



## **G8 Research Group**

### **Compliance Unit 2007-08 Commitment Interpretive Guidelines**

#### **CONTENTS**

<b>1. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROTECTION [21]</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. FIGHTING CLIMATE CHANGE [35]</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. ENERGY: TECHNOLOGY [36]</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4. ENERGY: EFFICIENCY [65]</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>5. ENERGY: DIVERSIFICATION [90]</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>6. RAW MATERIALS [103]</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>7. CORRUPTION [115]</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>8. HEILIGENDAMM PROCESS [134]</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>9. AFRICA: DEBT RELIEF [143]</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>10. AFRICA: OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE [144]</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>11. AFRICA: FINANCIAL MARKETS [183]</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>12. AFRICA: EDUCATION [202]</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>13. AFRICA: PEACE AND SECURITY [213]</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>14. AFRICA: GLOBAL FUND FOR AIDS, TUBERCULOSIS AND MALARIA [227]</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>15. AFRICA: SEXUAL AND REPRODUCTIVE EDUCATION [233]</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>16. AFRICA: HEALTH SYSTEMS [264]</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>17. NONPROLIFERATION: FISSILE MATERIALS [277]</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>18. NONPROLIFERATION: HAGUE CODE OF CONDUCT [293]</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>19. REGIONAL SECURITY: DARFUR [295]</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>20. COUNTER-TERRORISM: TRANSPORT SECURITY [314]</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>21. COUNTER-TERRORISM: FINANCIAL ACTION TASK FORCE [318]</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>22. TRADE [327]</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>23. GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP [328]</b>	<b>42</b>

# 1. Intellectual Property Protection [21]

## Commitment

“In partnership with certain developing countries we agree to launch technical assistance pilot plans with a view to building the capacity necessary to combat trade in counterfeited and pirated goods to strengthen intellectual property enforcement.”

*Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy*

## Commitment Features:

The Commitment includes two key points:

- (1) “launch technical assistance pilot programs”, which implies the actual organization of programs run by technically capable staff (i.e. lawyers)
- (2) The said programs must focus on combating counterfeited goods and piracy within the *existing* IP framework. They should not be programs designed to develop *new* frameworks.

## Background:

The issue of piracy and counterfeited goods is one that has been growing in importance with the rise of the manufacturing sectors of the two largest developing economies, India and China. IP was first discussed at the Gleneagles Summit in 2005, where the leaders agreed to implement a long list of measures to stem the entrance of pirated goods into their domestic markets and inform the public and government officials of the consequences of counterfeiting. They also agreed to cooperate with developing nations to strengthen their laws against the infringement of intellectual property rights and the export of pirated goods. Such concerns came against the backdrop of concerted effort by the developed nations, through the WTO, to force India to change its laws on drug and pharmaceutical patents, which the complainants argued were permissive of IPR infringements. At the St. Petersburg Summit in 2006, the issue of IPP was again raised, although this time leaders discussed the international implications of this problem and the possible solutions available through multilateral cooperation. In addition to calling on various international organizations to act with more force on the issues of piracy and counterfeited goods, the G8 nations agreed to launch pilot projects in developing nations with the stated aim of targeting the producers of counterfeited goods.

In various statements, the G8 nations have made clear the health and safety dangers associated with pirated and counterfeited goods. The Heiligendamm commitment on IPP comes after a series of scandals in which consumer goods exported from China and India were found to contain toxic levels of bacteria or chemical products. Although the goods themselves were not pirated or counterfeit, the events have encouraged public concern throughout the G8 nations for greater scrutiny of consumer products imported from the developing world. For their part, developing nations have often criticized the strict enforcement of IPR as a barrier to effective technology transfer and a hindrance to rapid economic growth. The health and safety implications of long-term patent laws, particularly for medications, has become a sore point in trade relations between

developed and developing nations, especially on the issue of anti-retroviral treatments. A variety of agreements brokered at the WTO have sought to find compromise between those who insist on the inviolability of IPR and those nations that seek to break international rules for causes of national interest.

**Scoring:**

-1	Member state does not provide a framework for any specific programs, does not engage in discussions on enforcement of IP laws with large developing nations and makes no statements on the need for cooperation on the matter.
0	Member state launches discussions with key developing nations (i.e. China, India) on issues of IPP, but does not engage in any pilot projects.
+1	Member state launches discussions with key developing nations (i.e. China, India) on issues of IPP and undertakes the establishment of multilateral or bilateral pilot programs in the specified country for the protection of IP and discouragement of piracy and counterfeited goods.

## 2. Fighting Climate Change [35]

### Commitment

“[We acknowledge that the UN climate process is the appropriate forum for negotiating future global action on climate change.] We are committed to moving forward in that forum and call on all parties to actively and constructively participate in the UN Climate Change Conference in Indonesia in December 2007 with a view to achieving a comprehensive post 2012-agreement (post Kyoto-agreement) that should include all major emitters.”

*Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy*

### Commitment Features:

Although the commitment mentions specifically the UN Climate Change Conference in Indonesia in December 2007, its focus is on the entire framework within which that conference is held. The commitment focuses on member states' participation in the UN framework and their commitment to multilateral negotiations on fighting climate change.

### Background:

One of the three treaties adopted at the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) has been, since the first Conference of the Parties (COP1) of the UNFCCC in 1995, the primary international venue for negotiations on mitigating the impacts of climate change. At COP3 in 1997, all parties adopted the Kyoto Protocol, which set out, for the first time, legally-binding targets for reductions in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by developed nations as well as several innovative 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 an 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 those 128 Parties that had ratified the Kyoto Protocol.

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. Seven G8 members' recommitment to the Kyoto Protocol process (including binding emissions reduction targets) indicated a high level of political support by those G8 members that had ratified the Protocol.

All G8 member states participated 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 included 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.

Since the Montreal Conference, there have been a number of further developments, including the first meeting in January 2005 of the Asia Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate. The APPCDC was established in July 2005 shortly after the Gleneagles G8 Summit and includes G8 members Japan and the United States, which is seen by many as a process parallel or even divergent to that of the COP and COP/MOP.

**Scoring:**

-1	State does not attend the Bali Conference and does not encourage other nations to do so; state does not engage in any UN forums.
0	State attends the Bali Conference but does not encourage other nations to do so; engages in some but not all UN forums.
+1	State attends the Bali Conference and encourages other states to do so; state actively participates in the United Nations framework and encourages other states, including those that pursue outside agreements, to remain in or join the UN discussions.

### 3. Energy: Technology [36]

#### Commitment

“We have urgently to develop, deploy and foster the use of sustainable, less carbon intensive, clean energy and climate-friendly technologies in all areas of energy production and use.”

*Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy*

#### Commitment Features:

The commitment has many layers. The member states have agreed to three specific actions:

- (1) Development of technologies;
- (2) Deployment or implementation of these technologies;
- (3) Fostering the aforementioned technologies, i.e. through consumption or installation subsidies.

