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Preface

Each year since 1996, the G8 Research Group has produced a compliance report on the progress made by the G8 members in meeting the commitments their leaders issue at each summit. Since 2002, the group has usually published an interim report to assess progress during the transition from one host to the next, as well as the final report issued just before the annual summit. These reports, which monitor each G8 member’s implementation of 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 the meaningful analysis of this unique and informal institution. Compliance reports are available at the G7 Information Centre at www.g7.utoronto.ca/compliance.

Based at the University of Toronto and founded in 1987, the mission of the G7 and G8 Research Group is to serve as the leading independent source of information and analysis on the institutions, performance, issues and participants of the G7/8 summit and system of global governance. It is a global network of scholars, students and professionals. The group oversees the G7 Information Centre, which publishes freely available research on the G7 as well as official documents issued by the G7.

For the 2014 Final Compliance Report, 16 priority commitments were selected from the 147 commitments made at the Brussels Summit, hosted by the European Union from 4 to 5 June 2014. This report assesses the results of compliance with those commitments as of 30 May 2015.

To make its assessments, the G7 Research Group relies on publicly available information, documentation and media reports. To ensure the accuracy, comprehensiveness and integrity of these reports, we encourage comments and suggestions. Indeed, this is a living document, and the scores can be recalibrated if new material becomes available. All feedback remains anonymous and is not attributed. Responsibility for this report’s contents lies exclusively with the authors and analysts of the G8 Research Group.

This report is produced entirely on a voluntary basis. It receives no direct financial support from any source, by a process insulated from the other major activities of the G7 and G8 Research Group, such as the “briefing book” produced by Newsdesk Media or the pre-summit conferences sponsored by various institutions.

The work of the G8 Research Group would not be possible without the steadfast dedication of many people around the world. This report is the product of a team of energetic and hard-working analysts led by Enko Kocaku, chair of the student G7 Research Group, as well as the co-directors of the Compliance Unit: Sarah Burton, David Cosolo and Michael Humeniuk. It would also not be possible without the support of Dr. Ella Kokotsis, director of accountability, and Caroline Bracht, senior researcher. We are also indebted to the many people who provide feedback on our drafts, whose comments have been carefully considered in this revised report.

John Kirton
Director, G7 Research Group
Executive Summary
The University of Toronto G7 Research Group Final Compliance Report on the 2014 Brussels Summit is based on the analysis of G7 countries and the European Union with 16 priority commitments made at the Brussels Summit. The period covered by this analysis is from 5 June 2014 to 30 May 2015. The final scores are summarized in Table A.

Scores are assigned on a scale where +1 indicates full compliance with the stated commitment, 0 is awarded for partial compliance or a work in progress, and −1 when countries fail to comply or that take action that is directly opposite to the commitment.

The Final Compliance Score
The results of the G7 Research Group’s assessments indicate that, from 5 June 2014 to 30 May 2015, G7 members received an average compliance score of +0.63. This is up from the previous year’s score of +0.50 for compliance with the commitments made at the 2013 Lough Erne Summit. This indicates positive growth in states’ compliance with G7 commitments over the past few years.

Compliance by Member
The European Union is ranked first with an average compliance score of +0.81, followed by Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States each with a score of +0.75 (see Table B). Canada remains above the overall average of +0.69 for all members with a score of +0.63. Countries below the average are France at +0.50, Japan at +0.44 and Italy with +0.38.

The first-ranked score of the EU, which hosted the 2014 Brussels Summit, suggests the presence of the hosting effect. The United Kingdom and United States have consistently ranked high in recent summits, having recently hosted summits. Germany also ranks well above the average as the expected host for the incoming 2015 Schloss Elmau Summit.

The Compliance Gap Between Members
The results from the 2014 Brussels Summit show a difference of 0.44 between the highest and lowest G7 compliance scores. This is consistent with the previous two years, with a spread of 0.45 in 2013 and 0.44 in 2012.

