G8 member nations, Japan has pledged the least - US$200 million – to the Global Partnership Program. Of this $200 million, one half, $100 million, has been allotted for plutonium disposition, while the other half is to be used for nuclear submarine dismantlement.798 Tokyo has plans to work closely with the Russian government to dismantle decaying nuclear submarines. In January 2005 Sergei Antipov, the deputy head of the Russian Federal Agency for Nuclear Energy (Rosatom), stated that “In the course of 2005, the Russian-Japanese committee is planning to sign an executive agreement with Rosatom on disposing nuclear submarines, to study related technological and financial issues, as well as security aspects, and then, proceeding from the results of this work, sign a financial contract with the bodies recommended by Rosatom.”799 In June 2005, Japan’s Ambassador to Russia, Mr. Issei Nomura, told a conference on the Global Partnership that Japan was willing to sign off on dismantling the five submarines.800 It should be noted that Japan is the only member of the Global Partnership that has taken a roll in dismantling the submarines of Russia’s Pacific Fleet.801

Analyst: Hitomi Roppongi

6. Russia: 0

The Russian government has not committed any new funds to the Global Partnership Program since Gleneagles; however, Moscow continues to work with donor countries on Partnership projects in Russia.

---

Among other projects, Russia continued cooperation with donor countries, such as Canada and Germany, in the destruction of chemical weapons and nuclear submarines.

At the same time, as of 17 November 2005 Russia continues to produce weapons-grade plutonium. It is currently estimated that Russia’s total stockpile of highly enriched uranium is approximately 1,208 tonnes. Approximately half of Russia’s nuclear materials have not had any form of security upgrade for the past 15 years. According to the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, Russia’s current nuclear inventory includes approximately 16,000 weapons, 7,200 of which are considered ready and active. There have been reports, that due to Russia’s lack of security at nuclear sites, workers have been able to steal plutonium and sell it on the black market.\(^{802}\) Finally, the Russian Agency for Atomic Energy has been criticized for its construction of floating nuclear power plants, which some believe to be highly vulnerable.\(^{803}\)

Analyst: Vera Serdiuk

7. United Kingdom: 0

The government of the United Kingdom has continued to support the non-proliferation commitments set out in the 2005 Gleneagles Summit, though no new funds have been committed. In December 2005, the UK’s Third Annual Report on the Global Partnership reported that London successfully led negotiations to secure an additional £210 million of funding from international aid donors for the Chernobyl Shelter project.\(^{804}\) The Report also noted, among other things, the completion of the major phases of the £15 million construction of the spent nuclear fuel (SNF) storage facility at the Atomflot site in Murmansk and the successful completion of a series of projects at Andreeva Bay in Northwest Russia.\(^{805}\) Out of the US$750 million commitment the British government has pledged to the Global Partnership, £150 million will be met by the end of the 2005 financial year.\(^{806}\)

Also in 2005, the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) initiated a contribution of “of up to £12m to the US led plutonium reactor shutdown programme and the implementation of a further £4m portfolio of projects to provide sustainable, non-weapons employment, for former nuclear scientists and technicians.”\(^{807}\) DTI Energy Minister Malcolm Wicks commented on 21 December 2005 that the “DTI is on target to spend £35m this financial year on nuclear safety, security and non-proliferation across the FSU (Former Soviet Union).”\(^{808}\)

Analyst: Joseph Tabago

---


8. United States: 0

The American government continued to support Gleneagles’ non-proliferation commitments but has not committed any new funds since Gleneagles. Washington is by far the largest contributor to the Global Partnership Program. The annual contribution of the United States to the Global Partnership is divided between three departments that each sponsor projects, the Departments of Defense, Energy, and State.809

The United States pledged US$10 billion (approximately US$1 billion per year for 10 years) to be spent on the full range of non-proliferation activities occurring as a part of the Partnership.810 For fiscal year 2004, the United States spent approximately US$1.02 billion dollars on Partnership initiatives (the majority of this was spent by the Departments of Defence and Energy).811 By 2009, this number is projected to rise to $7.02 billion (cumulative from 2003).

As a part of the continuous effort by the Bush Administration, the United States also took an active role in the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI), a global effort that aims to stop the trafficking of weapons of mass destruction between rogue states and non-state actors812. Over 70 states now support PSI.813

Analyst: Hitomi Roppongi

9. European Union: 0

The European Union (EU) Commission is continuing to strive to meet the €1 billion commitment it pledged at Gleneagles, but it is still a work in progress.

The EU Commission reiterated its commitment to the Global Partnership Program by initiating a Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) pilot project. The United Kingdom secured funding from the Global Opportunities Fund to co-sponsor the EU Commission.814 On 7-8 December 2005, a Conference entitled, “Strengthening European Action on Non-Proliferation and Disarmament: How can Community Instruments contribute?” was held in Brussels where the United Nations Institute For Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) and the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) presented reports that were prepared as a part of the EU pilot project.815 The research of UNIDIR and SIPRI was carried out as a part of the European Union pilot project.

Analyst: Joseph Tabago

Transnational Crime

Commitment

We are deepening these efforts at home and abroad, with the aim of reducing substantially global trade in pirated and counterfeit goods, and efficiently combating the transnational networks that support it. In particular, we will take further concrete steps to:

"Improve co-ordination of anti-counterfeiting and anti-piracy crime strategies, and ensure closer co-operation among enforcement officials, including through shared risk analysis, exchange of best practice, enhanced existing cooperation at international borders, and between governments and the private sector."816

- Reducing IPR Piracy and Counterfeiting Through More Effective Enforcement817

Background

The members of the G8 have emphasized the growing problem of pirated and counterfeit goods as linked to the funding of organized crime groups.818 As such, one of the commitments made at the G8 Summit in Gleneagles, Scotland in July 2005 was "Reducing IPR Piracy and Counterfeiting through more Effective Enforcement."819 As part of the commitment it was understood that increased trade in pirated and counterfeit goods "threatens employment, innovation, economic growth, and health and safety of consumers in all parts of the world."820 The members of the G8, having accepted that piracy and counterfeiting are global problems, have emphasized the importance of working together and with international organizations such as "the World Intellectual Property Organization, World Trade Organization, World Customs Organization, Interpol and other relevant organizations to combat piracy and counterfeiting more effectively."821 The G8 members have reiterated the need for cooperation between states to solve the problem of transnational crime as well as to provide a basis for education about the possible consequences of not fighting piracy and counterfeiting.822

Team Leader: Francesca Mattacchione
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Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance -1</th>
<th>Work in Progress 0</th>
<th>Full Compliance +1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown

1. Canada: 0

The Canadian government demonstrated partial compliance with its Gleneagles commitment to combat the trade in counterfeit and pirated goods through international co-ordination and cooperation with other states. However, beyond reiterating support for the commitment and taking part in two bilateral enforcement actions, Ottawa has not acted significantly to fully meet its Gleneagles transnational crime commitment.

The Royal Canadian Mounted Police and Health Canada hosted a joint training workshop on counterfeit pharmaceuticals aimed for government officials and some representatives of the industry in October 2005. On 15 and 16 November 2005, in Busan, Republic of Korea, Canada was present at the Seventeenth APEC Ministerial Meeting. The joint statement that came out of the meeting emphasized the importance of “Strengthened Intellectual and Property Protection and Enforcement.” While acknowledging the importance of fighting piracy and the distribution of counterfeit goods for “boosting economic development, promoting investment, spurring innovation, developing creative industries and driving economic growth,” the participants of the APEC Ministerial Meeting “fully supported the APEC Anti-Counterfeiting and Piracy Initiative adopted at the June 2005 meeting of APEC Ministers Responsible for Trade.” It was also reiterated at the Meeting that “Given the importance of strong IPR regimes in the region, Ministers instructed economies to take further steps that build on the APEC Anti-Counterfeiting and Piracy Initiative in the coming year, in consultation with the private sector, so as to reduce trade in counterfeit and pirated goods, curtail online piracy, and increase cooperation and capacity building in this area.” In addition, Canada was represented at the Second Global Congress on Combating Counterfeiting and Piracy, which was held on 14 and 15 November 2005.


The Canadian government also acted to partially fulfill its commitment to the reduction of Intellectual Property (IP) crime through international action. Since Gleneagles, Canadian federal law enforcement officials have participated in a number of significant bilateral coordination of anti-counterfeiting and anti-piracy efforts, which “represented a coordinated effort between federal, state and local law enforcement officials in the United States with the cooperation of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.”

Analyst: Kevin Jarus and Francesca Mattacchione

2. France: 0

The French government partially complied with its Gleneagles transnational crime commitment. No formal statements by the government of France on this issue were found. This being said, the government of France hosted and attended some conferences that dealt with issues surrounding transnational crime: the Global Congress on Counterfeiting in Lyon on 14 November 2005,628 a European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) seminar entitled “Fostering mutual trust between journalists and anti-fraud services in Europe”,830 and the first831 and second832 sessions of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime in September 2005 and October 2005, respectively.

The French government also hosted several gatherings of specialized agencies aimed at enhancing cooperation and coordination between countries and international organizations in their fight against counterfeiting and piracy. Firstly, it facilitated a gathering of EU customs agencies from 7 to 9 December 2005, the goal of which was to create a single, common way to codify merchandise.833 The Banque de France’s Institute Bancaire et Financier International also held a seminar in Paris that invited “representatives of more than 30 central banks throughout the world … to discuss counterfeit currency concerns.”834

The French city of Lyon hosted the Second Global Congress on Counterfeiting on 14 and 15 November 2005,835 suggesting that the government of France was involved in organizing the conference. There is, however, no evidence that France took an active, leadership role in complying with the G8 commitment. The European Union, however, was represented at the conference, where it joined governments and other international organizations836 in adopting the Lyon Declaration.837 The declaration reiterated the

Gleneagles commitment to combat IP piracy and counterfeiting. The declaration clearly states that the participants “agreed that the promotion and protection of Intellectual Property is a key element of economic development and agreed to enhance efforts to raise awareness and political will; improve cooperation and coordination among and between the public and private sectors; build national, regional and global capacity; and, promote more effective legislation and enforcement.” Therefore, the French government can be seen to have taken steps towards fulfilling its Gleneagles transnational crime commitment through its status as an EU Member State.

Analyst: David Raluca

3. Germany: 0

Germany has demonstrated partial compliance with its commitment to tackle intellectual property (IP) piracy and counterfeiting through cooperation and coordination with other states. Germany as a member of European Union (EU) was part of the creation of legislation against money laundering. At the International Monetary and Financial Committee of the International Monetary Fund, Joaquin Almunia, European Commissioner for Economic and Monetary Affairs emphasized the European Council’s “3rd Money Laundering Directive and the Regulation on payer’s information accompanying funds’ transfers.” There is thus some indication that, at the European level, the German government has worked to fulfil its transnational crime commitments in coordination with its EU allies, including France, Italy, and Britain.

Furthermore, Germany hosted the 74th session of the Interpol General Assembly, in Berlin from 19 to 22 September 2005. The government of Germany, together with other members of the G8 and Interpol, adopted resolution 12 entitled “Information on Money Laundering”. The resolution emphasized the importance of pushing to “Authorize Financial Intelligence Units or a national agency responsible for investigating economic crimes to process information on significant cases via Interpol channels”. This action was done on a multilateral level with other members of the G8.

In addition, the EU was represented at the Second Global Congress on Combating Counterfeiting and Piracy, which was held on 14 and 15 November 2005. There, it joined governments and other international organizations in adopting the Lyon Declaration. The declaration reiterated the commitment

---

made at the Gleneagles summit on reducing IP piracy and counterfeiting. The declaration clearly states that the participants “agreed that the promotion and protection of Intellectual Property is a key element of economic development and agreed to enhance efforts to raise awareness and political will; improve cooperation and coordination among and between the public and private sectors; build national, regional and global capacity; and, promote more effective legislation and enforcement.” Therefore the German government can be seen to have taken steps towards fulfilling its Gleneagles transnational crime commitment through its status as an EU Member State.

Analyst: Kevin Jarus and Francesca Mattacchione

4. Italy: 0

Italy partially complied with its commitment to reduce intellectual property (IP) piracy and counterfeiting. Most of Italy’s actions have been accomplished through the European Union (EU) and through Interpol. Italy is a member of Interpol and Italy’s law enforcement organization, la Guardia di Finanza, is a main member of the Interpol Intellectual Property Crime Action Group (IIPCAG). In September 2005, the European Commission adopted the “3rd Money Laundering Directive and the Regulation on payer’s information accompanying funds’ transfers.” Italy as a member of the European Commission is also an integral part of this decision.

The Italian government attended the Seventy-Fourth Session of the Interpol General Assembly, held from 19 to 25 September 2005. There, it participated in the Interpol General Assembly meeting that adopted resolution 12 entitled “Information on Money Laundering”. Interpol members were encouraged to “Authorize Financial Intelligence Units or national agency responsible for investigating economic crimes to process information on significant cases via Interpol channels.” This resolution was also agreed to by all other G8 members.

