



G8 Research Group

St. Petersburg Interim Compliance Report

20 July 2006 to 31 December 2006

Prepared by

Dr. Ella Kokotsis, Dr. Marina Larionova

Brian Kolenda, Matto Mildeberger, Janet Chow, Laura Sunderland,
the University of Toronto G8 Research Group

and the State University Higher School of Economics (Moscow) G8 Research Group

16 February 2007

(revised 9 March 2007)

www.g8.utoronto.ca

g8@utoronto.ca



Contents

- Preface..... 3
- Summary 4
- Research Team 6
- Special Considerations 7
- Table A: 2006 St. Petersburg Interim Compliance Scores 9
- Table B: G8 Compliance by Country, 1996-200610
- Table C: G8 Compliance by Issue, 1996-200611
- Table D: 2006 Priority Commitment Interim Compliance.....12
 - 1. Global Fund on HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria13
 - 2. Health: Tuberculosis.....19
 - 3. Health: Polio [43]23
 - 4. Energy: Oil and Energy Reserve Data Collection - JODI29
 - 5. Energy Intensity [99]36
 - 6. Surface Transportation [116]41
 - 7. Renewable Energy [156].....47
 - 8. Climate Change [162]54
 - 9. Education: Academic Mobility [188]62
 - 10. Education: Qualification Systems [191].....71
 - 11. Education: Gender Disparities [205]77
 - 12. Africa: Security84
 - 13. Africa: Debt Relief [226]91
 - 14. Transnational Crime and Corruption [232].....98
 - 15. Intellectual Property Rights [247].....106
 - 16. Trade: Export Subsidies and Agriculture [257]113
 - 17. Counterterrorism: Energy [263].....121
 - 18. Stabilization and Reconstruction [288].....131
 - 19. Global Partnership: Non-Proliferation [306]139
 - 20. Middle East: Lebanon [307].....146

Note: Numbers in square brackets represent identification number in the list of all 317 commitments identified in all St. Petersburg communiqués. For a full list of commitments, see www.g8.utoronto.ca/evaluations/G8_commitments.pdf

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 2006 Interim Compliance report, 20 priority commitments were selected from the record 317 commitments made at the St. Petersburg Summit, hosted by the Russian Federation from July 15 to 17, 2006. This report assesses the results of compliance with those commitments as of December 31, 2006. This year, the G8 Research Group in Toronto and the State University Higher School of Economics (HSE) in Moscow are collaborating on the reports for Germany and Russia. For this interim report, the Toronto team had final responsibility for all Germany scores and the HSE team had final responsibility for all Russian scores. Instances where the Toronto team disagreed with a score for Russia are noted throughout the document. Both teams will collaborate on the final compliance report that will be released in May 2007.

To make its assessments, the G8 Research Group relies on publicly available information, documentation and media reports. In an ongoing effort to ensure the accuracy, integrity and comprehensiveness of these reports, we encourage comments and suggestions. Any feedback remains anonymous and would not be attributed. Responsibility for this report's contents lies exclusively with the authors and analysts of the G8 Research Group.

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 Janet Chow, chair of the student executive, as well as Brian Kolenda and Matto Mildenberger, with the support of Dr Ella Kokotsis, Director of Analytical Research, and Laura Sunderland, Senior Researcher.

John Kirton
Director
G8 Research Group
Toronto, Canada

Summary

The University of Toronto's G8 Research Group has completed its fifth annual Interim Compliance Report, based on the results from the G8's compliance from July 2006 to January 2007 with their 20 priority commitments reached at the 2006 St. Petersburg Summit. 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 Russian Federation to Germany on January 1, 2007.

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 2007 Heiligendamm 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 20 priority commitments, including three from the Summit's 'Fight Against Infectious Disease' theme (Global Fund, Tuberculosis, Polio), three from the Summit's 'Education for Innovative Society in the 21st century' theme (Academic Mobility, Education Qualification Systems, Gender Disparities), and five from the Summit's 'Global Energy Security' theme (Oil and Energy Reserve Data Collections, Energy Intensity, Surface Transport, Renewable Energy, Climate Change). 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 2006 St. Petersburg Summit until January 2007, G8 members and the EU have achieved a compliance score of 0.33 (see Table A). This average is based on a scale whereby 1.0 is equivalent to perfect compliance and -1.0 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.