The technologies to be favoured should be:

- (1) Sustainable;
- (2) Less carbon intensive (than current, widespread carbon-based fuels);
- (3) Clean, i.e. low-emissions compared to currently employed technologies;
- (4) Climate-friendly, implying that they have low or minimal impacts on the process of climate change

Finally, these technologies should be encouraged at *all* stages of energy production and use, which entails generation, distribution and consumption.

#### Background:

Clean and less carbon intensive energy has been a topic of interest for the G8 nations since the 2003 Evian Summit. There, member states agreed to expand the availability and use of cleaner carbon-based fuels and carbon-capture programs. In 2004, at Sea Island, the progress of low- or zero-emissions carbon-fired plants was discussed, but no new major commitments on the issue of clean fuels was elaborated.

Comprehensive steps towards the development of cleaner fossil fuels were, however, included as part of the *Gleneagles Plan of Action: Climate Change, Clean Energy and Sustainable Development*, in which countries lent their support to a variety of IEA initiatives for the testing of clean-coal plants. At Gleneagles, the G8 states also agreed to undertake a number of measures for the commercialization and implementation of carbon-capture and low-emissions technologies, both on their own and in cooperation with the IEA.

Unlike the topics of energy efficiency and renewable sources of power, cleaner carbon fuels received relatively little attention within the context of the *St. Petersburg Plan of Action: Global Energy Security*. At St. Petersburg, G8 member states agreed only to continue their support for past initiatives on carbon-capture technologies and gas-flaring. The gradual diminution of interest in clean coal and other low-emissions fuels, as well as a shift in concentration from the fuels themselves to low-emissions technology,

represents a weakening of support among G8 electorates for any form of carbon-based initiatives.

**Scoring:**

-1	State implements no new programs or initiatives for the support of clean or climate-friendly technologies.
0	State offers small new programs with limited scope; state offers support to one aspect of the commitment only (i.e. generation only, but not consumption or distribution).
+1	State offers widespread policies for the generation, distribution and consumption of cleaner and climate friendly technologies; country adds programs and policies to existing frameworks and concentrates on development, implementation and fostering with equal vigour.

## 4. Energy: Efficiency [65]

### Commitment

“To this end, we will promote the appropriate policy approaches and instruments, including inter alia economic incentives and sound fiscal policies, minimum standards for energy efficiency, sound and ambitious energy performance labelling, information campaigns aimed at consumers and industry that enhance national awareness, sector-based voluntary commitments agreed with industry, investment in research and development and guidelines for public procurement.”

*Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy*

### Commitment Features:

Although the energy efficiency commitment is large, the action to which the G8 member states have committed is quite simple: the promotion of appropriate policies and instruments in order to foster energy efficiency. These measures include, but are not limited to:

- (1) “economic incentives and sound fiscal policies”, i.e. fiscally sustainable subsidies;
- (2) “minimum standards for energy efficiency”
- (3) “sound and ambitious energy performance labeling”
- (4) “information campaigns aimed at consumers and industry”
- (5) “sector-based voluntary commitments”
- (6) “investment in research and development”
- (7) “guidelines for public procurement”

The use of the phrase “inter alia” implies that these are not the only policies or instruments that may be employed to fulfill this commitment.

### Background:

The issue of energy efficiency has long been one of concern for the G8 member states. Four of the G8 states are not oil producers and, as public support for the abandonment of high-emissions fuels like coal dwindle, many G8 governments have actively sought to reduce the relative importance of hydrocarbon-based fuels like petroleum in their production processes. In 2003, the participants at the Evian Summit stated their support for continued measures to address energy efficiency and suggested the adoption of a variety of measures, including “standards, public procurement, economic incentives and instruments, information and labeling” as possible means of saving energy. At the Sea Island Summit in 2004, countries agreed, among other measures, to support and advance international cooperation on issues of energy efficiency, particularly in the realm of technological advancements.

Energy efficiency was first dealt with in a comprehensive manner at the 2005 Gleneagles Summit. As part of the *Gleneagles Plan of Action: Climate Change, Clean Energy and Sustainable Development*, member states agreed to cooperate with the IEA on the issue of energy efficiency, implement various IEA directives and develop and



implement their own standards and regulations with regards to buildings, appliances, surface transport, aviation and industry. These proposals also called for the sharing of information on energy efficiency with countries in the developing world. The comprehensive approach was maintained at the St. Petersburg Summit in 2006, where member states adopted the *St. Petersburg Plan of Action: Global Energy Security*. Although many components of the *St. Petersburg Plan* were merely reiterations of the commitments made at Gleneagles, a new focus was placed on measures for saving energy in the production of energy itself (i.e. wastage and flaring) and more emphasis was given to proposals for the reduction of energy intensity in the transportation sector. Energy efficiency continues to be a topic of importance in many G8 nations, but it has come under increasing criticism by environmental groups. These critics point out that energy efficiency merely slows down the process of global warming but does not reverse the trend. For this reason, governments have often been keen to cast energy efficiency initiatives in the light of economic policy approaches rather than environmental ones.

**Scoring:**

-1	Country implements no new measures for the encouragement of energy efficiency.
0	Country implements few new policies directed towards energy efficiency. State concentrates exclusively on encouraging energy efficiency among consumer or industry, but not both.
+1	Country implements widespread new policies to encourage energy efficiency among consumers and producers. New policies include a variety of instruments, both pecuniary and non-pecuniary, with varying timeframes.

## 5. Energy: Diversification [90]

### Commitment

“We will make efforts to integrate renewables into the power grid,”

*Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy*

### Commitment Features:

There are two components to watch in this commitment:

- (1) The energy sources integrated must be renewable: solar, biomass, hydro, wind and geothermal power are all examples of such renewable source energies. So called clean sources, like nuclear power or clean coal, are not acceptable.
- (2) They must be integrated into a power grid for widespread distribution. This means that the power is consumed by someone other than just the producer.

### Background:

Energy diversification has been touted of late as a solution to two problems facing many G8 states, particularly those in Europe. First, increasing the percentage of renewable sources in total national energy consumption responds to domestic demands for action on climate change. Second, greater emphasis on sources like wind, solar and geothermal power reduces dependence on imported hydrocarbon fuels and thus helps to “secure” the national energy sector.

The topic of renewable energy sources first appeared in official G8 Summit documents at the Evian Summit in 2003. There, the members agreed to take measures to encourage an increase in the percentage of global energy use attributed to renewable sources and advance research on these sources. At Sea Island in 2004, the topic of renewables was merged into a commitment on energy efficiency and called only for increased international cooperation on the matter. It was not until the *Gleneagles Plan of Action: Climate Change, Clean Energy and Sustainable Development*, however, that G8 leaders agreed to take comprehensive action on renewables, calling for greater research and development, international cooperation and initiatives to integrate renewable sources of energy into respective national power grids. Emphasis was also placed in technology transfer to the developing world and support for research into hydrogen as a source of energy. Diversification was again a major component of the *St. Petersburg Plan of Action: Global Energy Security*, in which nations agreed to encourage further developments in nuclear technology, hydrogen fuels and renewable sources of energy such as wind, solar, hydro, biomass and geothermal. Commitments on renewable sources of energy, however, amounted to a reiteration of promises made at the Gleneagles Summit and did not include new international or domestic initiatives for the integration of renewables into national power grids.