In addition, the EU was represented at the Second Global Congress on Combating Counterfeiting and Piracy, which was held on 14 and 15 November 2005. There, it joined governments and other international organizations in adopting the Lyon Declaration. The declaration reiterated the commitment made at the Gleneagles summit on reducing IP piracy and counterfeiting.
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clearly states that the participants “agreed that the promotion and protection of Intellectual Property is a key element of economic development and agreed to enhance efforts to: raise awareness and political will; improve cooperation and coordination among and between the public and private sectors; build national, regional and global capacity; and, promote more effective legislation and enforcement.” Therefore the Italian government can be seen to have taken steps towards fulfilling its Gleneagles transnational crime commitment through its status as an EU Member State.

Analyst: Francesca Mattacchi

5. Japan: 0

Japan demonstrated interest in strengthening existing regional and international cooperation to combat transnational crime; however, it only partially complied with the G8 Gleneagles commitment to fight intellectual property (IP) piracy and counterfeiting. While moving to improve the coordination of anti-counterfeiting and anti-piracy crime strategies, the Japanese government suggested the introduction of a Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Counterfeited and Pirated Goods. A Japanese proposal was presented at the Second Global Congress on Combating Counterfeiting and Piracy, held on 14 and 15 November 2005, outlining the treaty and the measures necessary to ensure its success.

In addition, Japan has shown considerable determination to enhance its partnership with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) in the area of transnational IP crime. At the Ninth ASEAN-Japan Summit, an agreement to “intensify bilateral as well as multilateral cooperation between ASEAN and Japan to eradicate the threat posed by transnational crimes, piracy, human trafficking and drugs” was concluded. Japan committed to sharing its knowledge and resources in combating transnational crime with ASEAN, a positive initiative to reduce illicit global trade. On 7 October 2005, Malasian ambassador to the UN Hamidon Ali, on behalf of ASEAN, noted that Japan has worked with ASEAN to “promote cooperation in combating transnational crime, both at the ministerial and senior official levels”.

It should also be noted that the Japanese government has not yet ratified the UN Convention on Transnational Crime.

Analyst: Lilianne Vicente

6. Russia: 0

The government of the Russian Federation demonstrated partial compliance with its Gleneagles commitment on co-operation tackling intellectual property (IP) piracy and counterfeiting. At the APEC meeting on 14 and 16 November 2005, the Russian government supported the adoption of the APEC Anti-Counterfeiting and Piracy Initiative adopted in June 2005 during the meeting of APEC Ministers


Responsible for Trade. Furthermore, the Russian Federation along with other G8 members were cited for their progress in establishing Intellectual Property Rights Service Centres to improve international coordination in the area of IP crime.

The Russian Federation took part in the “Comprehensive Programme of Action to Promote Cooperation between the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and the Russian Federation 2005-2015”. The heads of state of the Southeast Asian Nations (or ASEAN), including Russian president Vladimir Putin signed the Joint Declaration on Progressive and Comprehensive Partnership on 13 December 2005 in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. As part of its mandate, the program seeks to “enhance cooperation in combating money laundering.”

At the Seventy-Fourth Session of the Interpol General Assembly, the Russian Federation was among those states and international organizations that adopted resolution 12 entitled “Information on Money Laundering”. It encouraged the governments of countries to “Authorize Financial Intelligence Units or a national agency responsible for investigating economic crimes to process information on significant cases via Interpol channels”. It promotes the integration of various national networks so that successful networks can be established. This action was taken in co-operation with all the other members of the G8.

In addition, the Russian Federation was represented at the Second Global Congress on Combating Counterfeiting and Piracy, which was held on 14 and 15 November 2005. There, it joined governments and other international organizations in adopting the Lyon Declaration. The declaration reiterated the commitment made at the Gleneagles summit on reducing IP piracy and counterfeiting. The declaration clearly states that the participants “agreed that the promotion and protection of Intellectual Property is a key element of economic development and agreed to enhance efforts to: raise awareness and political will; improve cooperation and coordination among and between the public and private sectors; build national, regional and global capacity; and, promote more effective legislation and enforcement.”

Analyst: Anastasia Litchak
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G8 Research Group: Interim Compliance Report, February 9 2006 (revised)
7. United Kingdom: 0

The government of the United Kingdom demonstrated partial compliance with its Gleneagles commitment on co-operation tackling intellectual property (IP) piracy and counterfeiting. Through the European Commission, the government of Britain was involved in the creation of legislation against money laundering. One of them is the September 2005 “3rd Money Laundering Directive and the Regulation on payer’s information accompanying funds.” The actions were made in co-operation with France, Germany, and Italy.

The British government attended the Seventy-Fourth Session of the Interpol General Assembly, held from 19 to 25 September 2005. There, it participated in the Interpol General Assembly meeting that adopted resolution 12 entitled “Information on Money Laundering”. Interpol members were encouraged to “Authorize Financial Intelligence Units or a national agency responsible for investigating economic crimes to process information on significant cases via Interpol channels”. This resolution was also agreed to by all other G8 members.

In addition, the EU was represented at the Second Global Congress on Combating Counterfeiting and Piracy, which was held on 14 and 15 November 2005. There, it joined governments and other international organizations in adopting the Lyon Declaration. The declaration reiterated the commitment made at the Gleneagles summit on reducing IP piracy and counterfeiting. The declaration states that the participants "agreed that the promotion and protection of Intellectual Property is a key element of economic development and agreed to enhance efforts to: raise awareness and political will; improve cooperation and coordination among and between the public and private sectors; build national, regional and global capacity; and, promote more effective legislation and enforcement." Therefore the UK government can be seen to have taken steps towards fulfilling its Gleneagles transnational crime commitment through its status as an EU Member State.

Analyst: Anastasia Litchak

8. United States: 0

The government of the United States demonstrated partial compliance with Gleneagles’ transnational crime commitment. US president George W. Bush and Brazilian president Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva announced on 6 November 2005 an agreement to "strengthen bilateral cooperation to combat the
narcotics trade, trafficking in wildlife, terrorism, and money laundering, with an emphasis on information sharing between the two countries' financial intelligence units.685

The United States government also showed a desire to develop its partnership with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) to strengthen maritime and border security, helping to reduce illicit trade.686 In a 17 November 2005 joint statement,686 ASEAN and the US indicated that the United States has an interest in expanding on the ASEAN-United States Joint Declaration for Cooperation to Combat International Terrorism, signed in 2002.687 Furthermore, the United States participated at the Seventeenth Asia-Pacific Economic Corporation (APEC) Ministerial Meeting held in November, in which issues of anti-corruption and transparency were discussed.688 Further, the United States ratified the United Nations Convention on Transnational Crime on 3 November 2005.689 In support of the Convention, the United States provided US$816,500 to the UN Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Fund.690

The United States continued to reiterate its domestic and bilateral commitment to fighting IP piracy and counterfeiting. U.S. Attorney General Alberto Gonzales described the US government's presentation in November 2005 of a proposed legislative package regarding intellectual property law as "a good way to ensure that our laws are in step with the changing nature of intellectual property crimes."691 Mr. Gonzales also travelled to China the week of November 13 2005 to coordinate efforts with the Chinese government "to seek new effective ways of cooperation and coordination among the two countries’ law enforcement agencies on intellectual property crimes."692 Under-Secretary of State for Economic, Business and Cultural Affairs Josette Shiner, when referring to the G8 program to combat piracy and counterfeiting stated: "We are debating which mechanism would be the best and what agencies to involve."693

In addition, the United States government sent a delegation to the Second Global Congress on Combating Counterfeiting and Piracy, which was held on 14 and 15 November 2005. There, it joined governments and other international organizations in adopting the Lyon Declaration.694 The declaration reiterated the commitment made at the G8 program to combat piracy and counterfeiting.695 The declaration states that the participants "agreed that the promotion and protection of Intellectual Property is a key element of economic development and agreed to enhance efforts to:

---

and political will; improve cooperation and coordination among and between the public and private sectors; build national, regional and global capacity; and, promote more effective legislation and enforcement."  

Analyst: Lilianne Vicente

9. European Union: +1

The European Union is on the right track to achieving full compliance with its transnational crime commitment made at the Gleneagles Summit. The EU has kept its promise of "closer cooperation among enforcement officials…and between governments and the private sector". The EU has achieved this by making “the Europol Information System […] available to authorised law enforcement staff in all 25 member States”. The system went online on 10 October 2005, less than a year after "[t]he decision of the final structure of the system […] was made by the Europol Management Board in December 2004."  

The EU was also a leader at a European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) seminar on 15 November 2005 entitled “Building mutual trust between anti-fraud services and journalists". Both the European Commission’s Vice-President Siim Kallas, Commissioner in charge of anti-fraud policy, and his Head of Cabinet, Mr. Henrik Hololei, emphasised the importance of transparency for public institutions and reaffirmed Gleneagles transnational crime commitment. Mr. Kallas stated that, “My main message here today is the importance of cooperation and coordination…with other services within the Commission and [with] all Non-State Actors. We need to strengthen cooperation with Member States, beneficiary countries and international financial organisations…I would like to encourage this cooperation, especially when it comes to risk analysis and sector specific patterns [of intellectual property crime].”  

Europol announced on 7 November 2005 that it had forged a significant cooperative link with the US Secret Service to combat transnational financial crime. This was followed by a similar personal data sharing agreement announced on 24 November 2005 by Europol and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. The EU also attended the OLAF Conference on Fraud and Aid Funds in Brussels on 7 October 2005. Mr. Siim Kallas, European Commission Vice President, described the purpose of the conference as "[a]n exchange of experience and a further strengthening of international co-operation" on issues

---

related to fraud. In addition, the EU was represented at the Second Global Congress on Combating Counterfeiting and Piracy, which was held on 14 and 15 November 2005. There, it joined governments and other international organizations in adopting the Lyon Declaration. The declaration reiterated the Gleneagles commitment to combat IP piracy and counterfeiting. The declaration states that the participants “agreed that the promotion and protection of Intellectual Property is a key element of economic development and agreed to enhance efforts to: raise awareness and political will; improve cooperation and coordination among and between the public and private sectors; build national, regional and global capacity; and, promote more effective legislation and enforcement.”

Analyst: Raluca David
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Renewable Energy

Commitment

“We resolved to take action to meet the challenges we face. The Gleneagles Plan of Action which we have agreed demonstrates our commitment. We will take measures to develop markets for clean energy technologies, to increase their availability in developing countries, and to help vulnerable communities adapt to the impact of climate change.”

-Chairman’s Summary (final press conference)\(^912\)

Background

In the wake of rising oil prices, a growing demand of energy, and the need for sustainable development in the developing world, access to renewable energy is a key priority for all G8 member-states. These commitments dovetail with recognition of the need to limit greenhouse gases (GHGs), of the negative impacts of climate change, and to adapt to new environmental realities. With the exception of the United States (US), these commitments also support the G8 member-states’ commitments to meet the targets of the Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change. The projected rise in the demand for energy in developing countries, particularly India and China, will make energy security one of the main issues on the agenda next July at the G8 Summit in St. Petersburg, Russia.