The interim compliance score of 0.31 is significantly lower than interim compliance at recent G8 summits including 0.47 for Gleneagles (2005), 0.40 for Sea Island (2004), and 0.47 for Evian (2003), and only slightly higher than 0.25 for Kananaskis (2002).

Compliance by Country

Traditionally high-compliant United Kingdom sets the compliance standard across all 20 commitments observed again a score of 0.55, followed closely by Germany at 0.45¹, a significantly better ranking than its seventh place ranking at a similar point during the Gleneagles compliance period. In fact, Germany has already achieved the same level of compliance with its St. Petersburg commitments than its historical average total compliance score. Canada follows with a compliance score of 0.40, maintaining its historically high compliance position, though it still marks a modest decline from previous interim compliance rankings that placed Canada at or ahead of the compliance pack. The United States, with a compliance score of 0.35 ranks fourth, a return to historical averages after unusually high interim compliance during last year's Gleneagles compliance period. Tied for 5th are Japan, France and Russia, all with compliance scores of 0.25. For Japan, this represents a sustained rise in summit compliance rankings. Russia's score is a marked improvement from a similar point in last year's Gleneagles reporting period.² By contrast, Italy falls in its compliance levels and becomes the only G8 country to score in the negative range, with an interim compliance score of -0.05.

For six of the eight G8 member countries, as well as the European Union, the interim compliance score is down relative to their compliance score at a similar point during the Gleneagles compliance period. These declines range in scope from a -34% decline for Italy, to a -8% decline for Canada. By contrast, Germany bucks this trend and records an 9% increase in its compliance score relative to its Gleneagles interim compliance, and Russia improves 28% in its compliance over a similar period last year.

¹ The European Union has a compliance score of 0.53, on par with its historically high compliance scores.

² Note: The HSE team had ultimate responsibility for Russia's scores. The Russia scores for commitments 7, 12 and 19 were disputed by the Toronto team. The Toronto team's analysis yielded an interim compliance score of 0.10 for Russia. See Table A for details of commitment scores in dispute.

The Compliance Gap between Countries

After reaching a high at nearly 0.90 for the Gleneagles Interim Compliance period, the compliance gap between member countries decreased significantly to 0.59 (0.54 for the United Kingdom to -0.05 for Italy). This compliance gap is comparable to the 0.50 at the interim point post-Sea Island but still higher than the 0.25 at the interim period post-Evian. At a similar point post-Kananaskis, where the overall compliance level was comparable to that described here for the St. Petersburg summit, the compliance gap was still substantially higher, hitting 0.77.

Compliance by Issue Area

Compliance by issue area also varies considerably at the interim point. Of the 20 priority issues assessed, on the Oil and Energy Reserve Data (JODI) commitment and the Middle East/Lebanon commitment that called for the provision of economic and humanitarian support to the Lebanese people achieved a perfect compliance score of 1.0. Here, perfect compliance reflects unanimous efforts to enhance the collecting and reporting of market data on oil and other energy sources, including through the development of a global common standard for reporting oil and other energy reserves, and alternatively, sufficient and substantial economic and humanitarian support. Only three other commitments attain scores above 0.50. A commitment to support the Global Partnership against non-proliferation scored 0.78 and one to facilitate renewable energy development in developing countries attained a score of 0.67. A commitment to renew reaffirmation of climate change-related commitments made at Gleneagles followed close behind with scores of 0.56. At a similar point in the post-Gleneagles period, 9 of 21 priority commitments treated attained interim compliance scores above 0.50, including 3 with perfect compliance scores. Here, the next ranked commitment is that supporting the eradication of polio, achieving a compliance score of 0.44. Commitments on debt relief in Africa, economic goals of energy intensity and the elimination of gender disparities in education also attain scores above the compliance median (0.22), each with a recorded compliance score of 0.33

At 0.22 are commitments regarding the development of sustainable methods of surface transportation, one relating to the development of the African Standby Force, and one on the elimination of trade-distorting subsidies to agriculture. This latter agricultural commitment is notable in that its constituent national compliance scores were unusually polarized with four scores of +1, three scores of 0, and 2 scores of -1. A commitment to create websites in each G8 country providing information on intellectual property rights ranks next, with a low interim compliance score of 0.13, closely followed by three commitments that registered a similarly depressed score of 0.11: one to improve academic mobility, one relating to the Global Fund, and one relating to the protection of global energy infrastructure from terrorism.