### Scoring:

-1	State implements no new programs for the integration of renewables into the
----	---

	power grid and does not draw up new policies for wider implementation of renewables in national power generation for sale (i.e. expansion of existing programs to new regions, or to new renewable sources).
0	State implements new programs for the integration of renewables into the power grid, but of very limit scope (i.e. for small or restricted regions, or restricts the types of businesses/consumers eligible for support).
+1	State continues existing programs for the integration of renewables into the power grid and expands them, either by extending the lifetime of subsidies for consumption of power from renewable sources or by including new regions and/or types of renewable sources.

## 6. Raw Materials [103]

### Commitment

“To this end we will build capacity for good governance of mineral resources consistent with social and environmental standards and sound commercial practices by reducing barriers to investment and trade, through the provision of financial, technical and capacity building support to developing countries for the mining, processing and trading of minerals.”

*Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy*

### Commitment Features:

The committed actions occur in the latter part of the commitment and include:

- (1) “reducing barriers to investment and trade”, i.e. tariffs, domestic investment requirements, etc.
- (2) “the provision of financial, technical and capacity building support to developing countries for the mining, processing and trading of minerals”

The beginning of the commitment implies the goal of such actions should be the encouragement of “good governance” as well as “social and environmental standards and sound commercial practices”. The aim of the two actions, therefore, must be, at least in part, to foster best practices in the primary sector and good governance of mineral resources.

### Background:

The issue of good governance in the raw materials sector first arose at the 2004 Sea Island Summit. There, G8 leaders stressed the need for resource-rich nations to be particularly attentive to potentially corrupt practices arising from the revenues and expenses of these industries. The G8 countries had, of course, been involved with good governance programs outside the G8 forum for some time before the topic’s mention at Sea Island. One particular program of widespread attention was the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI), which brought together producer nations, major importing nations and firms in a forum designed to spread best practices among resource producers and consumers. At Gleneagles, petroleum producing nations were encouraged to implement best practices with regards to transparency in order to stimulate greater investment in their extractive industries. African states were also encouraged to comply with the EITI and implement its code of best practices, and the G8 countries pledged to continue their support of the EITI and reviews of its progress. The St. Petersburg Summit featured little emphasis on the issue of transparency and good governance in extractive industries, with only a short mention of continuing G8 support for the EITI. The current commitment, made at the Heiligendamm Summit, marks a departure from the historic G8 discussions on good governance in the raw material sector, as it calls for the establishment of new policies and programs outside the framework of the EITI. It is also novel in the fact that it excludes third parties, such as civil society groups and multi-national firms, from discussions.

**Scoring:**

-1	State takes no new steps to reduce barriers to investment and trade and does not extend support for good governance in the mining sector.
0	State extends financial support only, with little or no controls over the ultimate use of funds; state reduces barriers only on select industries/products.
+1	State reduces barriers to investment and trade with respect to mineral products; state extends financial, technical and capacity building support for the encouragement of good governance and best practices in terms of social and environmental standards.

## 7. Corruption [115]

### Commitment

“We are committed to full implementation of their obligations under existing international agreements created to combat corruption, particularly those of the United Nations and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).”

*Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy*

### Commitment Features:

The commitment calls for the implementation of obligations that arise from international agreements on corruption. There is added emphasis on those agreements created by the United Nations and the OECD. Note that ratification of the agreements presupposes implementation, i.e. changing national laws to reflect the agreements and setting up or altering existing watchdogs.

### Background:

At Evian, the G8 committed to strengthening the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention, concluding the UN Convention Against Corruption and supporting the accelerated ratification of the UN Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime. Most G8 states, however, had yet to ratify the UN Convention Against Corruption. As of the Heiligendamm Summit, Canada, Germany, Italy, Japan and the European Union had all failed to do so. Shortly after the St. Petersburg Summit, Italy became the second to last member to ratify the UN Convention on Transnational Organized Crime; Japan has signed but not ratified the treaty.

The G8 also pledged to encourage partner countries and companies, both in the private and public sectors, to disclose pertinent information to various IFIs such as, the World Bank or the IMF. At the 2004 Sea Island Summit, the G8 reiterated its commitment to fighting corruption and improving transparency and accountability in coordination with other relevant actors, and formed compacts with the governments of Georgia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, and Peru. More recently, the G8 pledged to continue its earlier efforts to “promote transparency in public financial management and accountability, including by following through on our 2004 Sea Island commitment to launch four compacts, and our 2005 Gleneagles commitment to increase support for the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) and countries implementing it.”

	UN Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime <sup>935</sup>		UN Convention Against Corruption <sup>936</sup>	
	Signed	Ratified	Signed	Ratified
Canada	14 Dec 2000	13 May 2002	21 May 2004	
France	12 Dec 2000	29 Oct 2002	09 Dec 2003	11 Jul 2005
Germany	12 Dec 2000	14 June 2006	09 Dec 2003	
Italy	12 Dec2000	02 Aug 2006	09 Dec 2003	
Japan	12 Dec 2000		09 Dec 2003	
Russia	12 Dec 2000	26 May 2004	09 Dec 2003	09 May 2006
United Kingdom	14 Dec2000	09 Feb 2006	09 Dec 2003	09 Feb 2006
United States	13 Dec 2000	03 Nov 2005	09 Dec 2003	30 Oct 2006
European Union	12 Dec 2000	21 May 2004	15 Sept 2005	

**Scoring:**

-1	State does not ratify all conventions; state ratifies all conventions but does not implement any components.
0	State ratifies convention if it has not yet done so; state implements a small proportion of the components of the conventions.
+1	State ratifies convention if it has not yet done so; state implements all or most of components of the conventions. If only some aspects the conventions can be implemented by federal authorities, those aspects are implemented and a concerted effort to encourage provincial/state authorities to adopt remaining components is demonstrated.

## 8. Heiligendamm Process [134]

### Commitment

“We will initiate a new form of a topic-driven Dialogue in a structured manner based on this new partnership.”

*Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy*

### Commitment Features:

The commitment has three components:

1. The dialogue is to be initiated during this compliance cycle;
2. It must be topic-driven, i.e. it cannot be a general conference on trade or the economy, and must be structured. It cannot be in the form of informal discussions between leaders;
3. It must be based on the new partnership, i.e. its goal must be the discussion of topics related to the liberalization of investment flows.

### Background:

The G8 has, for several years, sought to reach out to various developing nations in order to broaden the base of its discussions on topics such as trade, climate change, world economy and health. In 2002, the G8 leaders met with the Presidents of Algeria, Nigeria, Senegal and South Africa to discuss the NEPAD Initiative. The next year, these leaders were joined by the heads of government of Brazil, China, Egypt, India, Malaysia, Mexico, and Saudi Arabia. The G8 nations had thus begun a trend that saw the leaders of various nations attend the annual Summits for ad hoc discussions on pressing international or regional issues. Although each Summit has featured a variety of non-G8 leaders whose nations played key roles in topics of focus, the leaders of five emerging economies – India, China, Brazil, South Africa and Mexico – have been invited to the past three Summits. Although these nations are not formally acceding to the G8, they have now assumed a semi-permanent role in discussions of a recurring nature within the G8, including those on world economy, trade and HIV/AIDS. At the Heiligendamm Summit, the G8 nations decided to formalize their relationship with “major emerging economies” on the topic of freedom of international investment flows.