Team Leader: Adam Sheikh

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown

1. Canada: +1

The Canadian government complied with the G8 renewable energy commitment by participating in several international meetings and conferences promoting the development of markets for clean energy technologies, their availability in developing countries, and helping vulnerable communities adapt to the impact of climate change. On 24 September 2005, Canadian representatives participated in a World Bank conference.

meeting to launch an investment framework for clean energy and sustainable development. This framework convenes, among others, “senior representatives from regional development banks...and technology companies to explore practical solutions for achieving a less carbon intensive and more climate resilient development path” for developing countries.913 Canada also sent a delegation to the first ministerial meeting of the Dialogue on Climate Change, Clean Energy, and Sustainable Development in London. This meeting explored the possibility of promoting “wider access to cleaner energy technologies”, prioritized areas for “cooperation between developed and developing countries”, and acknowledged the need for “incentives to encourage private sector investment.”914 On 19 September 2005, Environment Minister Stéphane Dion reaffirmed Canada’s commitment to develop “initiatives in renewable energy along with targeted programs and tax incentives for environmental technologies.”915

In November 2005, Environment Minister Stéphane Dion led Canada’s delegation in support of the renewable energy goals outlined in the political declaration of the International Renewable Energy Conference in Beijing (BIREC). From 24 November to 9 December 2005, Canada hosted the United Nations Climate Change Conference. The conference brought together parties of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Kyoto Protocol signatories, both of which seek to recognize the importance of the developed world to “encourage the participation of developing countries in global efforts to combat climate change”.916 The conference adopted the Marrakesh Accords stressing the importance of capacity building and “developing innovative technologies through public and private sector involvement.”917 At the conference, Canada also committed to a declaration encouraging signatories “to consider issues related to the Arctic region[s]…vulnerability and adaptation to climate change.”918 As a continuation of the Aboriginal and Northern Communities Action Plan, Dion also reaffirmed Canada’s support of “a targeted science and research program focused on...climate change impacts and adaptation, and the health and well-being of northern communities.”919

Analyst: Katherine Kinley

2. France: +1

The French government fulfilled its G8 renewable energy commitment to develop markets for clean energy technologies. In August 2005, President Jacques Chirac called for a “loi-programe” authorizing the government to take measures which involve expenditures for research and development spanning several financial years.920 By enacting such legislative proceedings, Chirac intends to stimulate “research programmes addressing the crucial challenges presented by the environment and climate change: for example, the fuel cell, solar energy and the clean car”.921 At an announcement in Reims on 15 January


921 Speech by President Jacques Chirac on research and policy for industry, Présidence de la République (Reims), 30 August 2005. Date of Access: 15 January 2006.
2006, the President also highlighted his intent to fund the “development of new technologies” such as the ITER project. He explained that these “will open new avenues towards the development of an energy which is almost unlimited and has no impact on the climate”.²²²

On 14 November 2005, Prime Minister Dominique de Villepin announced “Plan Climat 2005”, further committing France to developing markets for clean energy technologies and increasing their availability in developing countries.²²³ De Villepin restated France’s commitment to clean technologies in the Rhone-Alps region with support of UK firm EDF, and encouraged French companies to continue investing in wind and solar power.²²⁴ He also promised a tax credit increase of 50% to private individuals who repurchase electricity from solar panels, and a doubling of the tax credit for collective, tertiary and industrial solar panel installations.²²⁵ Finally, De Villepin reiterated the need to develop international partnerships for sustainable development through research, innovation, and clean technologies.²²⁶

On 7 December 2005, President Chirac attended the Montreal UN Climate Change Conference pledging to increasing the availability of clean technologies in developing countries and help vulnerable communities adapt to the impact of climate change. France endorsed the conference’s adoption of the Marrakesh Accords which stress the importance of capacity building and “developing innovative technologies through public and private sector involvement”.²²⁷ In addition, the President articulated the need for scientific cooperation to “develop new energy sources, cleaner technologies, [and to]...help poor countries cope with the consequences of climate change.”²²⁸ At the end of the conference, France also committed to a statement on Climate Change in the Arctic Region which encouraged signing parties “to consider issues related to the Arctic region[s]... vulnerability and adaptation to climate change”.²²⁹

Analyst: Adam Sheikh and Jennifer Francis

3. Germany: +1

The German government complied with its G8 renewable energy commitments. In a policy statement to the German Bundestag, Chancellor Angela Merkel reiterated the importance of a sound energy policy with a “high degree of environmental compatibility”.²³⁰ Chancellor Merkel also pledged to “canvass
strongly for climate protection projects in line with the Kyoto Protocol" during trips abroad, and to promote the export of German technologies in the energy field.  

Germany played a key role in supporting China's hosting of the Beijing International Renewable Energy Conference 7-8 November 2005. At the conference, German Federal Minister for the Environment, Nature Conservation, and Nuclear Safety, Jurgen Trittin, reaffirmed Germany’s leading role in promoting renewable energy and encouraged more research and development to increase demand and reduce market costs. The conference resulted in the Beijing Declaration on Renewable Energy for Sustainable Development. All government representatives in attendance pledged to “substantially increase with a sense of urgency the global share of renewable energy in the total energy supply.” They also emphasized the need for further international cooperation in developing nations to enhance national capacities for research and development and establish markets for renewable energy.

Germany, in partnership with the United States, also formed a Working Group on Energy, Development, and Climate Change whose inaugural meeting took place 12 August 2005 in Berlin. Representatives from both countries resolved to “strengthen donor cooperation in developing countries consistent with the G8 Gleneagles Plan of Action.”

At the Montreal Climate Change Conference form 28 November to 9 December 2005, German Environment Minister Sigmar Gabriel announced that the German government “is ready to move forward on our commitments under 3.9 of the [Kyoto] Protocol” and called for the establishment of carbon markets by 2012. Mr. Gabriel also announced that the Clean Development Mechanism “is an important guarantee for technology transfer and sustainable development,” and pledged US$1 million to fund the Executive Board. Minister Gabriel also reaffirmed Germany’s commitment to renewable energy, stating that for environmental and economic reasons “the national and global expansion of renewable energies is a high priority” for the new German Government. Germany also committed to a declaration encouraging signing parties “to consider issues related to the Arctic region[s]… vulnerability and adaptation to climate change.”

Analyst: Matthew Chomyn

4. Italy: +1

The Italian government achieved full compliance with its G8 renewable energy commitments. As co-organizer of the Mediterranean Renewable Energy Partnership (MEDREPP), the Italian Ministry for the Environment and Territory developed markets for clean technologies in both developed and developing Mediterranean countries. The principle goals of the Italian government are to bring sustainable energy services to rural populations and increase the amount of renewable energy along the Mediterranean. In October 2005 Italy hosted the Photovoltaic Mediterranean Conference to promote solar electricity as a source of clean energy. At the conference Environment and Territory Minister, Altero Matteoli, and the President of the Regione Sicilia, Salvatore Caffaro, reiterated Italy’s commitment to renewable energies in Mediterranean countries by building “strong cooperative links to create the basis for an effective economy linked to the use of renewable energy sources.”

At the G8 Gleneagles Summit Italy accepted the responsibility to lead a Global Bioenergy Partnership to “promote collaboration between developed and developing countries, and propose solutions to the issues of trade barriers,” market development, and the sharing of new research and technologies. Italy’s Global Bioenergy Partnership has not yet materialized since the July 2005 Summit. Nevertheless, in November 2005 Director General of the Italian Ministry of Environment and Territory Corrado Clini emphasized his support of the Global Bioenergy Partnership, the need to create markets for renewables, and the need to build international programs for the adaptation to climate change in developing countries.

Analyst: Joanna Dafoe

5. Japan: +1

The government of Japan has taken several steps to comply with their G8 renewable energy commitments in both the domestic and international sphere. At Gleneagles, Japan publicized a policy document outlining their climate change initiatives and commitment to the Millennium Development Goals to diffuse energy-efficient and environment-friendly technologies to developing countries. Japan pledged to continue its contribution to the International Energy Agency (IEA) “to set up international benchmark[s] for assessing sectoral energy-efficiency performance and to promote research in the related fields.”

Japan participated in numerous international conferences and meetings to increase the availability of clean energy technologies markets in both developed and developing countries. For instance, on 24 September 2005 Finance Minister Sadakazu Tanigaki participated in a meeting at the World Bank to launch an Investment Framework for Clean Energy and Sustainable Development. This framework convenes, among others, “senior representatives from regional development banks … and technology companies to explore practical solutions for achieving a less carbon intensive and more climate resilient...”

development path" for developing countries. On 1 November 2005 Japanese representatives attended the first Ministerial meeting of the Dialogue on Climate Change, Clean Energy, and Sustainable Development in London. This meeting, explored the possibility to promote "wider access to cleaner energy technologies," prioritized areas for "cooperation between developed and developing countries," and acknowledged the need for "incentives [to encourage] private sector investment." Japan also sent a delegation from 24 November to 9 December 2005 to the Montreal UN Climate Change Conference which adopted the Marrakech Accords stressing the importance of capacity building and "developing innovative technologies through public and private sector involvement." Finally, on 12 January 2006 at the ASEAN Regional Forum in Sydney, Australia, Japan joined six other developed countries in launching the Asia-Pacific Partnership for Clean Development and Climate. This partnership aims to develop existing and emerging "cleaner, more efficient technologies and practices among the Partners through concrete and substantial cooperation.

Furthermore, from 20 to 21 October 2005, Japan hosted the Fourth Informal Meeting on Further Actions Against Climate Change in Tokyo. Participants highlighted the significance of, and the need to improve the Clean Development Mechanism System as a means to encourage sustainable development through cleaner energy technologies.

Environment Minister Yuriko Koike also announced a domestic policy, the Kyoto Protocol Target Achievement Plan, in September 2005 at the Preparatory Meeting of Ministers for the Eleventh Session of the Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP11) and the First Session of the Conference of the Parties Serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (COP/MOP1) in Ottawa, Canada. This domestic policy includes the Team Minus 6% initiative which encourages "all Japanese people [to] tackle global warming" through a six-step action plan which, among other things, encourages the development of markets for clean energy technologies.

Analyst: Katherine Kinley

6. Russia: +1

The Russian government fulfilled its G8 renewable energy commitments. Russian President Vladimir Putin assumed the G8 Presidency in 2006 and committed himself to the issue of renewable energy by identifying energy security as one of three major focuses for the upcoming St. Petersburg summit. At a Russian Security Council meeting in the Kremlin, President Putin stated that conserving energy, and searching for break-through technologies and environmentally friendly energy sources are necessities for promoting energy security. The President also stated that Russia is drafting the relevant initiatives and proposals in preparation for G8 discussions with full intention of partaking in their implementation.
Russia has also participated in several international meetings and conferences promoting the development of markets for clean energy technologies, their availability in developing countries, and for helping vulnerable communities adapt to the impact of climate change. For instance, on 24 September 2005 Russian representatives participated in a meeting at the World Bank to launch an Investment Framework for clean energy and sustainable development. This framework convenes, among others, “senior representatives from regional development banks ... and technology companies to explore practical solutions for achieving a less carbon intensive and more climate resilient development path” for developing countries. Russian representatives also attended the first Ministerial meeting of the Dialogue on Climate Change, Clean Energy, and Sustainable Development in London. This meeting explored the possibility of promoting “wider access to cleaner energy technologies and prioritizing areas for “cooperation between developed and developing countries.” This ministerial also acknowledged the need for “incentives [to encourage] private sector investment”. Finally, Russia sent a delegation from 24 November to 9 December 2005 to the Montreal UN Climate Change Conference which adopted the Marrakesh Accords stressing the importance of capacity building and “developing innovative technologies through public and private sector involvement”. At the conference, Russia committed to a declaration encouraging signing parties “to consider issues related to the Arctic region[s]... vulnerability and adaptation to climate change.”

Analyst: Adam Sheikh and Jennifer Francis

7. United Kingdom: +1

The United Kingdom (UK) government initiated many projects on renewable energy to develop the market for clean energy technologies and has thus registered full compliance with its Gleneagles commitment on renewable energy. In July 2005, the Department of Trade and Industry, and the Department of Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs published the Second Annual Report on the Implementation of the Energy White Paper. The report announced the implementation of the Renewables Obligation Order, a new goal to achieve 15.4% of energy within the UK from renewable sources by the year 2015/16. As a result of this increased target for renewable energy, the Department of Trade and Industry anticipates increased investor confidence in renewable energy and the development of markets for clean energy technologies. The report also published a list of funded renewable energy projects including: £42 million toward a large-scale wave and tidal farm, a ‘clear skies’ capital grants scheme for micro-hydro powered households, and £500 million toward Carbon Abatement Technologies. The UK also

---


continues to be the largest donor to the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Partnership (REEEP), an NGO focusing on policy-related elements of renewable energy promotion.968

At the 2006 Montreal UN Climate Change Conference, the UK adopted two decisions regarding the availability of clean energy technologies in developing countries.969 The first, entitled Further Guidance Relating to the Clean Development Mechanisms (CDM), promotes the use of renewable biomass energy in developing countries as a means for Annex I countries to meet their Kyoto Protocol targets.970 The second decision, entitled Guidance Relating to the CDM, will have the executive board of the UNFCCC agree on a definition of renewable energy sources in order to ensure a more consistent and systematic assessment of renewable energies in developing countries.971 The UK also committed to a declaration to encourage signing parties “to consider issues related to the Arctic region[s]… vulnerability and adaptation to climate change”.972

Analyst: Joanna Dafoe

8. United States: +1

The United States government fully complied with their G8 renewable energy commitments. By enacting national legislation and funding several long-term projects, the US federal government committed itself to develop domestic markets for clean energy technologies. For instance, on 10 August 2005, the US enacted the Transportation Equity Act (H.R. 3, H.Rept. 109-203) which “has provisions for clean (renewable) fuels, energy conservation, and advanced vehicle technologies”.973 This legislation supports the 2005 Energy Policy Act which requires that the US government “obtain 7.5 percent of its electrical power from renewable sources of energy by 2013”.974 In order to facilitate this program, the US Department of Energy announced that it “will provide federal energy managers, natural gas utilities, and manufacturers with training [and] instruction on commercially available energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies.”975 Furthermore, on 15 July 2005 the US Department of Agriculture announced a “US$11.4 million to guarantee loans to farmers, ranchers, and small rural businesses for renewable energy and energy efficiency projects.”976 This was followed by another commitment on 9 January 2006 to “provide more than US$19 million in grants to support renewable energy projects”.977 Many of the US' national programs parallel their State commitments to develop markets for clean energy technologies...
including Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Texas which enacted legislation to double its renewable energy requirement.