Compliance by Commitment
This year, the commitments with the highest compliance were tax evasion, stolen assets recovery, reproductive health, the issue of Syrian refugees and the regional security issue of Ukraine (see Table C). With respect to these commitments, the G7 members and EU all achieve a score of +1.00. The commitments on African infrastructure, infectious disease and the Muskoka Initiative on Maternal, Newborn and Child health achieved a relatively high level of compliance at +0.75. With similar consistency, low carbon economies, climate finance and the Deauville Partnership had a score of +0.63.

At a score of +0.50 and +0.38, crime and corruption, and protectionism placed in fifth and sixth place, respectively.

On the lower end of the spectrum, environmental goods and the Rome G7 Energy Initiative attained scores of +0.13.

With the lowest level of compliance, across all the commitments that were examined, peace and security in Libya had a score of −0.13.
Future Research and Reports

The information contained within this report provides G7 members and other stakeholders with an indication of their compliance results during the 2014-15 period, which spans from 6 June 2014, immediately following the 2014 Brussels Summit, to 31 May 2015. 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. Comments are always welcomed and would be considered as part of an analytical reassessment. If so, please send your feedback to g8@utoronto.ca.
### Table A: Overall Compliance Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Russia</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>European Union</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Regulation: Tax Evasion</strong></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trade: Protectionism</strong></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trade: Environmental Goods</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy: Energy Security</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate Change: Low-Carbon Economies</strong></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate Change: Climate Finance</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development: African Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deauville Partnership</strong></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stolen Assets Recovery</strong></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime and Corruption</strong></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health: Muskoka Initiative on Maternal, Newborn &amp; Child Health</strong></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Sexual and Reproductive Health and Reproductive Rights</strong></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health: Infectious Diseases and Global Action Plan</strong></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Security: Ukraine</strong></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development: Syrian Refugees</strong></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peace and Security: Libya</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compliance Average</strong></td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Final Compliance Average</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Interim Compliance Average</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Final Compliance Average</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Final Compliance Average</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Final Compliance Average</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B: Compliance by Member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>+0.81</td>
<td>+0.39</td>
<td>+0.22</td>
<td>+0.18</td>
<td>+0.56</td>
<td>+0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>+0.61</td>
<td>+0.61</td>
<td>+0.59</td>
<td>+0.61</td>
<td>+0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>+0.72</td>
<td>+0.61</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
<td>+0.61</td>
<td>+0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>+0.78</td>
<td>+0.56</td>
<td>+0.65</td>
<td>+0.61</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>+0.69</td>
<td>+0.39</td>
<td>+0.28</td>
<td>+0.76</td>
<td>+0.44</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>+0.44</td>
<td>+0.71</td>
<td>+0.67</td>
<td>+0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>+0.44</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>+0.44</td>
<td>+0.65</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>+0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
<td>+0.33</td>
<td>+0.17</td>
<td>+0.65</td>
<td>+0.56</td>
<td>+0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+0.33</td>
<td>+0.28</td>
<td>+0.29</td>
<td>+0.33</td>
<td>+0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>+0.52</td>
<td>+0.42</td>
<td>+0.60</td>
<td>+0.54</td>
<td>+0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spread</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table C: Compliance by Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Regulation: Tax Evasion</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Assets Recovery</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual and Reproductive Health and Reproductive Rights</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development: Syrian Refugees</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Security: Ukraine</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development: African Infrastructure</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health: Muskoka Initiative on Maternal, Newborn and Child Health</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health: Infectious Diseases and Global Action Plan</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change: Low-Carbon Economies</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change: Climate Finance</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deauville Partnership</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime and Corruption</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade: Protectionism</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade: Environmental Goods</td>
<td>+0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy: Energy Security</td>
<td>+0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace and Security: Libya</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Average</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“[We remain committed to tackling] tax evasion, where we look forward to the rapid implementation of the new single global standard for automatic exchange of tax information.”