Four commitments saw aggregate compliance scores of 0 - one relating to the fight against transnational crime and corruption, one regarding United Nations reforms for stabilisation and the reconstruction, one supporting the Global Plan to Stop TB, and one regarding the sharing of information about academic qualification systems. In all except the last of these, all G8 countries and the EU received a common score of 0, indicating a unanimous "work in progress". Unlike previous years, no commitments had scores in the negative range.

Compliance in Summit Priority Issue Areas

The Russian government identified three thematic priorities for the St. Petersburg summit: energy security, infectious diseases, and education. Compliance in these issue areas varied. Five representative commitments were drawn from the energy security summit document. These had an average compliance score of 0.53, substantially higher than the overall interim compliance average of 0.31, and but below G8 historical compliance averages with energy and environment commitments (see Table D). Compliance with the infectious disease and education commitments was more depressed, with the G8 registering average compliance scores of 0.19 and 0.15 in those areas, respectively - well below the average 2006 interim compliance score as well as average historical interim compliance levels in health and education.

Research Team

Professor John Kirton, Director, G8 Research Group
Dr. Marina Larionova, Chair, HSE Research Team
Dr. Ella Kokotsis, Director of Analytical Research, G8 Research Group
Janet Chow, Student Chair, G8 Research Group
Brian Kolenda, Co-Director, Compliance Unit
Matto Mildenberger, Co-Director, Compliance Unit
Laura Sunderland, Senior Researcher, G8 Research Group
Katya Gorbunova, HSE Research Team Leader

Team Leaders

Héloïse Apestéguy-Reux	Samreen Beg	James Meers
Brian Kolenda	Jeff Claydon	Jonathan Scotland
Matto Mildenberger	Michael Erdman	Cliff Vanderlinden
Julia Muravska	Courtney Hood	
Sadia Rafiquddin	Susan Khazaeli	

University of Toronto Analysts

Zeeshawn Ali	Erin Haines	Philippa Leslie
Dunja Apostolov	Ioana Hancas	Anita Li
John Alexander Ashbourne	Sina Hariri	Iryna Lozynska
Fritz Bartel	Haley Hatch	Ekaterina Mamontova
Greg Beres	John Howell	Aziza Mohammed
Farnam Bidgoli	Sophia Huda	Sumera Nabi
Viktor Brech	Stephanie Ing	Dediu Adina Nicoleta
Giovanni Bruno	Maria Delia Ionescu	Elvira Omarbagaeva
Navona Calarco	Taleen Jakujyan	Egor Ouzikov
Frances Cation	Katherine Kanczuga	Hilary Peden
Oana Chivaran	Rustana Kardasovski	Bonny Poon
Christian Cianfrone	Adrianna Kardynal	Kayla Pries
Rasta Daei	Nadjiba Karimi	Jen Quito
Gabriel De Roche	Sahar Kazranian	Esmahan Razavi
Hana Dhanji	Aftab Khan	Farah Saleem
Kirby Dier	Aisha Khan	Doug Sarro
Mark Donald	Susan Khazaeli	Daniela Scur
Kyle D'Souza	Mila Khodskaya	Vera Serdiuk
Qi Fang	Sarah Kim	Golta Shahidi
Erin Fitzgerald	Sarah Koerner	Dipna Singh
Charlotte Freeman-Shaw	Kathryn Kotris	Joseph Tabago
Katrin Geenen	Catherine Kunz	Christopher VanBerkum
Yinuo Geng	Augustine Kwok	Frida Wallin
Matthias Gerber	Alexandra Lapin	Jeremy Weiss
Aaron Ghobarah	Mariann Lau	Venus Yam
Sandro Gianella	Stephanie Law	Loretta Yau
Gunwat Gill	Dana Lepshokova	Tatyana Zeljkovic

State University Higher School of Economics (Moscow) Analysts

Elena Bylina	Maria Kaloshkina	Yuriy Zaitsev
Igor Churkin	Arina Shadrikova	
Natalia Churkina	Yulaj Sultanov	

Editing Committee

Farnam Bidgoli	Susan Khazaeli	James Meers
Viktor Brech	Catherine Kunz	Jen Quito
Michael Erdman	Alexandra Lapin	Cliff Vanderlinden