The US government also demonstrated its commitment to increase the availability of clean energy technologies in developing countries and help vulnerable communities adapt to climate change. At the Beijing International Renewable Energy Conference on 7 November 2005, the US reiterated its commitment to reduce the price of renewable energy technologies to make them cost-competitive” and assure their widest possible use. To fulfil this commitment the US, “in partnership with UNEP and others…developed a ‘geospatial toolkit’ that helps users identify renewable energy technologies appropriate for their situation.”

From 24 November to 9 December 2005 the US sent a delegation to the Montreal UN Climate Change Conference. The conference adopted the Marrakesh Accords stressing the importance of capacity building and “developing innovative technologies through public and private sector involvement.” In Montreal, Head US Delegate Paula Dobriansky highlighted the US’ “fifteen bilateral partnerships with both developed and developing countries,” and their collaborative work to explore renewables with China. The US also committed to a statement on Climate Change in the Arctic Region which encouraged signing parties “to consider issues related to the Arctic region[s]… vulnerability and adaptation to climate change”.

Analyst: Adam Sheikh

9. European Union: +1

The European Union (EU) complied with Gleneagles’ renewable energy commitments. The EU pursued the development of markets for clean energy technologies. The Energy Community Treaty established an integrated energy market within the EU, extending the application of the acquis communautaire – including energy, environmental, and renewables aspects of the legislation decided at the EU level – across thirty-four European nations. In addition, members of the European Parliament called for incentives for renewable energy production as well as “fair and free access to the grid and non-discriminatory tariffs.” The Biomass Action Plan, announced by the European Commission on 7
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December 2005, sets out to increase the production of biomass energy by "creating market-based incentives to its use and removing barriers to the development of the market".  

The EU also promoted international cooperation on renewable energy technologies. The European Parliament adopted a resolution stating that the use of alternative energy sources must be tackled with both high consumers and with developing countries. The EU will achieve this goal by integrating a sustainable energy provision into its development cooperation policy. Energy Commissioner Andris Piebalgs reaffirmed the EU’s commitment to clean energy technologies arguing that the EU "should work actively to build global alliances to explore more viable use of renewable energy sources, especially in the developing world." This was reinforced by a Joint EU Development Policy Statement released on 22 November 2005 stating that an “adaptation to the negative effects of climate change will be central in the community’s support to [Less Developed Countries (LDCs)] and small island development states.” The EU also created bilateral strategic partnerships with India and China for further research and development of new energy technologies “which will improve cooperation on climate change, including clean energy and energy efficiency, and will promote sustainable development.”

The European Commission also contributed to the organization of the Beijing International Renewable Energy Conference, held from 7 to 8 November 2005. Commissioner Stavros Dimas stated that the conference was “a clear signal of the Commission’s interest to work with China and other important partners in furthering global environmental issues such as renewable energy.” The European Commission is also a signatory to the Beijing Declaration on Renewable Energy for Sustainable Development, acknowledging the need for further international cooperation to establish markets for renewable energy, and create capacity for further research and development of clean energy technologies.

Analyst: Matthew Chomyn
Climate Change

Commitment

“We will advance the global effort to tackle climate change at the UN Climate Change Conference in Montreal later this year. Those of us who have ratified the Kyoto Protocol remain committed to it, and will continue to work to make it a success”


Background

The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) is one of the three treaties that were adopted at the 1992 Rio Earth Summit. Since the first Conference of the Parties (COP1) of the UNFCCC in 1995, it has been the primary international venue for negotiations on mitigating impacts of climate change. At COP3 in 1997 all parties adopted the Kyoto Protocol which established legally-binding targets for reductions in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by developed nations as well as several mechanisms for mitigating the cost of those reductions. The Protocol came into force on 16 February 2005 after ratification by the Russian Federation in November 2004, and in early 2005 the Canadian Government offered to host COP11 in Montreal from 28 November 2005 to 9 December 2005. This meeting was to be a historic one because parallel to it (indeed, in the same venue) would be held the first Conference of the Parties acting as Members of the Protocol (COP/MOP1), the first meeting of the 128 Parties that had ratified the Kyoto Protocol. Absent from COP/MOP1 was the United States, the world’s largest emitter of greenhouse gases, whose government has yet to ratify the Kyoto Protocol.

This is the context in which the G8’s climate change commitments were made. The commitment to act at the UN Climate Change Conference (as the combined COP11 and COP/MOP1 meetings were called) was significant as fears existed that US cooling to the UNFCCC process would stall further negotiations. The G8 members’ recommitment to the Kyoto Protocol process of binding emissions reduction targets indicated a high level of political support by those G8 members that had ratified the Protocol.

All G8 member states did participate in the UN Climate Change Conference and all accepted a total of over forty key agreements. As dictated procedurally, those agreed to under the COP did include the United States and those under the COP/MOP did not. The most significant agreements that were reached included the adoption of the 2001 Marrakech Accords (the so-called ‘Kyoto Rulebook’ which established how many of the Protocol’s mechanisms would be enforced) and agreement for movement forward on post-2012 emissions reduction negotiations.

There has, however, been some concern registered by a number of governments and non-governmental organizations about the January 2005 meeting of the Asia Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate, which was established in July 2005 shortly after the Gleneagles G8 Summit and includes G8 members Japan and the United States. Some have suggested that this meeting would undermine the UNFCCC process which G8 member states recommitted to at Gleneagles, but it is as yet too early to assess the outcomes of that meeting.

Team Leader: Brian Kolenda
Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown

1. Canada: +1

As host of the United Nations Climate Change Conference in 2005, as well as in its own capacity, The Canadian government continued to move forward on climate change issues since the Gleneagles Summit and has thus far demonstrated full interim compliance with its Gleneagles commitments. Canada has acted in support of the Kyoto Protocol, both domestically and internationally, in spite of its well-documented poor record on meeting its Kyoto Protocol greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions targets.

Canada fully complied with its commitment to work at the UN Climate Change Conference in November and December 2005, particularly as hosts of the Conference. Canadian Minister of Environment Stéphane Dion re-announced on 27 November 2005 the Canadian Government’s plans to make it the first carbon-neutral conference via the retiring “of approximately 10,000 tonnes of certified emission reduction credits from Canadian-generated wind power.” Canada and the other delegates adopted more than 40 key decisions aimed at combating climate change. The Canadian government also announced the signing of six joint agreements, mainly memoranda of understanding, which relate to the Clean Development Mechanism and Joint Implementation with Mexico, India, Morocco, the Czech Republic, Indonesia, and Ukraine on 8 December 2005.998

Ottawa reduced emissions from a variety of sources since the Gleneagles Summit, with the goal of meeting its Kyoto emissions reduction targets. On 16 July 2005, the Canadian government published the Notice of Intent to Regulate Greenhouse Gas Emissions by Large Final Emitters.999 In August, the Canadian government created the Offset System which will “reward innovation and provide incentives to

---

reduce GHG emissions. On October 3rd 2005, new legislation was passed by Parliament to establish the Climate Fund Agency, which will begin to purchase Kyoto units and credits created by Canada’s own Domestic Offsets System on 31 March 2006. With adequate funding it is predicted that “purchases by the Climate Fund could yield reductions of between 75 and 115 megatonnes [of CO2-equivalent emissions] annually between 2008 and 2012”. Dion and John McCallum, Canadian Minister of Natural Resources, announced on 17 November 2005 additional efforts to build on activities of carbon dioxide capture and storage. On the following day, Dion and McCallum announced the creation of a partnership with the province of Prince Edward Island and private sector actors to increase the amount of wind energy produced in Canada. Dion, on 27 November 2005, announced that in order to “mitigate climate change”, the government of Canada would also invest CAD$2.7 million in research on the potential role of prairie wetlands and agricultural lands as carbon sinks and in reducing GHG emissions. Furthermore, on 22 November 2005, in an effort to strengthen regulation, the Canadian government added six greenhouse gases to Schedule 1 of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act 1999, allowing “for the introduction later in 2006 and implementation of regulations to ensure large industrial emitters meet their commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 45 megatonnes by 2008-2012.”

However, Canada has yet to show significant progress on reducing its greenhouse gas emissions, which have risen by 24% above 1990 levels, according to Canada’s National Inventory Report 1990-2003, far above Canada’s 6% reductions target. The failure is alongside other means through which the government of Canada has supported the Kyoto Protocol. For example, Mr. Dion travelled to several nations to discuss climate change and cooperation and met with the President of the World Bank to discuss the organization’s climate change program. Furthermore, during the Montreal Conference, Canada involved a wide range of groups and actors, including Canadian and international youth, with a parallel International Youth Summit on Climate Change, giving them the opportunity to present a Youth Declaration at the high-level Ministerial Session of the Conference. Voice was also given to the Arctic populations as Canada and the Arctic Council presented a statement on climate change in the Arctic during the High-Level Segment on 9 December 2005, to highlight the effects of global warming that have already begun to manifest themselves in Canada’s north. The Canadian government also sought the ideas and recommendations of 20 corporations representing a broad cross-section of the Canadian economy on the subjects of climate change and energy.

Analyst: Melissa Fourage
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2. France: +1

The French government continued to push forward on the issue of climate change in an attempt to meet and surpass its Kyoto targets and has thus demonstrated full compliance with its Gleneagles climate change commitments. The French government sent a delegation to the UN Climate Change Conference from November to December 2005 and has taken a number of actions to promote the Kyoto protocol and its own GHG emissions reductions targets within France.

France has taken significant action in the international community to combat climate change. A French delegation attended the UN Climate Change Conference in Montreal, where it presented its own climate plan and progress to date, helping to mobilize the international community. With the Kyoto Protocol’s 158 other signatories, France “approved crucial decisions on strengthening the treaty’s mechanisms… [and] agreed to launch negotiations from next May on cutting greenhouse gas pollution beyond 2012, when the present Kyoto pledges run out.” The French government also hosted the Third World Forum on Sustainable Development in Paris on 2 December 2005, where the participants focused their discussion on climate change.

Beyond verbal reiteration of France’s commitment to the Kyoto Protocol, the French government recently expanded its National Climate Plan and began new regulatory and legislative initiatives to tackle GHG emissions and meet its Kyoto targets. New initiatives have been added on to the National Climate Plan originally introduced in July 2004 by the French Ministry of Ecology and Sustainable Development, and the Minister, Nelly Olin, announced that an updated Climate Plan 2006 will be released mid-2006. A number of new financial measures to encourage the use of cleaner energy were announced by Prime Minister Dominique de Villepin at the end of 2005, including higher tax credits for the use of renewable energy or products with low CO₂ emissions, both in the areas of housing and vehicles.

On 6 January 2006, Olin demonstrated a new vehicle labelling program that will be mandatory as of 10 May 2006, which will require all vehicles in France to be labelled on a scale of A to G indicating levels of CO₂ emissions. The program will be expanded to all types of housing by 1 July 2007, and France’s two biggest car manufacturers, Renault and PSA, have already begun the use of the labelling program ahead of the May 2006 deadline. The research effort on clean transportation technology has also been reinforced by the government’s announcement in September 2005 of a €100 million research program which has as its goal the development of a small, fuel efficient vehicle that is low in CO₂ emissions and other pollutants by the end of the decade. In addition, Olin has announced that a government television and radio campaign, launched in 2004 to sensitize citizens to the issue of global warming, will be extended in 2006 to encourage individuals to work towards France’s Kyoto emissions reduction targets.

The French government has also acted quickly to implement the European Union Emission Trading Scheme (EU ETS) Linking Directive into national legislation, which sets out rules for participation in the scheme by French firms and was signed into law on October 26. The first meeting of the "Facteur 4" occurred in early September, with the objective of creating and evaluating ways of diminishing greenhouse gas emissions fourfold by 2050. The group has met three additional times since. At the national level, Olin held the "Rendez-Vous Climat 2005" in mid-November to mobilize a variety of stakeholders who have an interest in climate change, including various ministerial departments and civil society actors (such as NGOs, firms, and locally elected officials).

Analyst: Melissa Fourage

3. Germany: +1

The government of Germany acted comprehensively towards fulfilling its Gleneagles climate change commitments. It attended the Montreal UN Climate Change Conference and has instituted a number of policies that move it closer to fulfilling its Kyoto Protocol-mandated GHG emissions reductions targets.

The German delegation attended the COP11 and COP/MOP1 meetings in Montreal and negotiated with its European Union allies as a single bloc. Along with the other Parties, they agreed to a series of reforms that “continue[d] the course of the Kyoto Protocol” and set in motion a process for post-2012 commitments. Indeed, on 8 December 2005, just before the conclusion of the Montreal conference, Federal Minister of Environment Sigmar Gabriel announced the signing of a partnership to develop Clean Development Mechanism (a key Kyoto mechanism) projects between Germany and Mexico.