### Scoring:

-1	State does not actively pursue the creation of such a forum nor does it engage in diplomacy to encourage other nations to participate in the new partnership.
0	State participates in discussions, but does not engage in diplomacy to encourage other nations to participate in the new partnership.
+1	State actively participates in discussions within the new partnership and engages in diplomacy to gather representatives from the other G8 member states for topic-driven discussions with the large developing economies.



## 9. Africa: Debt Relief [143]

### Commitment

“These include the historic multilateral debt relief of up to US\$ 60 billion, the implementation of which is now well underway.”

*Growth and Responsibility in Africa*

### Commitment Features:

There is only one component to this commitment: continued progress towards the fulfillment, not necessarily the completion, of the commitment at Gleneagles to forgive up to US\$60 billion of debt. See the Gleneagles commitment for specific details.

### Background:

At the July 2005 G8 Summit in Gleneagles, Scotland, G8 leaders pledged to cancel the debt of the world’s most indebted countries, most of which are located in Africa. The G8 Proposal for Debt Relief, which was renamed the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative (MDRI) provides for 100% relief on eligible debt from three multilateral institutions – the International Monetary Fund, World Bank (International Development Association), and the African Development Fund. MDRI supplements the 1996 Initiative for Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC Initiative) by granting 100% relief for those countries completing the HIPC Initiative process. MDRI is seen as a supplementary initiative that would assist low-income countries to meet the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (commitments at [http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/finance/fm050611\\_dev.htm](http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/finance/fm050611_dev.htm)).

At the G8 Summit in St. Petersburg in July 2006, G8 leaders affirmed their support for long-term debt sustainability through the IMF and World Bank debt sustainability framework for low-income countries. This framework (officially titled the Debt Sustainability Framework in Low-Income Countries) was implemented by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund in the spring of 2005.

Debt sustainability is the ability to manage debts so they do not grow. Many low-income countries have struggled to maintain their external debt at sustainable levels while trying to meet development objectives. The goal of the Debt Sustainability Framework in Low-Income Countries is to provide guidance on new lending to low-income countries whose main source of financing is official loans. The framework has been developed with the intention to better monitor and prevent the accumulation of unsustainable debt.

### Scoring:

-1	State begins issuing large amounts of new debt to MDRI countries; state actively supports other frameworks for debt relief as alternatives to the MDRI. State does not issue new debt nor does it actively discourage negotiations on the issue of debt forgiveness, but the state does not forgive any debt during the compliance cycle and does not identify debt ideal for forgiveness under the
----	---

	MDRI.
0	State forgives some debt from countries identified by the MDRI but does not actively encourage other states and organizations (i.e. Paris Club, IMF, World Bank) to participate in the MDRI.
+1	State issues little or no new debt to MDRI countries and forgives at least some of the debt identified by the Gleneagles framework; state encourages other creditor nations through the Paris Club, World Bank, IMF and other international financial organizations to engage in the Gleneagles framework for debt relief.

## 10. Africa: Official Development Assistance [144]

### Commitment

“They also include increasing, compared to 2004, with other donors, ODA to Africa by US\$ 25 billion a year by 2010.”

*Growth and Responsibility in Africa*

### Commitment Features:

The commitment calls for the G8 states to continue in their progress towards increasing ODA by US\$25 billion a year by 2010. It does not require that member states have increased their ODA by US\$25 billion compared to 2004 by the end of the compliance cycle. Note that the US Dollar figure is based on 2004 exchange rates; the ultimate goal is the *doubling* of the national ODA budget by 2010. Compliance must therefore be measured in national currency terms and not US dollars.

### Background:

Official Development Assistance (ODA) to Africa was one of the highest profile issue areas at the Gleneagles Summit. Former British Prime Minister Tony Blair made it clear from the earliest days of summit planning that devising a strategy and targets for the attainment of the UN Millennium Development Goals would be one of the top priorities of the British Presidency of the G8. The Make Poverty History Campaign added to the UK’s sense of responsibility to ensure the basic well being of the world’s poor by securing adequate amounts of aid money. 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 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. Because of this commitment, civil society groups were satisfied with the G8 commitment on aid; Bob Geldof granted the G8 a 10 out of 10 on ODA. The actual implementation of these goals, however, has been controversial and has not always occurred as planned.

### Scoring:

-1	State does not increase absolute value of ODA from previous year(s) in local currency terms.
0	State increases ODA slightly in local currency (more than rate of inflation, but less than 10% year-on-year).
+1	State increases absolute value of ODA from previous year by a substantial quantity, i.e. by 10% of previous year’s allocation or more. Note that the increase cannot result from a decrease in the local currency value of the US dollar.

## 11. Africa: Financial Markets [183]

### Commitment

“[This partnership should help us work together more effectively with a variety of new and existing initiatives such as:] developing a regional Micro Small and Medium Enterprises Investment Fund (REGMIFA) as an instrument to mobilize resources to refinance medium- and long-term investment credits for smaller enterprises and to microfinance institutions.”

*Growth and Responsibility in Africa*

### Commitment Features:

The commitment calls for one action: “developing a regional Micro Small and Medium Enterprises Investment Fund (REGMIFA)”. This generally implies providing funds for the start-up capital of such an institution. The institution has two focuses:

1. Providing funds to refinance microfinance institutions (i.e. as a sort of microfinance central bank)
2. Refresh the medium- and long-term credits of small African enterprises

### Background:

The G8 states have occasionally addressed the issue microfinance and private market development in the developing world. At the 2004 Sea Island Summit, the nations agreed to various measures to encourage private sector development, including an increase in support for microfinance and microenterprises. Their initiatives were inspired by the Martin-Zedillo report on Private Sector Development to the United Nations in 2004. Microfinance came up again, briefly, in discussions on African development at the Gleaneagles Summit in 2005. The issue of microfinance was once again in the news in December, 2005, when the founder of the first microfinance bank, Muhammed Yunus, won the Nobel Peace Prize for the work of his microfinance outfit, Grameen Bank. There was no discussion of the issue in any G8 press release from the 2006 St. Petersburg Summit.

Mircofinance initiatives now exist throughout Latin America, Africa and Asia and are financed in a variety of manners, including private capital raised in the developed world and official development assistance. The seek to encourage development by granting small loans (usually less than US\$100) to individual entrepreneurs or cooperatives in regions of developing nations without formal banking sectors or where asymmetric information is so acute as to eliminate the possibility of established creditors.

### Scoring:

-1	State does not actively participate in the creation of a regional microfinance bank.
0	State promotes the idea of a regional microfinance bank in press releases and policy speeches, but does not donate start up capital or aggressively pursue

	international consensus on the topic.
+1	State takes active steps to bring together relevant donors and establish a regional microfinance bank for Africa; state donates a portion of the REGMIFA's start-up capital.