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 a G8 communiqué may also be encoded precisely or partially in communiqués from other international forums, the decisions of other international organizations, or even national statements such as the State of the Union Address in the U.S., the Queen's Speech in the UK and the Speech from the Throne in Canada. Without detailed process-tracing, it cannot be assumed that compliant behaviour on the part of countries is fully caused by the single fact of a previous G8 commitment.
- ♣ Compliance here is assessed against the precise, particular commitments made by the G8, rather than what some might regard as necessary or appropriate action to solve the problem being addressed.
- ♣ With compliance assessed on a three-point scale, judgements inevitably arise about whether particular actions warrant the specific numerical value assigned. As individual members can sometimes take different actions to comply with the same commitment, no standardized cross-national evaluative criterion can always be used. Comments regarding the judgements in each case, detailed in the extensive accompanying notes, are welcome (see below).
- ♣ Because the evaluative scale used in this compliance report runs from -100 percent to +100 percent, it should be assumed that any score in the positive range represents at least some compliance with the specific commitments made by the G8. It is not known if commitments in other international forums or at the national level on occasions such as the State of the Union Address, Queen's Speech or Speech from the Throne, etc., are complied with to a greater or lesser degree than the commitments made by the G8.
- ♣ It may be that commitments containing high degrees of precision, obligation and delegation, with short specified timetables for implementation, may induce governments to act simply to meet the specified commitment rather than in ways best designed to address core and underlying problems over a longer term.
- ♣ In some cases, full compliance by all members of the G8 with a commitment is contingent on cooperative behaviour on the part of other actors.
- ♣ The report was compiled in conjunction with the team from the State University Higher School of Economics. Canadian and Russian analysts collaborated on the reports for Germany and

Russia, but the Toronto team had final responsibility for all Germany scores and the HSE team had final responsibility for all Russian scores. Instances where the Toronto team disagreed with a score for Russia are noted throughout the document.

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 2006 St. Petersburg commitments. As always, comments are welcomed and would be considered as part of an analytical reassessment. Please send your feedback to g8@utoronto.ca.

Table A: 2006 St. Petersburg Interim Compliance Scores

No.	Issue Area	CAD	FRA	GER	ITA	JAP	RUS	UK	USA	EU	Issue Average
1	Health (Global Fund)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.11
2	Health (Tuberculosis)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
3	Health (Polio)	1	0	1	-1	0	1	1	1	0	0.44
4	Energy (Oil and Energy Reserve Data Collection)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.00
5	Energy Intensity	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0.33
6	Surface Transport	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0.22
7	Renewable Energy	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0.67
8	Climate Change	-1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0.56
9	Education (Academic Mobility)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.11
10	Education (Qualification Systems)	0	0	1	-1	-1	-1	0	1	1	0.00
11	Education (Gender Disparities)	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.33
12	Africa (Security)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.22
13	Africa (Debt Relief)	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.33
14	Transnational Crime and Corruption	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
15	Intellectual Property Rights	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	N/A	0.13
16	Trade (Export Subsidies, Agriculture)	1	-1	1	-1	1	0	1	0	0	0.22
17	Counter-terrorism (Energy)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.11
18	Stabilization and Reconstruction (UN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
19	Global Partnership (Non-Proliferation)	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0.78
20	Middle East (Lebanon)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.00
	Country Average:	0.40	0.25	0.45	-0.05	0.25	0.25	0.55	0.35	0.53	
	All Country Average:										0.33
	All Issue Average:										0.33
	2006 Interim Compliance Average:										0.33
	2005 Final Compliance:	0.81	0.57	0.88	0.29	0.52	0.14	0.81	0.95	0.89	0.65
	2005 Interim Compliance:	0.52	0.48	0.33	0.43	0.52	-0.14	0.71	0.67	0.75	0.47

Note: The HSE and Toronto Teams disagree on the final scores for Russia on commitments 7, 12 and 19. The HSE scores are presented. Toronto analysts' scores were 0, -1 and 0, respectively.

Note:

+1 represents full compliance.

0 represents partial compliance.

-1 represents no compliance

The average score by issue is the average of all countries' compliance scores for that issue. The average score by country is the average of all issue scores for a given country. The overall compliance average is an average of the overall issue average and overall country average. N/A represents scores where either a commitment is considered irrelevant to a particular party or insufficient data has been gathered to make an assessment of compliance with a commitment; such scores are excluded from the average.