Brussels G7 Summit Declaration

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

Background

Tax evasion is the illegal evasion of tax by individuals, corporations or trusts. In recent years G8 member countries have faced public outcry over corporate tax evasion and avoidance.1 The government of the United Kingdom has encountered significant pressure to diminish the use of tax havens by British companies.2 The European Commission has made the reduction of tax evasion a priority. Since 2013, it has made strides towards minimizing banking secrecy on the continent and introducing EU-wide standards for the exchange of banking information.3 Tax evasion and avoidance have also received popular attention in the United States and France.4

The reduction of tax evasion has been part of the commitments of the G8 since the 2013 Lough Erne summit. British Prime Minister and G8 President for 2013 David Cameron promised to make “fighting the scourge of tax evasion and aggressive tax avoidance a priority.”5 In response to recent controversy, the leaders pledged to “restore confidence in the fairness and effectiveness of our international tax rules and practices, and to ensure that each country is able to collect taxes owing.”6

Since 2012, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has attempted to formulate common standards for exchanging tax and financial information between countries. On

19 April 2013, the leaders of the G20 endorsed the OECD’s Common Reporting Standard as the normative model for the exchange of tax data.7 At the 2013 Lough Erne Summit, the G8 leaders called “on all jurisdictions to adopt and effectively implement this new single global standard at the earliest opportunity.”8

This commitment, and much of its phrasing, remains in the 2014 Brussels Summit Leaders’ Communiqué.

Commitment Features

The commitment describes the leaders’ ongoing commitment to reduce the capacity of persons, companies or trusts to illegally evade tax. Although tax avoidance and evasion are often part of the same public discourse, the reduction of avoidance is not relevant to this commitment. Therefore, measures with respect to eliminating tax havens, the closure of legal loopholes, or any measure to reduce legal non-payment does not constitute the satisfaction of this commitment. Measures that could reduce both avoidance and evasion, such as the increased sharing of information and greater transparency, do constitute measures against tax evasion.

The Leaders’ Declaration makes specific reference to the OECD Standard for Automatic Exchange of Financial Account Information. This suggests that the G7 Leaders approach to the reduction of tax evasion relates specifically to increasing transparency and the exchange of information. These are capacity-related measures. Therefore, measures intended simply as deterrents, such as increasing prison sentences for convicting tax evaders or increasing fines, also do not constitute compliance with the commitment. Funding for anti-tax evasion organizations is capacity-based, and therefore does constitute compliance.

The Leaders’ commitment to a “new single global standard” implies that full compliance constitutes measures to reduce tax evasion specifically through the promotion or implementation of the OECD Standard for Automatic Exchange of Financial Account Information.

For example, partial compliance would occur if a member country passed domestic legislation allowing other countries to submit requests for citizens’ banking information if they are suspected of tax evasion abroad. This builds capacity to fight tax evasion, but does not pertain to the OECD Standard because it does not promote the automatic exchange system.

Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>−1</td>
<td>Member introduces no new measures to reduce tax evasion practices AND does not act to further the promotion or implementation of the OECD Standard for Automatic Exchange of Financial Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member introduces new measures to reduce tax evasion practices BUT does not act to further the promotion or implementation of the OECD Standard for Automatic Exchange of Financial Account Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member acts to further the promotion or implementation of the OECD Standard for Automatic Exchange of Account Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lead Analyst: Jerome Newton

---

8 G8 Lough Erne Leaders Communiqué, G8 Information Centre (Toronto) 2013, Date of Access: 2 March 2015. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2013lougherne/lough-erne-communique.html#tax
Canada: +1
Canada has fully complied with its commitment to tackle tax evasion and to further the implementation of a new single global standard for automatic exchange of tax information.