Throughout the Conference, Gabriel reiterated Germany’s position in support of the Kyoto Protocol, saying that Parties to the UNFCCC “need to build upon Kyoto, not … replace it”. The German government has also demonstrated its commitment to the Protocol by introducing a number of policies designed to reduce GHG emissions in the months after the Gleneagles G8 Summit. The government published the National Climate Protection Programme (NCPP) 2005 shortly after the Summit, which outlined measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the 2008-2012 period and establish “further ambitious environmental policies after 2012.” Even though Germany has attained considerable reductions in GHG emissions over 1990 levels, the NCPP sets out an ambitious plan for reductions of 30% by 2020.

Analyst: Afsheen Lalani
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4. Italy: +1

The Italian government complied with Gleneagles’ climate change commitments through participation in the United Nations Climate Change Conference and initiating several programs aimed at reducing GHG emissions to meet its Kyoto Protocol target of 8 percent below 1990 levels.

At the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Montreal, the Italian government, with its EU counterparts, signed a number of key agreements including a reinforcement of the Clean Development Mechanism, the details of a five-year program on adaptation, and the so-called Marrakech Accords. This full participation at the Conference fulfils a key portion of the Italian government’s Gleneagles commitment.

The Italian government has also undertaken a number of actions in support of the Kyoto Protocol. On 19 October 2005, Altero Matteoli, the Italian Minister of the Environment, announced a new anti-smog strategy under which €20 million would be spent by the Italian government on incentives for Italian automobile owners to convert gasoline-powered vehicles to run on natural gas or methane and construct distribution centres for those fuels. Under this scheme, some 40,000 automobiles are expected to be converted to fuels that emit less greenhouse gases. In December 2005, the European Commission approved a contribution of €853,000 to help operate the ratified Kyoto Protocol Clean Development Mechanism and establish the International Registry System, which, through Italy’s status as a Member State of the EU, can be regarded as Italian compliance to its commitment to support the Protocol. In October 2005, the second phase of European Climate Change Plan came into force, which began new programs aimed at tackling issues related to “carbon capture and storage, emissions from road vehicles, aviation and strategies to adapt to the effects of climate change.”

Analyst: Ayako Yamamoto

5. Japan: +1

The Japanese government registered full interim compliance with its Gleneagles climate change commitments.

Tokyo fulfilled its commitment to attend the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Montreal. The Japanese government signed, along with all other Parties to the Kyoto Protocol, various agreements, including reforms to the Clean Development Mechanism, details of a five-year program on adaptation, and the Marrakech Accords.

On 28 September 2005, Japan launched the Voluntary Emissions Trading Scheme, under which 34 selected companies and corporate groups are required to commit to their own targets on the reduction of greenhouse emissions, in exchange for subsidization of “the installation cost of CO₂ emissions reduction equipment to help businesses that are actively attempting to reduce greenhouse gas emissions” by the Ministry of Environment.
The Japanese Ministry of Environment’s most ambitious plan is a comprehensive Environmental Tax that was announced on 25 October 2005. A revision of a 2004 plan, the Japanese government now plans to introduce a comprehensive tax on consumption-related GHG emissions generated by end-users of energy by January 2007. The plan will create a tax on all carbon of about JPY2, 400 per ton of atmospheric emissions and is expected to contribute to a decrease in GHG emissions by 3.5% over 1990 levels. Annual tax revenues will be reinvested to fund research into energy efficient technologies.

In July 2005, following the Gleneagles Summit, Japan signed the pact creating the Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate. The group met from 11-12 January 2006 and has been criticized by some countries and environmental groups as an avoidance of Kyoto emissions reduction targets and as a challenge to the UNFCCC process on climate change. In spite of this, it appears that Japanese action through that partnership, particularly the creation of “taskforces in which governments and businesses create action plans to cut global warming emissions in sectors such as aluminium, cement, steel and power” may be successful in complementing Japan’s Kyoto emissions reduction targets.

Analyst: Ayako Yamamoto

6. Russia: +1

In spite of some criticism, the Russian government registered full compliance with one aspect of its commitment – to attend the UN Climate Change Conference in November – December 2005. Moscow sent a delegation to the UN Climate Change Conference in Montreal, where it agreed to over forty decisions regarding global efforts to fight climate change, as well as new agreements to deal with the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol. It was, however, widely reported that the Russian delegation blocked an agreement that referred to the extension of the Kyoto Protocol beyond 2012. At the end of the conference, Russian chief negotiator Alexander Bedritsky claimed that “the document as it stands now does not command consensus,” and requested the addition of “a mechanism for the approval of voluntary targets by non-Annex 1 countries.”

As a signatory of the Kyoto Protocol, the Russian government has ratified the Protocol but is exempted from any emissions reduction targets. Registering Russian compliance on the second part of its Gleneagles commitment to ‘continue to work to make the Kyoto Protocol a success’ thus must be seen in...
the context of Article 10 of the Kyoto Protocol, which calls for all signatories to act to stabilize emissions and to take voluntary measures to reduce emissions.1046

There have been few major statements or actions in support of the Kyoto Protocol or its objectives by the Russian government since Gleneagles, but particularly since the Russian government’s announcement of its National Action Plan on the Kyoto Protocol in March 2005.1046 The interdepartmental commission of Russia’s Cabinet responsible for implementation of the Kyoto Protocol sealed “draft rulings on greenhouse gas emission accounting and on responsibility segregation concerning the progress in Kyoto efforts” on 14 November 2005 and set out guidelines of a further bill on Kyoto implementation.1047 However, Mr. Vladimir Berdin of Russia’s Center for Preparation and Implementation of International Projects on Technical Assistance outlined in a September 2005 presentation that while a climate change cooperation scheme with the European Union had been started in the Summer of 2005,1048 most regulatory action and cooperation with other countries is still either in a planning or negotiating phase, particularly with regards to Joint Implementation projects.1049
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7. United Kingdom: +1

The government of the United Kingdom registered full compliance with its Gleneagles Summit commitments related to climate change. From 1-2 November 2005 the UK government hosted the first Ministerial meeting of the Dialogue on Climate Change, Clean Energy and Sustainable Development that was launched at Gleneagles. The UK government invited G8 energy and environment ministers and officials to meet and coordinate policy and organize international movement forward on climate change. The group reiterated support for discussion at the UN Climate Change Conference that was to start later that month.1050 The UK delegation led European Union negotiators at the UN Climate Change Conference in Montreal from 29 November to 9 December 2005, and along with the other parties to the Kyoto Protocol signed a number of key agreements.1051

On 7 September 2005, UK Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Margaret Beckett reiterated a commitment made in March 2005 that aims to allow, by April 2006, all UK Government Departments to make carbon offset investments for all departmental and ministerial air travel.1052 On 12 September 2005, Elliott Morely, UK Government minister for climate change and environment, urged individuals to use a UK government-supported scheme introduced by British Airways to offset emissions from air travel.1053 Following this strategy, Ms. Beckett and Transport Secretary Alistair Darling announced UK support for the inclusion of aviation emissions in the EU Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS).1054 On 29 October 2005, Mr. Elliot Morley, UK Minister of State for Climate Change and the Environment announced the introduction in Parliament of a set of regulations to bring the UK in line with
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the EU’s so-called Linking Directive, which sets out rules for the participation in the EU ETS by British firms.\textsuperscript{1055} Finally, on 1 December 2005, the UK Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs launched its "Tomorrow’s Climate, Today’s Challenge" campaign, that will last three years and will provide £6 million to fund projects run by local private organizations to raise awareness of climate change and promote attitudinal change.\textsuperscript{1056}

The UK Government announced on 5 September 2005 that it will extend funding of £2.5 million for 2006 and 2007 for the Renewable Energy And Energy Efficiency Partnership (REEP),\textsuperscript{1057} an international NGO that "is to accelerate the marketplace for renewable energy and energy efficiency."\textsuperscript{1058}

Finally, the United Kingdom both attended and hosted several international conferences to parallel and complement its efforts at the Montreal Conference to promote the Kyoto Protocol’s objectives. On 19 August 2005, Mr. Morley attended the informal Danish-organized Greenland Dialogue on Climate Change along with representatives from 19 other countries and spoke to the "urgency of the climate change challenge", reiterating the UK’s commitments to tackle this issue.\textsuperscript{1059} From 5-6 October 2005, the UK government hosted the conference Climate Change: The Business Forecast which invited over 300 delegates from "businesses in the UK, EU, G8 and the key emerging markets" to discuss climate change issues that were then used as input for the G8+Dialogue and the UN Climate Change Conference.\textsuperscript{1060} Following the G8 ministerial meeting held from 1-2 November, the UK additionally invited representatives from forty nations to the International Energy Efficiency conference from 2-3 November. The latter conference dealt with issues related to the European Commission Green Paper on energy efficiency and sought to develop international consensus around those issues.\textsuperscript{1061}
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8. United States: +1

The United States government registered full compliance with its Gleneagles commitment to "advance the global effort to tackle climate change at the UN Climate Change Conference in Montreal." While it signed the Kyoto Protocol in 1997, the United States has not yet ratified the global climate pact and so is exempt from the second part of the G8 Gleneagles climate change commitment, which calls for support of the Kyoto Protocol only by those who have ratified the agreement.

Washington sent a delegation to the UN Climate Change Conference in Montreal. However, the US government has been accused by many environmental campaigners of impeding global efforts in tackling climate change problems at the Conference.\textsuperscript{1062} The US delegation rejected a proposal from conference president and Canadian Environment Minister Stephane Dion, "to undertake a dialogue on future commitments under the auspices of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change."\textsuperscript{1063} Refusing to be included in broader negotiations on future commitments, Mr. Harlan Watson, the chief US negotiator, left the Conference early on 2 December 2005, which was scheduled to be the last date of the

\textsuperscript{1063} Alessandro Vitelli, US resisting overtures on climate change talks: participants, Platts Commodity News, (Hong Kong), 7 December 2005.
After intense discussions, revisions were made to the agreement and Watson returned to the Conference and later agreed to a document that commits to “a dialogue [on future emissions reductions], without prejudice to any future negotiations, commitments, process, framework or mandate” without a deadline for conclusion under the aegis of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.
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9. European Union: +1

The European Union registered full interim compliance with its Gleneagles climate change commitments. Attending the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Montreal, the 25 Member States of the EU negotiated as a bloc. Additionally, the UK G8 Presidency from July through December 2005 made climate change a priority during its mandate and the European Commission and European Parliament have, furthermore, acted in support of the Kyoto Protocol. Of some concern, however, is the extent to which these policies will be implemented in each of the EU’s Member States and whether they will contribute to a fulfilment of the EU15’s stated objective of an 8% reduction in GHGs by 2012 over 1990 levels.

The EU and its Member States all registered compliance with the part of the Gleneagles climate change commitment that mandated action on climate change at the United Nations Climate Change Conference. The EU negotiated as a bloc at the Conference and signed onto the same package of agreements as the other parties attending the COP11 and COP/MOP1 in Montreal.

In terms of support for the Kyoto Protocol and its goals, the UK EU Presidency expressed that “[c]limate change has been one of the main priority areas” in the post-Gleneagles period. The European Union’s energy commissioner Andris Piebalgs outlined on 8 December 2005 an EU action plan for the widespread use of biomass energy to reduce GHG emissions in the transportation, electricity production and heating and cooling sectors. It is anticipated that reforms to the EU Biofuels Directive will be completed in 2006 and that the potential CO2 savings that could result would be approximately 209 million tonnes of CO2-equivalent annually. The EU also agreed to a Partnership on Climate Change with the government of China on 5 September 2005 that would see EU expertise and Member States’ funding for projects in China to promote “development and demonstration of advanced, ‘zero emissions’ coal technology based on carbon dioxide capture and geological storage.”

The European Council of Environment Ministers on 5 December 2005 endorsed plans to expand the European Union Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS) to include emissions from international aviation.

This action is significant as that sector alone has contributed to 73% of the increase in EU emissions.