Table B: G8 Compliance by Country, 1996-2006

Summit Location Summit Date Report Type	Lyon 96-97 Final	Denver 97-98 Final	Birmingham 98-99 Final	Cologne 99-00 Final	Okinawa 00-01 Final	Genoa 01-Feb Final	Kananaskis Mar-02 Interim	Kananaskis Mar-02 Final
Canada	0.47	0.17	0.50	0.67	0.83	0.82	0.77	0.82
France	0.28	0.00	0.25	0.34	0.92	0.69	0.38	0.64
Germany	0.58	0.17	0.25	0.17	1.00	0.59	0.08	0.18
Italy	0.43	0.50	0.67	0.34	0.89	0.57	0.00	-0.11
Japan	0.22	0.50	0.20	0.67	0.82	0.44	0.10	0.18
Russia	N/A	0.00	0.34	0.17	0.14	0.11	0.14	0.00
United Kingdom	0.42	0.50	0.75	0.50	1.00	0.69	0.42	0.55
United States	0.42	0.34	0.60	0.50	0.67	0.35	0.25	0.36
European Union	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.17	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Average	0.40	0.27	0.45	0.39	0.78	0.53	0.27	0.33
<i>Number of Commitments:</i>	19	6	7	6	12	9	13	11
Summit Location Summit Date Report Type	Evian Apr-03 Interim	Evian Apr-03 Final	Sea Island May-04 Interim	Sea Island May-04 Final	Gleneagles Jun-05 Interim	Gleneagles Jun-05 Final	St. Petersburg Jul-06 Interim	
Canada	0.58	0.83	0.50	0.72	0.52	0.81	0.40	
France	0.50	0.75	0.39	0.50	0.48	0.57	0.25	
Germany	0.42	0.50	0.50	0.67	0.33	0.88	0.45	
Italy	0.38	0.25	0.39	0.44	0.43	0.29	-0.05	
Japan	0.42	0.42	0.33	0.39	0.52	0.52	0.25	
Russia	0.42	0.33	0.00	0.06	-0.14	0.14	0.25	
United Kingdom	0.58	0.50	0.50	0.67	0.67	0.95	0.55	
United States	0.50	0.50	0.44	0.72	0.71	0.81	0.35	
European Union	N/A	N/A	0.50	0.72	0.75	0.89	0.53	
Average	0.48	0.51	0.39	0.54	0.47	0.65	0.33	
<i>Number of Commitments:</i>	12	12	18	18	21	21	20	