Due to growing concerns over FACTA in Canada, Finance Ministry Jim Flaherty and National Revenue Minister Kerry-Lynne D. Findlay announced 5 February 2014 that Canada and the US, after prolonged negotiations, have signed an intergovernmental agreement under the Canada-US Tax Convention. The Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act (FACTA) required non-US financial institutions to report to the US Internal Revenue Service (IRS) accounts held by US taxpayers. However under the agreement, financial institutions in Canada will not report any information directly to the IRS but to the CRA. The IRS will also provide the CRA with enhanced and increased information on certain accounts of Canadian residents held at US financial institutions.9

In October 2014, at the OECD Global Forum on Transparency and Exchange of Tax Information, Canada committed to undertaking its first information exchanges by 2018, though it did not commit to early adoption of the standard.10

On 7 January 2015, Kerry-Lynne D. Findlay announced the launch of the Canada Revenue Agency’s (CRA) Electronic Funds Transfer (EF) initiative, introduced in Economic Action Plan 2013, as one of several new measures to break down on international tax evasion and aggressive tax avoidance. Effective 1 January 2015 certain financial intermediaries, including banks, have to report to the CRA incoming and outgoing international EFTs of $10,000 or more. Findlay states, “These new measures will help crack down on international tax evasion and ensure our tax system remains fair for all Canadians.” 11

Canada has complied fully with its commitment to furthering the implementation of the OECD automatic exchange of tax information. Therefore, it has been awarded a compliance score of +1.

Analyst: Jennifer Commisso

France: +1
France has fully complied with its commitment to fight tax evasion and to aid in the implementation of a global standard for automatic exchange of tax information.

In June 2014, French Finance Minister Michel Sapin and Swiss Finance Minister Eveline Widmer-Schlumpf signed an agreement committing their countries to work more closely to fight tax evasion. Sapin stated, “Improving the exchange of information on judicial request is a step towards the automatic exchange of information, which is set to become standard in international tax cooperation.” The deal allows France to request access to data on groups of its citizens’ bank accounts in Switzerland.12

---

In October 2014, France signed the OECD Multilateral Competent Authority Agreement, committing to specific procedures implementing by September 2017 automatic tax information exchanges as agreed under the OECD Standard for Automatic Exchange.\(^{13}\)

France has fully complied with the commitment to deter tax evasion through capacity-based measures. Thus, a score of +1 has been awarded to France.

*Analyst: Jennifer Commisso*

**Germany: +1**

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to further promote or implement the OECD Standard for Automatic Exchange of Account Information.

On 28 and 29 October 2014, Germany hosted the Global Forum on Transparency and Exchange of Information for Tax Purposes. There, Germany signed the multilateral agreement on the automatic exchange of tax information developed by the OECD.\(^{14}\)

In November 2014, at the Brisbane G20 summit, Germany committed to undertake automatic information exchanges by 2017 and to becoming one of the first jurisdictions to do so.\(^{15}\)

Germany has taken active steps to implement the OECD Standard for Automatic Exchange of Account Information. Thus, it has received a compliance score of +1.

*Analyst: Alexander Marshall*

**Italy: +1**

Italy has fully complied with its commitment to reduce tax evasion and increase transparency and information sharing, both domestically and abroad.

Italy has participated in the European Union’s initiative to “strengthen its tax-saving directive, which requires member states to exchange information,” and was also one of 80 countries that agreed to the OECD’s “common reporting standard” for financial transparency in 2014.\(^{16}\)

On 23 February 2015, Italy signed an agreement with Switzerland to “exchange tax-relevant information.”\(^{17}\) The agreement will “allow Italian tax authorities to ask for financial information about Italian residents who hold assets in Swiss bank accounts.”\(^{18}\)

---


On 2 March 2015, Italy signed a similar agreement with Monaco that grants “total transparency” between the Italian Revenue Agency and the accounts of Italian taxpayers in Monaco. The agreement was formulated in accordance with the OECD standard for transparency and information sharing.

Domestically, Italy has made changes to its tax collection methodology. New regulations require banks to transfer their data to tax authorities. Tax authorities are now sent “pre-filled tax declarations to all taxpayers except the self-employed” that will allow for more focused and coherent audits.

Because of Italy’s work to decrease tax evasion domestically, and its participation in multiple international treaties designed in direct adherence to the OECD Standard for Automatic Exchange of Financial Information, Italy has been given a score of +1.