## 12. Africa: Education [202]

### Commitment

“The G8 will continue to work with partners and other donors to meet shortfalls in all FTI endorsed countries, estimated by the FTI Secretariat at around US\$ 500 million for 2007.”

*Growth and Responsibility in Africa*

### Commitment Features:

The commitment requires the same action to be performed in 2007 and 2008. It requires G8 member states to build support among donors to meet the shortfalls in all FTI (Fast Track Initiative) countries. This requires some financial commitment on the part of the states themselves. Note that the shortfall for 2008 has yet to be announced.

### Background:

At the World Conference on Education for All in Jomtien, Thailand (5-9 March 1990), delegates from 155 countries as well as representatives from approximately 150 organizations agreed to universalize primary education and massively reduce illiteracy before the year 2000. Article III of the World Declaration on Education for All addresses universalizing access to, and promoting equity in, education, stating that “basic education should be provided to all children, youth and adults.” The Article also recognizes the most urgent objective as ensuring access to, and improving the quality of, education for girls and women and removing every obstacle that hampers their active participation. Senegal hosted the World Education Forum in April 2000. Through the adoption of the Dakar Framework for Action, the 1,100 participants of the Forum reaffirmed their commitment to achieving Education for All by the year 2015, and entrusted UNESCO with the overall responsibility of coordinating all international players and sustaining the global momentum. The G8 countries reaffirmed further their support for the Education for All agenda at the July 2001 Genoa Summit, and all endorsed the results of the G8 Education Task Force, which reported at the 2002 Kananaskis Summit. Three years later, at the 2005 Gleneagles Summit, G8 leaders once again renewed their commitment to the Education for All initiative, with a strong emphasis placed on its implementation in Africa. All participants expressed support for the Fast Track Initiative, a partnership between donor and developing countries guaranteeing progress toward universal primary education as an objective of the Millennium Development Goals, provided that the candidate countries display a strong commitment to implementing strategies geared to improving the educational sector.

Education was a topic of particular emphasis for the Russian Presidency of the G8. At the 2006 St. Petersburg Summit, leaders reaffirmed their support for the Millennium Development Goals focused on education and stressed their commitment to the Education for All initiative. Seven separate commitments on Education for All were included in the document *Education for Innovative Societies in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2006stpetersburg/education.html>). These

commitments reaffirmed support for promises made at numerous previous G8 Summits, highlighted the importance of education in furthering African development and stressed the necessity of including programs for HIV/AIDS awareness in education systems. The leaders also agreed to assist FTI-identified nations in developing sustainable capacity and identifying necessary resources for the completion of their educational goals.

**Scoring:**

-1	State does not deliver some of its previously committed funds for the FTI. State makes no attempts to obtain further funding from other donors, nor does it contribute any new funding.
0	State commits new funds, but does not seek to obtain further funding from other donors. Alternatively, state obtains shortfall funding from other donors but does not increase its own funding.
+1	State increases its funds for the FTI to cover shortfalls and actively pursues further funding from other donors.

## 13. Africa: Peace and Security [213]

### Commitment

“At the same time we remain firmly committed to providing the necessary support to the ASF for its core military capabilities, which require increased investment by troop contributors and donors alike.”

*Growth and Responsibility in Africa*

### Commitment Features:

The commit contains one action, “providing the necessary support to the ASF for its core military capabilities”. One aspect of this action requires “increased investment” from both troop contributors (i.e. more troops for the African Standby Force) and from donors (i.e. more funds). Fulfillment is not limited to these actions and may take other forms, but these two forms of compliance are prioritized.

### Background:

The G8’s commitment to security in Africa is founded in the African Action Plan created at the 2002 Kananaskis Summit. The plan was built on at the 2003 Evian Summit with the Joint Africa-G8 Action Plan to Enhance African Capabilities to Undertake Peace Support Operations. The primary focus of the G8’s commitment is to work with its African counterparts in developing local and regional capacities to undertake peace support operations in accordance with the UN Charter in hopes of preventing outbreaks of violence and to ensure violent conflict is quickly diffused. In recognition of the financial and logistical difficulties faced by many African states when deploying troops/equipment the G8 has focused on transportation and logistical support as the primary means of assistance to its African counterparts.

At the 2004 Sea Island Summit, G8 nations launched the *G8 Action Plan: Expanding Global Capacity for Peace Support Operations*. The *Action Plan* was a comprehensive document committing the G8 countries to aid in the creation of an African-owned peacekeeping and stabilization force. The leaders agreed to assist in financing, logistics and training of staff. They also called for greater participation from non-governmental actors, such as academic and research institutions. These principles were reaffirmed at the Gleneagles Summit in 2005, where leaders included a new anti-terrorism centre in Algiers within the sphere of the G8’s peace and stability goals. Progress reports on these initiatives were delivered at the St. Petersburg Summit in 2006, although no new commitments were made concerning peacekeeping and conflict resolution in Africa.

### Scoring:

-1	State does not seek to fill staffing or financial gaps (as defined by the ASF) with its own contributions or with those from other nations.
0	State contributes its own troops and/or financing as required by the ASF, but



	does not seek to obtain further support from other troop contributors and/or donors.
+1	State increases support for the ASF in accordance with the needs of the ASF and seeks to obtain further support from troop contributors and donors.

## **14. Africa: Global Fund for AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria [227]**

### **Commitment**

“[We recognize that the level of demand to the Global Fund to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (GFATM) will increase substantially in the future as has been projected by the GFATM Board. In this regard, noting the conclusions of the April meeting of the GFATM Board, which estimated an additional demand approximately of US\$ 6 billion by 2010 which might possibly reach US\$ 8 billion,] G8 members pledge to work with other donors to replenish the GFATM and to provide long-term predictable funding based on ambitious, but realistic demand-driven targets.”

*Growth and Responsibility in Africa*

### **Commitment Features:**

There are two actions contained in this commitment:

- (1) G8 countries have committed to working towards replenishment of the GFATM, together with other donors;
- (2) The leaders have also committed to working with other donors towards long-term funding solutions based on “ambitious, but realistic demand-driven targets.”

### **Background:**

The Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria was formed at the 2000 Okinawa Summit and formally launched at the 2002 International AIDS Conference in Barcelona. The Global Fund is a private-public partnership between governments, civil society, the private sector and communities around the world. It aims to finance projects that support the eradication, treatment or prevention of those diseases which cumulatively kill approximately 6 million people a year. At the 2006 St. Petersburg Summit, the G8 countries renewed their commitment toward combating HIV/AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis through the financing mechanism of the Global Fund. The G8 affirmed their goal of replenishing the Global Fund’s 2006-2007 funding period as well as encouraging the global community to actively work towards the development of the four-year Strategic Framework. Commitments to replenish the Global Fund have been made at past G8 Summits: 2003 Evian and 2005 Gleneagles.