Table C: G8 Compliance by Issue, 1996-2006

Issue Area	Summit Location Summit Date Report Type	Lyon 96-97 Final	Denver 97-98 Final	Birmingham 98-99 Final	Cologne 99-00 Final	Okinawa 00-01 Final	Genoa 01-Feb Final	Kananaskis Mar-02 Interim	Kananaskis Mar-02 Final	Evian Apr-03 Interim	Evian Apr-03 Final	Sea Island May-04 Interim	Sea Island May-04 Final	Gleneagles Jun-05 Interim	Gleneagles Jun-05 Final	St. Petersburg Jul-06 Interim
TOTAL (average)		0.40 19	0.13 6	0.32 6	0.44 6	0.81 12	0.46 9	0.30 13	0.36 13	0.47 12	0.51 12	0.40 18	0.55 18	0.47 21	0.65 21	0.31 20
<i>Economic Issues</i>																
World Economy	-	-	-	-	-	0.86	-	-	-	0.13	0.25	0.33	0.22	0.22	0.56	-
IFI Reform	.40a	-	-	-	-	-	-1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Exchange Rates	-	-	-	-	0.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Macroeconomics	1.00	-	-	-	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Microeconomics	.33b	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Employment	-	+0.38c	0d	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aging	-	-	+0.33e	-	-	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ICT	0.67b	-	-	-	-	1.00	0.75	-	-	1.00	0.75	-	-	-	-	-
Trade	0.33b	-	+0.33f	-	-0.25	1.00	0.88	0/0.14m	0.1/-0.13	-0.25n	-0.38	1/0.22r	0.88/0.56r	0.67/0.11/0.33t	0.33/0/0.33t	0.22
Development (General/ODA)	0b	0.00	-	-	-	-	0.00	0.50	0.88	0.88	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	0.22	0.22	-
Debt of the Poorest/HIPC	-	-	0.00	-	0.86	-	1.00	-0.50	0.25	0.00	0.38	1.00	1.00	0/0.25u	1/0.88u	0.33
Education	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.58	-	+0.63p	-	-	-	-	0.56	0.33	0/0.11/0.33
<i>Global Transnational Issues</i>																
Energy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.00	0.75	0.89	0.78	1.00	-	1/0.33
Environment	0.14	+0.50c	+1.00g	-	-	-	0.17	0/0.5l	0.57/0.57l	0.38o	0.50o	0.00	1.00	1/0.67x	0.89/1.0x	0.22/0.56/0.67
Biotech	-	-	-	-	0.75	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Human Genome	-	-	-	-	0.80	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Health (General)	-	-	-	-	1.00	0.75	+0.25k	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.44	-	0.11/0
HIV/AIDS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.88	0.88	0.33	0.56	0.22	0.33	-
Polio	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.00	0.44	0.44	0.11	0.44
Cultural Diversity	-	-	-	-	-	0.63	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nuclear Safety	0.29	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Crime & Drugs	0.50b	0c	+0.25h	0.00i	0.88	-	0.25	0.25	-	-	0.00	0.11	0.11	-	-	-
Terrorist Financing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.25	-0.50	-0.11	0.44	-	-	-	-
<i>Political/Security Issues</i>																
East/West Relations	1b	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Terrorism	.83b	-	-	-	1.00	0.40	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	-	-	0.89/0.11w	1/1	0.11
Arms Control	0.33b	-	-	-	-	0.88	-	0.63	0.25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Landmines	0.71	+0.75c	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Human Rights	.83b	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Transport Security	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.38	0.63	0.11	0.00	0.67	0.67	-
WMD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.00	1.00	0.78	0.78	0.44	0.89	0.78
<i>Regional Security</i>																
Asia	-0.50b	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Europe	.83b	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Middle East	-0.50b	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1/0.78q	1/0.89q	1/0.89v	1/0.89v	1
Russia	-	-0.86	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Conflict Prevention	-	-	-	-	-	0.63	-	0.60	0.38	-	-	+0.78s	+0.89s	-	-	-
Food Security	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.67	0.67	-	-	-
Peacebuilding (Africa)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.44	0.67	0.44	0.67	0.22
Governance Issues	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
UN Reform (\$)	0.14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
UN Reform (development)	0.14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Good Governance (Africa)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.50	0.25	-	-	-	-	-0.11	0.25	-
Peer Review (Africa)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.00	0.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

^a Excludes Italy and France.

^b Excludes Italy.

^c Refers to G8 (includes Russia).

^d Refers only to Japan, UK, Russia.

^e Refers only to Canada, Germany, U.S.

^f Excludes Germany.

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

^h Refers to human trafficking; refers only to France, Germany, Japan.

ⁱ Refers specifically to the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering.

^j Excludes Japan.

^k Refers to Africa Health.

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

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

ⁿ Refers to Multinational Trade Round (MTN).

^o Refers to Marine Environment.

^p Refers to Africa Education.

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

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

^s Refers to Regional Security in Darfur.

^t Refers to Trade in Africa, Export Subsidies and LDCs.

^u Refers to Debt Relief in Africa and Iraq.

^v Refers to Middle East and Sudan.

^w Refers to non-proliferation and transnational crime.

^x Refers to climate change and tsunami support.

Table D: 2006 Priority Commitment Interim Compliance

No.	Issue Area	CAD	FRA	GER	ITA	JAP	RUS	UK	USA	EU	Issue
Health (Infectious Diseases)											
1	Health (Global Fund)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.11
2	Health (Tuberculosis)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
3	Health (Polio)	1	0	1	-1	0	1	1	1	0	0.44
2006 Interim Health Average											0.19
G8 Health Average since 1996											0.34
Energy Security											
4	Energy (Oil and Energy Reserve Data Collection)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.00
5	Energy Intensity	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0.33
6	Surface Transport	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0.22
7	Renewable Energy	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0.67
8	Climate Change	-1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0.56
2006 Interim Energy Security Average											0.56
G8 Energy Average since 1996											0.64
<i>2006 Environment Average*</i>											<i>0.48</i>
<i>G8 Environment Average since 1996*</i>											<i>0.36</i>
Education											
9	Education (Academic Mobility)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.11
10	Education (Qualification Systems)	0	0	1	-1	-1	-1	0	1	1	0.00
11	Education (Gender Disparities)	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.33
2006 Interim Education Average											0.15
G8 Education Average since 1996											0.35

* 2006 environment average includes only commitments 6, 7 and 8 – presented in comparison to all G8 environment commitments over time.