**Analyst: Matthew Boissonneault**

**Japan: +1**

Japan has fully complied with its commitment to further the implementation of OECD standards. Japan is committed towards the information exchange policies of the OECD, outlined in Standard for Automatic Exchange of Financial Information.

On 20 February 2015, the governments from Japan and the State of Qatar signed a tax agreement, opening an exchange of information on taxes in line with OECD principles. The agreement mimics those Japan has with many other countries, including Portugal and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

As acknowledge by the OECD, Japan has publically and judicially committed itself to the implementation of the global standard for automatic exchange information.

Due to Japan’s adhering to resistant measures against tax evasion, by committing to OECD standards, Japan has been awarded a compliance score of +1.

**Analyst: Eliza Coogan**

**United Kingdom: +1**

The UK has complied fully with its commitment to promote OECD regulations and to prevent tax evasion. Since the Brussels Summit it has initiated measures to comply with OECD guidelines.

On 29 October 2014, at the Global Forum on Transparency and Exchange of Information for Tax Purposes, the United Kingdom agreed to allow automatic information exchange between countries.

---

19 Italy and Monaco sign agreement as last tax haven gives in, italy24, 3 March 2015. Date of Access 5 May 2015.
20 Italy and Monaco sign agreement as last tax haven gives in, italy24, 3 March 2015. Date of Access 5 May 2015.
22 Tax Agreement with Qatar was Signed, Ministry of Finance Japan, 20 February 2015, Date of Access: 10 May 2015.
23 Ministry of Finance, Japan, Date of Access: 10 May 2015.
The UK has been at the forefront of what is known as the “early adopters” of new regulations against tax evasion.\(^{25}\) The information exchange allows the UK to monitor overseas assets of its taxpayers and spot tax evasion more easily.

On 15 April 2015, the UK expanded upon this with the International Compliance Regulations. It cemented the UK’s commitment to combatting tax evasion by outlining the necessary procedures for information exchange.\(^{26}\)

The United Kingdom has been at the forefront of initiatives to combat tax evasion in accordance with the OECD standard. It has therefore been awarded a score of +1.

**Analyst: Eliza Coogan**

### United States: +1

The United States has fully complied with its stated goals to combat tax evasion and increase the transparency and exchange of information in accordance with the OECD Standard for Automatic Exchange of Financial Information. The United States built upon the “Swiss Bank Program,” a 2013 agreement between the United States Department of Justice and the Swiss Federal Department of Finance designed “to get the financial institutions that facilitated a massive fraud on the American tax system to come forward with information about their wrongdoing – and to ensure that they are held responsible for it,”\(^{27}\) by striking a plea agreement with Credit Suisse - one of Switzerland’s largest banks- that requires the bank to “disclose all of its cross-border activities, cooperate in treaty requests for account information and provide intelligence on other banks that transferred funds into secret accounts.”\(^{28}\) All of those requirements are in strict compliance with the standards established by the OECD Standard for Automatic Exchange of Financial Information.

The Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act (FATCA), which the United States passed in 2010, “forces thousands of foreign financial institutions to report American clients’ balances to its tax authority, the IRS.”\(^ {29}\) This year, the United States has made substantial progress in gathering the signatures of foreign governments and putting the laws and policies dictated by FATCA into effect abroad. Now included on the list of countries that have signed on to the agreement are Switzerland, Luxembourg and the Cayman Islands, three of the largest tax havens for American citizens.\(^ {30}\) Since July 2014, countries that have chosen to sign the agreement have either been collecting information on accounts held by Americans at financial institutions within their country and sending this information to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) in the United States, or have had their banks send

---


the information directly. This constitutes major progress with respect to information sharing and transparency.

On 14 November 2015, the US Department of the Treasury announced that the US had signed an intergovernmental agreement with France to implement the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act (FACTA). Enacted in 2010, FACTA aims to curtail offshore tax evasion by facilitating the exchange of tax information. FATCA seeks to obtain information on accounts held by US taxpayers in other countries. It requires US financial institutions to withhold a portion of payments made to foreign financial institutions (FFIs) who do not agree to identify and report information on US account holders.