---

emissions from 1997 to 2003.\footnote{1072} The European Commission further announced on 21 December 2005 a directive to create a market to promote cleaner vehicles\footnote{1073}, and proposed its Euro 5 standard for vehicular emissions, which would see cuts in nitrous oxide (a GHG) emissions by 20\% and 25\% for gasoline and diesel automobiles, respectively.\footnote{1074} Finally, the European Parliament on 17 November 2005 voted to accept a report that would allow it to present its proposal to fight climate change by “building on key Kyoto elements - binding greenhouse gas emission targets, a global cap-and-trade system, and flexible mechanisms … [and] undertaking strong emissions reductions at home, starting with 20-30\% domestic reductions by 2020”.\footnote{1075}

Analyst: Afsheen Lalani

**Tsunami**

**Background**

On 26 December 2004, an earthquake under the Indian Ocean generated a massive tsunami that seriously affected the coastal regions of Southeast Asia, Asia and Africa, particularly Indonesia and Sri Lanka. Immediately thereafter, the world community reacted to the tragedy by sending humanitarian aid, foodstuffs and supplies. Cognizant that the tsunami had badly damaged the infrastructures and the economies of many developing countries, G8 Finance Ministers took the relief efforts further by proposing debt moratoriums, through the Paris Club, for tsunami-affected countries. The G8 has also encouraged the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and other multilateral establishments to contribute financial resources to post-tsunami humanitarian relief and reconstruction projects. Such reconstruction and rehabilitation projects will likely be costly and long-term, however, G8 governments have all reaffirmed their commitment to reconstruction and development plans. While the tsunami revealed the destructive forces of nature, the impact of the disaster would have been mitigated had an effective tsunami warning system been in place. At the World Conference on Disaster Reduction held in Kobe, Japan the G8 countries discussed strategies that might alleviate the impact of future tsunamis. The G8 is committed to finding a global solution that would both minimize the effects of and reduce the risk from future tsunamis. Thusly, the G8 expresses support for the UNESCO creation of an Indian Ocean Early Warning System.

Team Leader: Susan Khazaeli

**Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance -1</th>
<th>Work in Progress 0</th>
<th>Full Compliance +1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>France</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown:

1. Canada: +1

Canada is taking several measures in order to achieve compliance with its Gleneagles commitment regarding the Indian Ocean tsunami, and has, therefore, registered full compliance. Through the Paris Club creditors, the Canadian government not only agreed to freeze the debts of the tsunami-affected countries of Indonesia and Sri Lanka, but also added that these deferrals would be exempt from moratorium interest. In addition to this debt relief, the Canadian government earmarked approximately CAD$425 million for humanitarian aid, and post-tsunami rehabilitation and reconstruction, which will be made available incrementally over the next five years. The Canadian government remains committed to long-term reconstruction: to date, the Canadian government has issued CAD$166 million of its initial CAD$425 million pledge and has approved an estimated CAD$92.3 for reconstruction projects. As well, the Minister of International Cooperation, Ms. Aileen Carroll, announced on 22 November 2005, that the government would funnel an addition CAD$33 million through the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) in support of rehabilitation for the tsunami-affected countries of India, Indonesia, the Maldives and Sri Lanka. Speaking on the one-year anniversary of the tsunami, Prime Minister Paul Martin reaffirmed Canada's commitment to such projects, saying, “Reconstruction will take years, and Canada is prepared to go the distance. We will continue to assist those affected by the tsunami through direct support for the affected regions and through the promotion of global efforts to enhance international disaster risk reduction and disaster response efforts.”

The Canadian government encourages the reform of existing humanitarian system: the government has been working alongside international organizations, particularly with the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) arm, under the auspices of UNESCO, to help find a means of minimizing the impact of, and the risk from future tsunamis. As of 2 November 2005, the Canadian government contributed approximately CAD1 million toward the creation of an Indian Ocean tsunami early warning system, and plans to contribute more.

Analyst: Susan Khazaeli
2. France: +1

France has begun work to implement the commitment made at the Gleneagles Summit in regards to post-tsunami humanitarian aid and reconstruction. Through the private and public sector, the French government secured approximately €400 million for direct aid and promised an additional €300 million in “very prime-rate” loans to the affected region.1084 France, working through the Paris Club, pushed for debt moratoriums, estimated at €4 million, for the Indonesian and Sri Lankan governments.1085

In keeping with its commitment to reduce the risk from future disasters, the French government pledged up to €1.6 million, to be spent under the auspices of UNESCO, for the creation of the Indian Ocean Tsunami Warning System (IOTWS).1086 While the French government demonstrated support for humanitarian aid and reconstruction, it has yet to deliver on the entirety of its pledges.1087

Analyst: Sakshi Mehta

3. Germany: +1

Germany has fully complied with its G8 commitment on the Indian Ocean tsunami. The German government encourages the improvement of the existing prevention and response systems. It is currently preparing, under the aegis of the UN, for its role as host to the upcoming International Early Warning Conference III; scheduled to take place from 27-29 March in Bonn.1088 The purpose of the Conference is to “work systematically at a global level to close the gaps still remaining” in the field of early-warnings, damage control, and risk reduction.1089 The government is also demonstrating support for the work of the UN on post-tsunami humanitarian aid and reconstruction: A German representative attended the twelfth session of the UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR) task force, which was held from 22-23 November 2005.1090

Since the German government acknowledges that it is impossible to prevent natural disasters, the German Cooperation Agency (GTZ) is funding and coordinating microfinance initiatives that might better equip vulnerable populations, particularly in the tsunami-affected regions, to cope post-disaster.1091 On 15 December 2005, the German government, in accordance with its Gleneagles commitment, pledged to contribute approximately US$500 million to the UN Central Emergency Revolving Fund.1092 According to the Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development, Ms. Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul, the government has taken such measures “to ensure that there is a smooth transition from emergency relief
to long-term development cooperation so that the support is sustainable.\textsuperscript{1093} Other positive actions on the part of the German government include: working alongside the European Union to secure funds and coordinate resources for humanitarian efforts and reconstruction activities.\textsuperscript{1094}

Analyst: Aaron Ghobarah

4. Italy: 0

The Italian government is taking steps to achieve compliance with its G8 commitment regarding the Indian Ocean Tsunami. As of 28 December 2005, total Italian aid from the public and private sectors totalled €163.3 million.\textsuperscript{1095} Of this total, over €10 million has been directed toward supporting emergency interventions, rehabilitation, and reconstruction.\textsuperscript{1096} The Italian government also offered assistance loans of US$31 million to Indonesia and of US$7.2 million to Sri Lanka in order to alleviate the reconstruction burden.\textsuperscript{1097}

While the government's pledge of US$99 million ranks Italy 18 among the largest contributors to long-term reconstruction plans,\textsuperscript{1098} it has yet to fully deliver on several commitments. A large portion of the funds earmarked for such reconstruction projects, including its commitment of US$1.2 million for the creation of the UNESCO-sponsored Indian Ocean Tsunami Warning System, has not been disbursed.\textsuperscript{1099} Further action on the part of Italy is necessary if it is to register full compliance with its G8 commitments.

Analyst: My-Hanh Hoang

5. Japan: 0

Japan is working towards fulfilling its commitment regarding post-tsunami aid and reconstruction. Immediately after Gleneagles, Prime Minister Koizumi solidified his G8 commitment at the Japan-Bangladesh Summit Meeting, announcing that Japan would direct its Official Development Assistance for the creation of a Tsunami Early Warning System in the Indian Ocean and, concluded an Exchange of Notes, stipulating that Japan will provide a grant assistance of ¥866 million for the development of meteorological radars in Bangladesh for the detection of natural disasters.\textsuperscript{1100} As of 26 December 2005, the Japanese government extended bilateral grants of ¥14.6 billion to Indonesia, ¥8 billion to Sri Lanka, and ¥2 billion to Maldives both for humanitarian assistance and for reconstruction projects.\textsuperscript{1101}

In terms of reducing risks from future disasters, the government contributed 15 seismic sensors and accelerometers to help Indonesia support its tsunami early-warning and disaster mitigation systems.\textsuperscript{1102} The Japan Meteorological Agency also announced that it plans to use data from international seismometers to create a superior rapid warning network, which is slated to begin incorporating


\textsuperscript{1096} Interview with Minister Gianfranco Fini: “Tsunami, Italy has done a lot,” Ministry of Foreign Affairs, (Rome), 12 December 2005. Date of Access: 6 January 2006 http://www.esteri.it/eng/0_1_01.asp?id=1259.


\textsuperscript{1102} Five Countries to Provide Equipment for Tsunami Warning. Antara: The Indonesian National News Agency, (Jakarta), 27 September 2005: page 1
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necessary data by April of 2006.\textsuperscript{1103} Until this system is completed, the Indian Ocean countries will continue to be monitored by the Pacific Tsunami Warning System, which works in tandem with the Japan Meteorological Agency and other agencies to co-ordinate both observation and emergency communication.\textsuperscript{1104} However, in order for Japan to achieve full compliance, it must demonstrate greater support for UN work on post-tsunami humanitarian assistance and reconstruction projects.

Analyst: Aprile Cadeau

6. Russia: 0

The Russian government is taking steps in accordance with its G8 commitment regarding the Indian Ocean Tsunami. On 9 August 2005, a Russian ship, the Amoryllis, delivered 20,000 tons of wheat to Jakarta.\textsuperscript{1105} This cargo represents just one aspect of Russia's humanitarian aid effort for the tsunami-affected country of Indonesia.\textsuperscript{1106} The Russian government, through its emergency response agency, Emercom, has also participated in UN post-tsunami humanitarian aid and reconstruction projects. While it gave US$3.5 million in support of WHO post-tsunami activities, the Russian government has been generally slow in disbursing promised funds to various organizations.\textsuperscript{1107} Thus far, the Russia government has accumulated an estimated total of US$18.5 million in outstanding, or uncommitted pledges.\textsuperscript{1108}

Analyst: My-Hanh Hoang

7. United Kingdom: +1

The British government has fulfilled the tsunami commitments to which it agreed at the 2005 G8 Summit, undertaking initiatives supportive of all broad aspects of the commitment. The United Kingdom offered financial support of the International Oceanographic Commission's plan to implement early warning systems in the Indian Ocean “when funding requirements are clarified.”\textsuperscript{1109} Having already pledged US$70 million to the UN Central Emergency Revolving Fund,\textsuperscript{1110} the government is also actively involved in the UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR); a British representative attended the twelfth session of the ISDR's task force on disaster reduction held in November 2005.\textsuperscript{1111} On 8 December 2005, the Minister for International Development, Gareth Thomas announced the pledge to contribute an additional £1.5 million in reconstruction to the seriously affected North East region of Sri Lanka.\textsuperscript{1112} On 20


December 2005, the British government donated another £23.6 million to support reconstruction and economic stimulus programs in the Aceh province of Indonesia.  

Although not specifically related to the Gleneagles tsunami commitment, it ought to be noted that the United Kingdom is working in close partnership with the European Union: contributing £55 million in humanitarian and development assistance to be coordinated and spent in the affected areas.

Analyst: Aaron Ghobarah

8. United States: +1

The US has put forth a strong effort to achieve compliance with the G8 commitment as regards to post-tsunami aid and reconstruction. As of 2 December 2005, the US Congress designated US$907.3 million toward long-term sustained rebuilding and recovery of tsunami-affected regions, with US$656 million earmarked for the US Agency for International Development's Tsunami Recovery and Reconstruction Fund. Concerning its stated commitment to reduce the risk from future disasters, the US is actively engaged in UN reconstruction activities, including the UN's International Strategy for Disaster Reduction and has lent its support to UNESCO's International Oceanographic Commission's efforts for the creation of an early-warning system for 16 different states. Since Hurricane Katrina, the Bush administration has taken action to expedite current plans for an estimated US$37.5 million expansion of the US tsunami early-warning network, which will include an additional 32 seafloor sensors, and an unprecedented 7 such sensors in the Atlantic and in the Caribbean. In addition, the US pledged that it would supply Indonesia with more equipment to support an early-warning system.

The US Trade and Development Agency also granted US$650,000 for the Indian Ocean states to set up an early-warning system and work on reconstruction following a meeting with the Director of the Indonesian Meteorological and Geophysical Agency, Sri Woro Harijono. As well, the US provided US$16.6 million to support plans for the Indian Ocean Tsunami Warning System, in which US private sector experts will work within the affected countries to improve the IOTWS. At the end of December, the United States National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) engaged in the installation of 25 supplementary sea-level buoys in the Indian Ocean, and committed to more in the future. Speaking on the first anniversary of the tsunami, a spokesman for the US State Department reaffirmed America’s commitment to reconstruction and rehabilitation efforts. He said: “The United States government provided US$411 million for tsunami relief and reconstruction, and the American people have contributed more than US$1.8 billion in private funds.”