Several contributions towards the Global Fund have been made since the July 2006 Mid-Term Replenishment Review Meeting in Durban, South Africa to close the 2007 funding gap of 2.1 billion-- most notably, a pledge of US\$500 million by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation distributed from 2006- 20105 and a major contribution from the United States of USD747 million for 2007. In order to achieve successful compliance, G8 countries are expected to contribute their “fair share” in pledges towards the closing of the funding gap. Under the Fund-the-Fund campaign, 100 international organizations came together to support the Equitable Contributions Framework. The Equitable Contributions Framework is a formula developed to show the world’s forty-seven wealthiest states what their “fair share” contribution to the Global Fund to Fight for

HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria should be based on the Global Fund's total budget relative to a country's GDP and economic capability.

In addition, G8 member states have committed to actively support and participate in the development of a four-year Strategic Framework. This Strategic Framework will ultimately solidify the activities and initiatives of the Global Fund for the coming four years. The first elements of the Framework were adopted at the Global Fund's Fourteenth Board Meeting from 31 October to 3 November 2006 in Guatemala City, Guatemala. The Fifteenth Board Meeting of the Global Fund took place from 25 to 27 April 2007 in Geneva, Switzerland.

**Scoring:**

-1	State donates nothing to the Global Fund, effectively allowing its share of contributed funds as a proportion of the total to shrink; state does not engage in discussions to find long-term funding solutions.
0	State donates some funds to the Global Fund, but far below the suggested 0.035% of GDP of the Equitable Contribution Framework (i.e. state does not engage in burden-sharing with other member states); state does not actively participate in discussions on long-term funding.
+1	State donates close to its proposed share under the Equitable Contribution Framework (0.035% of GDP at time of the Heiligendamm Summit) and actively participates in discussions with other states and non-state actors on long-term funding solutions.

## 15. Africa: Sexual and Reproductive Education [233]

### Commitment

“The G8 will take concrete steps to support education programs especially for girls, to promote knowledge about sexuality and reproductive health and the prevention of sexually transmitted infections.”

*Growth and Responsibility in Africa*

### Commitment Features:

The wording of the commitment provides for one action: supporting education programs, particularly for girls. These programs have two goals:

- (1) promoting knowledge about sexuality and reproductive health;
- (2) prevention of sexually transmitted infections (not just HIV/AIDS).

### Background:

The issue of sexual and reproductive health is a new one for the G8 Summit. It has long been an issue of concern for the United Nations. The UN’s Beijing Platform for Action noted that complications related to pregnancy and child-birth are the leading causes of mortality among women of reproductive age. In recognizing this fact, the United Nations made reduction of maternal mortality one of the Millennium Development Goals. The same Beijing Platform for Action noted that these trends in female mortality were exacerbated by the changing pathology of the AIDS epidemic in Africa. UNIFEM now estimates that, while almost half of all HIV/AIDS sufferers in the world are women, young African women are three times as likely to be HIV-positive as young African men. Information and educational campaigns are thus crucial to reversing the HIV/AIDS epidemic, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, where 77% of all HIV-infected women live.

UNIFEM argues that women are more likely to be infected by HIV because of a lack of information about prevention and the disease. According to UNIFEM, 50% of all women and girls in the region were unaware that condoms can help prevent the spread of HIV. On the other hand, studies from 17 African countries have shown that girls who receive some sexual and reproductive health education are more likely to delay sex and insist on the use of condoms during intercourse, thereby reducing the spread of the infection.

### Scoring:

-1	State provides no financial or technical support for sexual and reproductive health education programs in Africa.
0	State provides financial and/or technical support for limited educational programs (i.e. about HIV/AIDS only, or about safe motherhood only).
+1	State provides support (financial and otherwise) for the establishment of sexual and reproductive health education and STI prevention programs, targeted at

	youth and children specifically.
--	----------------------------------

## 16. Africa: Health Systems [264]

### Commitment

“We will work with African states to address the different causes of this lack of human resource capacity within the health sector, including working conditions and salaries with the aim of recruiting, training and retaining additional health workers.”

*Growth and Responsibility in Africa*

### Commitment Features:

The commitment calls for work on the part of G8 member states with African states to address the causes of a lack of medical staff. The causes may include, but are not limited to working conditions and salaries. The goal of this work is to:

- (1) recruit staff;
- (2) train staff;
- (3) retain staff.

### Background:

Health staff in Africa has dwindled for two different but equally important trends: AIDS infections and emigration. The first issue is generally addressed through wider initiatives to combat the HIV/AIDS epidemic in Africa. The second, however, has exposed a conflict between domestic and international priorities for the G8 countries. On the one hand, the increasing need for health care staff in the developed world has led many governments to seek foreign, including African, practitioners to staff hospitals and clinics in the developed world. On the other hand, African health facilities are often woefully staffed and require greater personnel in order to adequately service the needs of the local population. Although researchers have revealed that the HIV/AIDS epidemic claims more health service professionals in Africa than emigration, brain drain is an increasingly important topic in discussions between African nations and the G8.

The G8 leaders first discussed the migration of African medical professionals at the Gleneagles Summit, where they agreed to help “Africa train and retain doctors, nurses and community health workers.” They recognized that such actions would in turn encourage donors to invest in African health systems and expand their capacity. Although the topic was not discussed again at the St. Petersburg Summit, several nations reported on their actions to help encourage growth in African health services’ capacity. In particular, Canada, France, Germany and Italy have all engaged in development projects aimed at strengthening the health care systems of a variety of African states.

### Scoring:

-1	State does not undertake cooperative actions with African states to address the issues underlying health care staff shortages.
0	State begins discussions with African nations on the issue at hand but does not release any definitive conclusions or recommendations to deal with the issue.

+1	State undertakes discussions with African states about the issues underlying health care staff shortages and releases comprehensive recommendations to address the issues at hand both in Africa and in the developed world.
----	--

## 17. Nonproliferation: Fissile Materials [277]

### Commitment

“We reaffirm our support to the early commencement of negotiations on a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty.”

*Heiligendamm Statement on Nonproliferation*

### Commitment Features:

The content of this commitment is very simple. G8 member states have committed themselves to support an early start for discussions on a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty. The content of such discussions is not in question.

### Background:

The issue of the Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty first arose in the context of a G8 Summit in St. Petersburg in 2006, where the G8 countries called for the early start of negotiations on such a document. Nevertheless, the topic of fissile material proliferation has long been one of international importance. Since the 1950s, governments have proposed a treaty to limit the possibility of proliferation. In 1994, a Commission for Disarmament was established with the specific goal of building consensus for a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty. Although an ad-hoc committee for the discussion of such a treaty was established in 1998, disagreement about the agenda of the committee delayed its work and effectively derailed negotiations. Since 1998, no new committees or negotiations have been established for the creation of a FMCT, although several G8 nations have actively sought their commencement.

### Scoring:

-1	State issues no statements (in press releases, policy statements, etc.) about the early commencement of negotiations on a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty.
0	State issues statements about the commencement of FMCT negotiations, but does not undertake any special diplomacy or actions to encourage the early commencement of negotiations.
+1	State actively encourages all nations to begin negotiations on a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty and identifies the commencement of such negotiations as a priority for its foreign policy.



## 18. Nonproliferation: Hague Code of Conduct [293]

### Commitment

“In this regard we remain committed to implementing the Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation and call upon other subscribing States to follow suit.”

*Heiligendamm Statement on Nonproliferation*

### Commitment Features:

The commit involves only one action: implementation of the Hague Code of Conduct. It does not require that the states encourage other to implement the Hague Code of Conduct.

### Background:

G8 nations routinely use their Summit statements to call on non-signatory states to ratify the Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation. The HCOC was finalized in 2002 in The Hague, Netherlands and, as of April 2007, 126 nations had signed the Code. The HCOC seeks to regulate and verify trade in ballistic missiles, delivery systems that might be used to carry weapons of mass destruction (WMD) over long distances. It calls for states to establish bilateral and multilateral systems for monitoring the proliferation of such systems. The HCOC also aims to provide nations with a means of developing programs for the exploration of space with purely peaceful goals. Signatory nations gathered for the 6<sup>th</sup> Regular Conference of Subscribing States in Vienna from 31 May to 1 June 2007. At the 6<sup>th</sup> Regular Conference, states agreed to strengthen confidence building measures; undertake outreach measures to increase the number of signatories; and endorsed the activities of the chairman of the Conference, Ivica Dronjic, to promote the HCOC in the International Organization of the Islamic Conference and the Non-Aligned Movement.

### Scoring:

-1	State implements none of the components of the HCOC and does not promote it among non-signatories.
0	State implements only some of the components of the HCOC and undertakes little action to promote it among non-signatory states.
+1	State implements all or nearly all components of the Code of Conduct and promotes the HCOC among non-signatories.

## 19. Regional Security: Darfur [295]

### Commitment

“We reiterate our commitment to continue to provide humanitarian assistance and will undertake, in coordination with the African Union and the United Nations, to identify options for improving humanitarian access.”

*G8 Statement on Sudan/Darfur*

### Commitment Features:

The commitment on Darfur is a reiteration of previous support for humanitarian assistance. It includes two separate actions:

- (1) “continue to provide humanitarian assistance”;
- (2) “identify options for improving humanitarian access”.

The former action is to be taken independently of international organizations, while the latter should be completed in coordination with the AU and the UN.

### Background:

Propelled by the crisis in Darfur, Sudan first appeared on the G8’s agenda at the 2004 Sea Island Summit. Approximately 2.4 million people have been displaced by the Darfur crisis, and the death toll is estimated at 400 000, although estimates vary widely. 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 (SLM). 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.

On 5 May 2006, the Sudanese government and Darfur’s largest rebel group, the Sudan Liberation Movement (SLM), signed the Darfur Peace Agreement. Efforts continue to convince other rebel groups, namely the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) and the Abdel Wahid-led faction of the SLM, to sign on. The agreement is multifaceted and contains provisions for power and wealth sharing and security arrangements. In the immediate term, responsibility for enforcing the agreement falls to AMIS. However, on 10 March 2006, responding to widespread criticisms of ineffectiveness, the AU decided to support the transition of AMIS into a UN peacekeeping operation “at the earliest possible time.” UN Security Council Resolution

1679, passed unanimously on 16 May 2006, called on the parties to the Darfur Peace Agreement to accept AMIS' transition into a UN force. As of late-May, Khartoum had not yet agreed; however, it agreed to a joint UN-AU team to travel to Sudan and lay the groundwork for a potential transition.

The difficulty and danger of delivering humanitarian assistance to the region of Darfur has been underlined by attacks on AU peacekeepers and aid workers alike. AU peacekeepers have been attacked by both janjaweed and Darfuri rebels in April and September of this year. The difficulty of delivering aid has been exacerbated by the instability in border regions of Chad and the allegations that the Sudanese government has been airlifting arms to pro-government militias in Darfur. A series of peace conferences between major rebel groups and the Sudanese government have so far failed to produce greater stability or accessibility for aid providers. The latest peace conference started on 27 October 2007 in Libya and resulted in the unilateral declaration of a ceasefire by the Sudanese government. Expectations for a major breakthrough were marginal, however, given the absence of key rebel movements.

**Scoring:**

-1	State provides no additional humanitarian assistance for the people of Darfur and does not seek to fill gaps through other donors. State does not cooperate in identification of means for improving humanitarian assistance.
0	State continues to provide humanitarian assistance for the people of Darfur but does not participate in discussions with the AU and the UN to improve humanitarian access.
+1	State continues to provide humanitarian assistance and actively engages in discussions with the AU, UN and other donors for the improvement of humanitarian access.

## 20. Counter-Terrorism: Transport Security [314]

### Commitment

“Furthermore, we aim to improve passenger screening programs and techniques, port facility security audits, security management systems and transportation security clearance programs.”

*G8 Summit Statement on Counter Terrorism – Security in the Era of Globalization*

### Commitment Features:

The G8 member states have agreed to improve four separate aspects of transport security:

- (1) “passenger screening programs and techniques”;
- (2) “port facility security audits”;
- (3) “security management systems”;
- (4) “transport security clearance programs”.

All four components are separate and equally important parts of this commitment.

### Background:

Since the September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States, transport safety has been a recurrent item on the G8 policy agenda. The 2003 Evian Summit contained a G8 Action Plan to counteract the threat posed by Man Portable Air Defense System (MANPADS), shoulder-fired missiles, to civilian aviation. At the 2004 Sea Island, the US unveiled the Secure and Facilitated Travel Initiative (SAFTI) to consolidate and harmonize G8 efforts to make civilian transport, travel documents, and airports more secure.

SAFTI measures are designed to address the current lacunas in the global integration of information systems, designed to not only share data on personal travellers, but also exchange information on commercial shipments and prevent the shipment of illicit weapons material that could threaten international security. Soon after the 2001 terrorist attacks and the subsequent crack-down on border control in the US, the American government announced it would be phasing in the issuance of biometric/smart-chip passports to its citizens that would contain personal information such as fingerprints or retina scans. More importantly, as a part of the campaign to control exactly who enters and exits the US, the US Congress passed legislation demanding that all 27 countries currently exempted from requiring visas to enter the United States to also implement biometric passports for their nationals or lose their visa-waiver status. They set the implementation date for October 2004. Nevertheless, after hearing testimony from Secretary of State Colin Powell who recommended a two-extension on this deadline, the US Congress extended the deadline until October 2005. In February 2005, the US State Department once again conceded that major countries, such as Japan, France and the UK, would not have biometric passports on-line until spring 2006.

A report on progress made towards the full implementation of SAFTI was delivered at the 2005 Gleneagles Summit. Although the British Presidency of the G8 had hoped to shift focus away from security and terrorism and toward Africa and climate

change, the July 7 terrorist attacks in London forced the creation of a *G8 Declaration on Counter-Terrorism*. The short time period involved in the drafting of the *Declaration* resulted in no new initiatives on the issue of transport security. Despite a heavy emphasis on security and terrorism at the St. Petersburg Summit in 2006, there was again little mention made of transport security. Leaders merely remarked on reports on the subject made to the Ministerial Conference on International Transport Security in Tokyo on 12 and 13 January 2006. The current commitment reflects the resurgence of an issue that has often been a sore point in relations between the United States and its G8 partners.