Analyst: Aprile Cadeau

9. European Union: +1

The European Union is taking several positive measures towards achieving compliance with the G8 commitment regarding post-tsunami humanitarian aid and reconstruction. The European Union committed €566 million in humanitarian aid assistance and, €1.5 billion in rehabilitation and reconstruction, bringing its total pledged in excess of €2 billion for tsunami-affected regions.\(^{1124}\) Of this total amount, the European Commission alone pledged an additional €20 million to the €103 million already mobilized for humanitarian aid,\(^{1125}\) and promised €350 million for long-term reconstruction projects in the “worst-affected areas.”\(^{1126}\) In addition, the European Union supports the work on the UN and other agencies, including UNESCO’s Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) in the development of early warning systems to reduce the risk from future disasters, and in the improvement of the rapid assessment and response capacity of the humanitarian systems.\(^{1127}\)

Analyst: Sakshi Mehta


Surface Transportation

Commitment

“We will encourage the development of cleaner, more efficient and lower-emitting vehicles, and promote their deployment, by: Adopting ambitious policies to encourage sales of such vehicles in our countries, including making use of public procurement as appropriate to accelerate market development;”

- Gleneagles Plan of Action: Climate Change, Clean Energy, and Sustainable Development

Background

According to official UNFCC figures released in November 2005, transportation accounts for between 17 percent and 26 percent of G8 member stats’ greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The G8’s commitment to the promotion of more environmentally-friendly and fuel-efficient vehicles can thus be seen in the context of a wider effort to generate consensus around international action on climate change, particularly with the United States and other large emitters resisting pressure to join into international legally-binding commitments to make emissions reductions. Indeed, “the development of cleaner, more efficient and lower-emitting vehicles” is a policy area around which even governments that dismiss the importance of climate change can come together as part of a larger international consensus, as the issue is often one framed in terms of energy security and energy independence, particularly from imported oil.

Team Leader: Brian Kolenda

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown

1. Canada: +1

As the following initiatives will show, the Canadian government has thus far taken significant measures to comply with its Gleneagles commitment to encourage the development and sales of “cleaner, more efficient and lower-emitting vehicles” in support of reducing the emission of harmful greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. If it continues in this stride, it will boast full compliance of its G8 commitment before the St. Petersburg G8 Summit.

The Canadian government, working in association with the Canadian Natural Gas Vehicle Alliance (CNGVA) on this initiative, renewed its commitment to encourage the sale of more efficient, lower-emitting vehicles by announcing an extension of the pilot project and an additional $1.8 million of funding on 27 July 2005.\(^{1129}\)

On 17 July 2005, Natural Resources Canada sponsored the world’s longest solar-car race, which began in Austin, Texas and ended in Calgary, Alberta.\(^{1130}\) The competition spurred 30 teams of university students from Canada and the United States to design, build, and race the fastest solar-energy vehicle in the continent. This event attracted innovators from both Canada and the US to help promote the development of solar vehicle technologies and the widespread use of solar-powered vehicles.

The Government of Canada also unveiled funding for its SmartDriver for Highway Trucking program, designed by Natural Resources Canada, at the Fergus Truck Show in Ontario on 22 July 2005. The program aims to educate truck drivers about fuel-efficient operating practices and “smart-driving” techniques.\(^{1131}\) Although the new training program is not in direct support of launching new efficient vehicles, it has as its aim to reduce vehicular emissions by promoting fuel-efficient driving habits.

On 7 September 2005, the Alberta Research Council (ARC) together with Natural Resources Canada announced the launch of an online Biofuels Quality Registry where biodiesel producers can sign up to have their products tested for quality.\(^{1132}\) The two-year program worth $100 000 per year encourages small and medium sized biodiesel producers and consumers to regularly register their products for quality analysis, and will provide monetary incentives to this end. The program is part of the Canadian Government’s Biodiesel Initiative, which falls under the $11.9 million Climate Change Plan for Canada effective from 2003 to 2007.\(^{1133}\) Providing resources for the development of the biodiesel industry builds consumer confidence in alternatives to traditional fuels harmful to the environment, such as gasoline, and may contribute to increased sales of products and vehicles that can run on these innovative sources of clean energy. It is also evident that the government is allocating funds to accelerate market development for biodiesel products.

Finally, the boldest move to encourage the sale of more fuel-efficient vehicles was made in November 2005 by Mr. John McCallum, Minister of National Revenue and Minister of Natural Resources. Minister McCallum announced a $3.6 million contribution through the Climate Change Technology Early Action Measures Program (TEAM) to Canadian companies developing natural gas vehicles in India and working to prepare them for widespread sale in the Indian market. “These technologies have the potential to


reduce emissions on an international scale, as well as create market opportunities for Canadian companies,” McCallum said.  

Analyst: Taleen Jakujyan

2. France: +1

The French government has recorded a high level of compliance with the commitments made at the Gleneagles Summit with regards to surface transportation and the reduction of harmful emissions via the use of clean vehicles. The French government has initiated several policies aimed at encouraging French motorists to use and buy low-emissions vehicles, plans to invest millions of Euros into research and development of cleaner automobiles, and states it will increase the fuel efficiency of its own vehicle fleet.

On 1 September 2005, Prime Minister Dominique de Villepin announced a series of reforms aimed at “[encouraging] new choices and behaviour,” and “to give a real boost to energy-saving measures” in the hopes of reducing French energy dependence in the face of high gas prices. A day later, Minister of Ecology and Sustainable Development Nelly Olin referred to the program, interpreting it as an emissions reduction initiative, not as a potential oil crisis solution. Nonetheless, the program, whose main goal is to encourage French motorists to use clean vehicles, allows the French government to meet some of the criteria of its Gleneagles commitment.

The reforms that de Villepin and Olin announced in September went into effect on 1 January 2006, marking an ambitious step by the French government to encourage the use of clean vehicles and reduce emissions. The government has increased the tax incentive given to motorists who drive low-emission vehicles from €1,525 to €2,000. Furthermore, the cost of registration documents has been altered to depend on the extent of vehicle pollution. Cars, emitting CO₂ levels between 200-250g/km will now be taxed €2/g, while cars emitting in excess of 250g/km, will be taxed €4/g.

Furthermore, the government will devote €100 million to the research and development within the next five years of a low-emission family vehicle that will emit less than 100g/km of CO₂.

---

The French government is further trying to spur consumers to move towards cleaner vehicles by example. By 2006, the government intends to replace most of its own vehicles with new ones that emit no more than 140g CO₂/km and eliminate all cars manufactured before 1997 from the government’s fleets. The efforts to this end, including the Fuel Strategy of the Federal Government to substitute traditional fuels with biofuels, are expected to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 8.5 million metric tons, against the 171-million-ton reduction target for the transportation sector. Other efforts to increase energy efficiency in German transportation are a tax-incentive program for low fuel consumption vehicles, a revamping of the German automotive industry’s promise to reduce CO₂ emissions in new vehicles, and the development of innovation to increase engine efficiency.

Many of the strategies outlined in the NCPP were reiterated in an article published by the German Embassy in the American capital. The article states that the federal government spent €193 million in 2005 on a market incentive program to promote the affordable use of renewable energies. It is unclear what portion of these funds were allocated or spent during the compliance period.

On 12 August 2005, German government officials met with their counterparts from the United States in Berlin to launch the U.S.-Germany Working Group on Energy, Development, and Climate Change. The working group is a follow up to the Mainz Declaration made in February of the same year US President George W. Bush and German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder and was created to implement directives outlined in the G8 Gleneagles Plan of Action (as well as the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and the World Summit on Sustainable Development Plan of Implementation). However,
information is not available to establish whether or not these strategies deal specifically, and significantly enough, with encouraging the development and marketing of fuel-efficient vehicles. German and American representatives also discussed options to improve collaboration specifically in the areas of energy supply, energy efficiency, and renewable sources. In addition, Germany is expected to join the Methane to Markets Partnership, which is an international initiative to reduce global methane emissions from three major sources of emission: coal mines, landfills and oil and gas systems.\textsuperscript{1149}

Analyst: Taleen Jakujyan

4. Italy: +1

Italy has already registered a high level of interim compliance with its Gleneagles Surface Transportation Commitment, proposing substantial national commitments that supplement its obligations under ambitious EU-wide compliance activities.

Italy’s efforts to promote the use of more environmentally-friendly vehicles have been significant. On 20 September 2005, the Italian Ministry of Environment and Territorial Protection released a press statement reaffirming its commitment to sustainable ground transport, and outlining Italy’s considerable efforts to promote sustainable transport and car-free commuting during ‘European mobility’ week held between 16 and 22 September, with planned activities in over 30 Italian cities.\textsuperscript{1150} The Ministry then made a major policy announcement on 19 October 2005, which provided a comprehensive set of measures to promote sustainable surface transport.\textsuperscript{1151} These included €20 million to promote clean fuels, including €15 million to finance an expansion of the Italian rebate program for the conversion of cars to methane and liquefied propane gas fuel (a new federal rebate of €350 that is non-cumulative with other incentives from local and regional governments),\textsuperscript{1152} and €5 million to procure sustainable vehicles for public transport systems.\textsuperscript{1153} On 15 November 2005 the Ministry signed and announced an agreement with the ‘I\textsuperscript{n}iziativa dei comuni per il car sharing (ICS)’\textsuperscript{1154} worth €10 million to establish an incentive program (up to €700 per person) for joining car sharing programs in major Italian cities.\textsuperscript{1155}

Italy has also complied or will soon comply with several EU-wide programs to promote fuel efficient and alternative energy vehicles. The European Commission announced on 21 December 2005 a directive to create a market to promote cleaner vehicles,\textsuperscript{1156} which would impose a quota for the purchase of clean vehicles on all public bodies (25 percent of annual procurement of heavy-duty vehicles over 3.5 tonnes), estimated to lead to the purchasing of 52,000 vehicles.\textsuperscript{1157} On that same day, the European Commission


\textsuperscript{1154} Iniziativa dei comuni per il car sharing (ICS), ICS, 8 January 2005, (Palermo, Italy), Date of Access: 8 January 2005. http://www.icscarsharing.it/.


also formally proposed its Euro 5 standard for vehicular emissions, which would see cuts in nitrous oxide emissions by 20 percent and 25 percent for gasoline and diesel automobiles, respectively.\(^{1158}\)

Analyst: Matto Mildenberger

5. Japan: 0

The Japanese government has registered some level of compliance with its Gleneagles commitment to promote environmentally-friendly surface transportation. It has advanced a number of initiatives to meet this commitment, including new taxation policies, but the majority of initiatives, including the Voluntary Emissions Trading Scheme, do not sufficiently address the issue of vehicular transport to justify, at this time, a score of full compliance.

Japan’s single major vehicular economy policy change since the Gleneagles summit is an ambitious initiative that would set new fuel economy standards for trucks and buses over 3.5 tonnes. The standards, which would come into effect in April 2006 and which represent the first such standards anywhere in the world, would aim to improve fuel efficiency by 12 percent over 2002 levels by 2015.\(^{1159}\)

Another ambitious initiative is the Japanese Ministry of Environment’s comprehensive Environmental Tax Plan that was announced on 25 October 2005. A revision of a 2004 plan, the Japanese government now plans to introduce a comprehensive tax on consumption-related GHG emissions, including the burning of fossil fuels in cars, by January 2007.\(^{1160}\) The plan would create a tax on gasoline of about ¥1.52 per litre of gasoline and is expected to lower consumption of gasoline and raise in total about ¥370 billion in annual revenue.\(^{1161}\) Some share of which would go to fund research into energy efficient technologies and “[p]romote the increase[d] use of energy-saving ... low emission cars.”\(^{1162}\) However, the Environment Ministry has not yet set a firm date for when the automobile-specific taxes will be introduced, which will likely be after the January 2007 commencement of the other emissions taxes.\(^{1163}\)

On 28 September 2005 Japan launched the Voluntary Emissions Trading Scheme, under which 34 selected companies and corporate groups are required to commit to their own targets on the reduction of greenhouse emissions in exchange for subsidization of the costs of retrofits.\(^{1164}\) These subsidies have the potential to be used for firm’s automobile fleets, but it is unclear what share, if any, of the subsidies will in the final implementation be devoted towards improving vehicular fuel economy or expanding the use of renewable energy sources in automobiles.

These measures taken by the Japanese government are a first step to demonstrating compliance with its Gleneagles commitment but the final two plans lack specificity of application to surface transport. Japan has yet to focus on market development for cleaner vehicles either by encouraging consumer sales of


fuel-efficient vehicles or using public procurement policies, which are both key elements of its Gleneagles commitment.

Analyst: Asif Farooq

6. Russia: -1

The Russian government has shown little evidence of compliance with the commitments it made at the Gleneagles Summit with regards to surface transportation and the promotion of low-emission vehicles. No official statement has been made by President Vladimir Putin or any of his ministers to indicate that the Russian government will endorse or move towards fulfilling any of these goals. Russia has made no effort to encourage Russian consumers to buy or drive low-emission vehicles, has made no changes to its procurement policies vis-à-vis cleaner vehicles, and has not made any substantial financial contribution or commitment into research and development of low-emission vehicles.