**Scoring:**

-1	State does not draw up new plans for the improvement of the four prioritized areas and does not seek out best practices.
0	State draws up plans for the improvement of only some of the priority areas or simply increases funding for them without new plans or best practices.
+1	State draws up new plans for improvements of the four priority areas of the commitment and plans for their implementation or implements them. State seeks out best practices for these four priority areas either through domestic consultations or through information sharing with other states.

## 21. Counter-Terrorism: Financial Action Task Force [318]

### Commitment

“We commend the efforts of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) and reaffirm our commitment to implement and promote internationally its 40 Recommendations on Money Laundering and nine Special Recommendations on Terror Finance.”

*G8 Summit Statement on Counter Terrorism – Security in the Era of Globalization*

### Commitment Features:

This is a reaffirmation commitment that contains two separate actions:

- (1) domestic implementation of the FATF recommendations;
- (2) international promotion of the FATF recommendations.

The commitment specifically states that all 40 Recommendations and 9 Special Recommendations must be considered in assessing compliance.

### Background:

The FATF was established at the G7 Summit in Paris in 1989 and released its first set of 40 Recommendations in 1990. The mandate of the FATF is to ensure that national financial systems are not used for illegal purposes. The FATF was charged by the G7 nations with the task of reviewing their national and international rules and regulations with the goal of identifying possible areas to be strengthened against money laundering and criminal enterprise. The 40 Recommendations were revised in 1996 and 2003 in order to ensure that they remain current and relevant.

In 2001, the FATF added the problem of terrorism financing to its primary scope of activities. In 2004, the FATF released a further 9 Special Recommendations in order to comply with its new goal of combating terrorism financing. Some of the Recommendations include specific actions to be undertaken by national authorities, while others insist on the ratification and implementation of UN Conventions and Treaties. As of 2007, 32 nations and 2 regional bodies (including all members of the G8 plus the European Union) were members or observers of the Financial Action Task Force.

### Scoring:

-1	State implements none of the FATF Recommendations and Special Recommendations and does not actively encourage other states to implement such Recommendations.
0	State implements some of the FATF Recommendations and Special Recommendations and does not actively encourage other states to implement such Recommendations.
+1	State implements all or most of the Recommendations and Special Recommendations and actively encourages other states to do so. State implements all those Recommendations and Special Recommendations it can implement, actively encourages provincial/state authorities to implement those

	bearing on their responsibilities and encourages other states to implement the Recommendations and Special Recommendations.
--	---

## 22. Trade [327]

### Commitment

“We remain fully committed to the development dimension of the DDA, promoting progressive trade liberalisation, helping developing countries to better integrate into the multilateral trading system and providing support to the poorest countries in order to enable them to benefit from the significant opportunities of globalisation.”

*G8 Trade Declaration*

### Commitment Features:

The G8 countries have committed themselves to three separate aspects of the Doha Development Round of trade liberalization negotiations:

- (1) Continued liberalization of trade
- (2) Integration of developing nations into the multilateral trade system
- (3) Support for LDCs in the exploitation of opportunities from globalization

These are not actions that the countries have undertaken to complete on their own or as a group. They are principles that they have agreed to maintain in their own positions (or, in the case of the four EU members, in the EU position) at trade talks.

### 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. To this end, they have made the commitment to put the talks back on track and resume negotiations to meet extended deadlines.

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. The package was negotiated by the ‘Group of Interested Parties’ which was comprised of the US, EU, Australia (from the Cairns Group), Brazil and India (from the G20). 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 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 agricultural subsidies; 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.

**Scoring:**

-1	State does not actively pursue developments on the three priority topics as part of its stance on trade negotiations within the DDA.
0	State incorporates only some of the three priority areas as main components of its stance on DDA negotiations; state includes all priority areas as part of its liberalization platform but does not prioritize them with respect to other goals/topics.
+1	State actively promotes the four priority areas during trade negotiations and engages in discussions with other nations to encourage their adoption of the three priority areas as components of their trade platforms.

## 23. Global Partnership [328]

### Commitment

“We reaffirm our commitment to the Global Partnership against the Proliferation of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction as set out in the 2002 Kananaskis G8 Summit documents.”

*Report on the G8 Global Partnership*

### Commitment Features:

The commitment calls for one simple action: maintenance of the principles outlined in the 2002 Kananaskis G8 Summit Documents

(<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2002kananaskis/arms.html>).

### Background:

Introduced at the 2002 Kananaskis Summit, the Global Partnership against the Proliferation of WMD is aimed at assisting Russia and former member states of the USSR in decommissioning excess nuclear, biological and chemical weapon stocks. This initiative was spearheaded by the United States under the auspices of threat reduction measures intended to minimize the potential of rogue states and terrorist organizations to acquire access to large, often poorly guarded, stocks of weapons of mass destruction, or the materials needed to develop such weapons.

Given that these weapons stocks are improperly or insufficiently secured primarily due to prohibitive disarmament costs, G8 member states pledged to collectively raise US\$20 billion over ten years to fund Global Partnership program initiatives. At the Gleneagles Summit in 2005 and again at St. Petersburg in 2006 the G8 member states renewed their commitment to their 2002 pledge.

The following is a chart of the contributions agreed by each participant at the 2002 Kananaskis Summit, to be provided by 2012.

<u>Member State</u>	<u>Original Currency</u>	<u>2002 US Dollars</u>	<u>2007 US Dollars</u>
Canada	CAD1 billion	\$637 million*	\$917 million <sup>†</sup>
France	€1 billion	\$941 million*	\$1.35 billion <sup>‡</sup>
Germany	€1.5 billion	\$1.4 billion*	\$2.03 billion <sup>‡</sup>
Italy	€1 billion	\$941 million*	\$1.35 billion <sup>‡</sup>
Japan	USD200 million	\$200 million	\$200 million
Russia	USD2 billion	\$2 billion	\$2 billion
United Kingdom	€750 million	\$706 million*	\$1.01 billion <sup>‡</sup>
United States	USD10 billion	\$10 billion	\$10 billion

European Union                      €1 billion                      \$941 million\*                      \$1.35 billion<sup>‡</sup>

*\* According to IMF's 2002 average exchange rate*

*† According to average Bank of Canada exchange rate for 02.01.2007 to 26.10.2007*

*‡ According to average ECB exchange rate for 02.01.2007 to 26.10.2007*

**Scoring:**

-1	State provides no new funds towards the Global Partnership and does not participate in any new programs initiated under the auspices of the Global Partnership.
0	State provides some funding towards the Global Partnership but funding is substantially less than in previous years. State continues funding but does not engage in new projects.
+1	State continues to provide funding according in line with previous years' allocations, continues to support the principles of the Partnership in its diplomacy and to support individual programs in which it is already engaged.