The only policy Russia has adopted towards reducing automobile emissions was verbalized at a press conference held by Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Alexander Yakovenko who announced that on 6 October 2005, the Russian government approved special technical regulations on requirements for emissions of harmful (polluting) substances of motor vehicles. This initiative imposes new criteria and standards for cars based on the Euro 2 standard for automobile emissions with the hope that this will allow for an eventual move towards Euro 3, 4 and 5 standards. Although this can be seen as a positive step towards the reduction of emissions caused by vehicles, with regards to the specific goals of the Gleneagles commitment, it falls short of compliance; the commitment clearly calls for the government to encourage and promote the use and development of cleaner, more fuel-efficient vehicles. While the government’s decision to require all Russian vehicles to meet the Euro 2 emissions standard is in the spirit of the commitment, it is not significant enough a development to be counted as evidence of compliance given “the gap in vehicular exhaust standards” that is exemplified in the fact that almost all the other G8 countries already require Euro 3, 4 and 5 emissions standards or their equivalent.

Analyst: Elaine Kanasewich

7. United Kingdom: +1

The government of the United Kingdom has already demonstrated a high level of interim compliance with its Gleneagles commitment to promote the development of fuel-efficient vehicles and technologies. It has engaged in a number of partnerships and regulatory initiatives domestically and has complied or will likely comply with a number of changes to European Union regulations.

The UK government’s actions on domestic regulation have been significant and broad, affecting a number of key transport sectors. To address emissions from private vehicles, a new consumer fuel efficiency labelling program was announced on 10 February 2005 by the Low Carbon Vehicle Partnership, a public-
private partnership which is funded by the UK Department for Transport and the Department of Trade and Transport.\(^{1168}\) The program was to be voluntarily carried out by all 42 automobile manufacturers operating in Britain in a program to last from July to September 2005.\(^{1169}\) UK Transport Secretary Alistair Darling announced on 10 November 2005 the implementation of the Renewable Transport Fuels Obligation, a new regulation which requires that 5% of all fuel sold in Britain by 2010 come from a renewable source, such as biomass, solar or wind. Darling estimated the potential CO\(_2\) savings in 2010 would be “1 million tonnes of carbon dioxide emissions in 2010 - the equivalent of taking a million cars off the road.”\(^{1170}\)

Its status as an EU Member State and EU President from July through December 2005 indicates a level of financial and political support for EU actions. The European Commission on 12 August 2005 adopted a Biomass Action Plan, which “includes proposals on the tightening of fuel standards for biomass … aims to promote investment in research, in particular in making liquid fuels out of wood and waste materials; and the running of information campaigns to inform farmers and forest owners about energy crops.”\(^{1171}\) It is anticipated that reforms to the EU Biofuels Directive will be completed in 2006 (whereupon the UK will be obligated to adopt them) and that the potential CO2 savings that could result would be approximately 209 million tons of CO\(_2\)-equivalent annually.\(^{1172}\) On 15 December 2005, the European Parliament voted in favour of an 2003 proposal to amend the 1999 Eurovignette Directive which would require all member states by 2010 to charge road fees for transport trucks that are based on the Euro fuel efficiency standards.\(^{1173}\) It is expected that the plan will download more emissions-related costs onto road users and improve total average EU truck fuel efficiency.\(^{1174}\)

Analyst: Brian Kolenda

8. United States: +1

The United States government has demonstrated full interim compliance with its Gleneagles commitment to the promotion of environmentally-friendly vehicles, notably through regulatory changes, international partnerships, significant enforcement activities related to existing regulations and the introduction of tax incentives.

There have been a number of regulatory changes introduced by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to address fuel efficiency standards since Gleneagles. On 29 December 2005 it introduced a new rule to mandate that automobile manufacturers must show that all cars and light-duty trucks that have minimum fuel efficiency standards applied to them will be able to meet those standards throughout the planned lifetime of the vehicle.\(^{1175}\) The EPA announced a proposal on 10 January 2006 that would see improvements to the testing procedures to make fuel efficiency estimates of vehicles more accurate for consumers deciding to purchase automobiles.\(^{1176}\)

In addition, the EPA has engaged in a number of international partnerships to promote fuel efficiency. The agency signed a memorandum of understanding with Canada’s Natural Resources Canada (NRCAn)


Ministry that lays out plans "to cooperate and share information in research, development, and projects to save fuel and reduce emissions".1177

Additionally, the US Justice Department has recently shown willingness to engage in significant fuel efficiency standards enforcement activity related to the Clean Air Act. It announced on 21 December 2005 a settlement with DaimlerChrysler in the amount of US$94 million to repair violations of emission control defects on 1.5 million Jeep and Dodge vehicles.1178

These regulatory and enforcement actions were complemented when, in August 2005, the US Congress created a new clean vehicular tax credit and passed the Energy Policy Act 2005. Coming into effect on 1 January 2006, the tax credits will reduce American consumers’ and firms’ tax liability by up to US$3,400 for each purchase of a fuel efficient vehicle.1179

Analyst: Asif Farooq

9. European Union: +1

The European Union has registered a high degree of interim compliance with the Gleneagles Surface Transportation Commitment, pursuing a comprehensive set of reforms and policies to facilitate the development of cleaner transport alternatives.

The main thrust of these efforts has been legislation passed through EU governance in the fall of 2005. Notably, on 20 September 2005, the European Parliament passed a lengthy directive to promote the reduction of vehicle emissions.1180 Critical elements of this directive included clarification and harmonization of emissions standards; commitment to require more expansive testing of vehicle emissions type and levels; commitment to improve the quality of motor fuel; provisions to require on-board diagnostics for the detection of deterioration in emission control equipment; and explicit permission to allow member states to offer tax incentives or subsidies to manufacturers in the clean surface transport sector.1181 Responsibility for the implementation of the directive was placed with the European Commission. It was followed on 21 December 2005 by a European Commission directive to create a market to promote cleaner vehicles.1182 This latter directive imposed a quota for the purchase of clean vehicles on all public bodies (25 percent of annual procurement of heavy-duty vehicles over 3.5 tonnes), estimated to lead to the purchasing of 52,000 vehicles.1183 The European Commission also formally
proposed its Euro 5 standard for vehicular emissions, which would see cuts in nitrous oxide (a GHG) emissions by 20% and 25% for gasoline and diesel automobiles, respectively.\textsuperscript{1184}

The EU continued the expansion and promotion of several of its existing ‘clean transport’ programs. On 8 July, the Directorate General for Energy and Transport “published its fourth and last call for proposals (total value of €214 million) under the 6th Framework Programme for Research, Technology Development and Demonstration”, available in three issue areas, including “Sustainable Surface Transport”.\textsuperscript{1185} Similarly, at the third annual meeting of the cities taking part in the EU’s CIVITAS program for cleaner and better transport in cities, Mr Jacques Barrot, EU Commissioner for Transport and Tourism, reiterated the Commission’s support to continue the program under the seventh Framework Programme for Research and Development (2007-2013), committing to select new demonstration cities in 2007 with a special emphasis on new EU member states.\textsuperscript{1186}

Analyst: Matto Mildenberger


Appendix
Priority Commitments: 2005 Gleneagles Summit

1. Peacekeeping
2005:3. (Chairman’s Summary) “The G8 in return agreed a comprehensive plan to support Africa’s progress. This is set out in our separate statement today. We agreed:
* to provide extra resources for Africa’s peacekeeping forces so that they can better deter, prevent and resolve conflicts in Africa.”

2. Good Governance (Africa)
2005:24. (Africa) “We will work vigorously for early ratification of the UN Convention Against Corruption and start discussions on mechanisms to ensure its effective implementation.”

2005:42. (Africa) “We will work to meet the financing needs for HIV/AIDS, including through the replenishment this year of the Global Fund to fight AIDS, TB and Malaria; and actively working with local stakeholders to implement the ‘3 Ones’ principles in all countries.”

4. Health (Polio Eradication)
2005:44. (Africa) “Supporting the Polio Eradication Initiative for the post eradication period in 2006-8 through continuing or increasing our own contributions toward the $829 million target and mobilising the support of others.”

5. Debt Relief (Africa)
2005:12. (Chairman’s Summary) “The G8 has also agreed that all of the debts owed by eligible heavily indebted poor countries to IDA, the International Monetary Fund and the African Development Fund should be cancelled, as set out in our Finance Ministers agreement on 11 June.”

6. Official Development Assistance to Africa (ODA)
(Chairman’s Summary) ”We have agreed to double aid for Africa by 2010. Aid for all developing countries will increase, according to the OECD, by around $50bn per year by 2010, of which at least $25bn extra per year for Africa.”

7. Promoting Growth (Africa)
2005:60. (Africa) “We agree to support a comprehensive set of actions to raise agricultural productivity, strengthen urban-rural linkages and empower the poor, based on national initiatives and in cooperation with the AU/NEPAD Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) and other African initiatives.”

8. Education (Africa)
2005:36. (Africa) “As part of this effort, we will work to support the Education for All agenda in Africa, including continuing our support for the Fast Track Initiative (FTI) and our efforts to help FTI-endorsed countries to develop sustainable capacity and identify the resources necessary to pursue their sustainable educational strategies.”

9. Trade (Africa)
2005:6. (Chairman’s Summary) “The G8 in return agreed a comprehensive plan to support Africa’s progress. This is set out in our separate statement today. We agreed:
* to stimulate growth, to improve the investment climate and to make trade work for Africa, including by helping to build Africa's capacity to trade and working to mobilise the extra investment in infrastructure which is needed for business.*

10. Trade (Export Subsidies)
2005:14. (Chairman’s Summary) “We reaffirmed our commitment to open markets more widely to trade in agricultural goods, industrial goods and services, and in agriculture to reduce trade distorting domestic subsidies and eliminate all forms of export subsidies by a credible end date.”

11. Trade (Least Developed Countries)
2005:15. (Chairman’s Summary) “We also committed to address products of interest to Least Developed Countries in the negotiations, and to ensure Least Developed Countries have the flexibility to decide their own economic strategies.”

12. Middle East Reform
2005:1. (Middle East Peace Process) “We support Mr Wolfensohn’s intention to stimulate a global financial contribution of up to $3bn per year over the coming three years. Domestic and international investors should be full partners to this process. We are mobilising practical support for Mr Wolfensohn’s efforts and look forward to further development of his plans and their presentation to the Quartet and the international community in September.”

13. Debt relief (Iraq)
2005:2. (Iraq) “We reaffirm our intention to reduce Iraq’s debt by implementing the terms of the November 2004 Paris Club agreement. We call on other creditors to provide debt relief on generous terms comparable to or even better than those agreed by the members of the Paris Club in November 2004.”

14. Sudan
2005:2. (Statement by the G8 and AU on Sudan) “We commend and will continue to support the African Union’s mission in Sudan (Darfur), just as we are contributing to UNMIS’s operation in southern Sudan.”

15. Terrorism
(G8 Statement on Counter-Terrorism) “We have carried forward initiatives to prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction to terrorists and other criminals, reinforce international political will to combat terrorism, secure radioactive sources and - as announced at Sea Island - ensure secure and facilitated travel. Today we commit ourselves to new joint efforts. We will work to improve the sharing of information on the movement of terrorists across international borders.”

16. Non-Proliferation
2005:11. (G8 Statement on Non-Proliferation) “We renew our pledge to raise up to $20 billion over ten years to 2012 for Global Partnership priorities, initially in Russia.”

17. Transnational Crime
2005:4. (Reducing IPR Piracy and Counterfeiting Through More Effective Enforcement) “We are deepening these efforts at home and abroad, with the aim of reducing substantially global trade in pirated and counterfeit goods, and efficiently combating the transnational networks that support it. In particular, we will take further concrete steps to:
* Improve co-ordination of anti-counterfeiting and anti-piracy crime strategies, and ensure closer co-operation among enforcement officials, including through shared risk analysis, exchange of
best practice, enhanced existing cooperation at international borders, and between
governments and the private sector;”

18. Renewable Energy
2005:1. (Chairman’s Summary) “We resolved to take urgent action to meet the challenges we face. The Gleneagles Plan of Action which we have agreed demonstrates our commitment. We will take measures to develop markets for clean energy technologies, to increase their availability in developing countries, and to help vulnerable communities adapt to the impact of climate change.”

19. Climate Change
2005:2. (Chairman’s Summary) “We will advance the global effort to tackle climate change at the UN Climate Change Conference in Montreal later this year. Those of us who have ratified the Kyoto Protocol remain committed to it, and will continue to work to make it a success.”

20. Tsunami
2005:16. (Chairman’s Summary) “Six months on from the enormous tragedy of the Indian Ocean disaster on 26 December 2004, we have underlined our support for UN work on post-tsunami humanitarian aid and reconstruction, as well as confirming our commitment to reduce the risk from future disasters and to encourage reform of the humanitarian system.”

21. Surface Transportation
2005:9. (Gleneagles Plan of Action: Climate Change, Clean Energy, and Sustainable Development) “We will encourage the development of cleaner, more efficient and lower-emitting vehicles, and promote their deployment, by:
* Adopting ambitious policies to encourage sales of such vehicles in our countries, including making use of public procurement as appropriate to accelerate market development.”