On 15 July 2014, OECD countries approved a new “common reporting standard”, which requires financial jurisdictions “to obtain information from their financial institutions and automatically exchange that information with other jurisdictions on an annual basis.” The United States has stated its intent to pursue further intergovernmental agreements for FATCA-based automatic information exchanges beginning in 2015.

The United States has formulated and enacted numerous policies, both independently and with reference and adherence to the OECD, that have improved the transparency of financial institutions domestically and abroad. For these reasons, the United States has been awarded a score of +1.

Analysts: Matthew Boissonneault and Jaspreet Khela

European Union: +1

The European Union has fully complied with the commitment to propose policies and implement legislation to develop a global standard for automatic exchange of tax information. It has proposed and partially developed many programs regarding tax information sharing but still needs to pass legislation to have those programs take effect.

In 2012, the European Union proposed an action plan that included the adoption of the revised Parent Subsidiary Directive to impede tax abuses by companies, the creation of the Platform for Tax Good Governance, as well as the launch of the Value Added Tax (VAT) Forum for business-to-tax authority dialogue. Additionally, practical measures were undertaken such as the creation of standard forms for exchange of tax information and computerised information exchange systems across European jurisdictions.

In December 2014, the European Union adopted a revised version of the Directive on Administrative Cooperation, laying the foundation for a legislative framework for automatic tax information exchange. It requires member states of the European Union to automatically exchange

---

financial information between jurisdictions, in line with the global tax standard set in place by the OECD and G20.\textsuperscript{36}

On 15 December 2014, The European Commission adopted Commission Implementing Regulation 1353/2014, amending Regulation (EU) No 1156/2012. Furthering on from the mandatory automatic exchange of information in the field of taxation, this was to ensure a standard computerized format in order to assess data more comparatively.\textsuperscript{37}

The European Union is working towards implementing the Base Erosion and Profit Sharing (BEPS) project in 2015. The BEPS action plans sets out 15 actions that need to be pursued to readjust international tax standards such as in permanent establishment, transfer pricing, and digital taxation.\textsuperscript{38}

On 18 March 2015, the European Commission presented a package of measures to boost tax transparency. This is the first step in an action plan on corporate taxation to be presented in the summer of 2015. This will include ideas for integrating OECD/G20 actions at EU level.\textsuperscript{39}

The European Union has proposed and developed multiple plans to implement a system for automatic tax information and has furthered the OECD standard. Therefore, it has been awarded a score of +1.

\textit{Analysts: Jaspreet Khela and Alexander Marshall}


2. Trade: Protectionism [12]

“We reaffirm our commitment to keep our markets open and to fight all forms of protectionism including through standstill and rollback”

\[12\]

*G7 Leaders' Declaration on the Global Economy*

---

### Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>− 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Background

Protectionism can be observed as any government policy, whereby market forces are regulated such that international trade is restricted for the purposes of thwarting foreign competitors and supporting domestic business.

As economics and politics are increasing influenced by globalization, free trade agreements are seen as the optimal model for long-term financial success and superior to insular protectionist policies.

In the past two years, free trade agreements have included the negotiations of: “Canada-EU; Japan-EU; Canada-Japan; EU-US; the Trans-Pacific Partnership; and the Trade in Services Agreement.” Additional, in line with the World Trade Organization (WTO), G7 members have pledged to execute measures that reduce or eliminate tariff or non-tariff barriers as they pertain to environmental goods and services.

Historically, the G7/8 and G20 have promulgated commitments so that, ultimately, market-openness is maintained and increased.

Recognizing the risks of exacerbating economic decline through protectionism, leaders at the 2008 Washington G20 Summit pledged to “refrain from raising new barriers to investment or to trade in goods and services, imposing new export restrictions, or implementing WTO inconsistent measure to stimulate trade.” For the 2012 G7, the Camp David Declaration stipulated the commitment for all members to reduce trade barriers and counter protectionist measures within the framework of the energy sector.

---

At the 2013 Lough Erne G8 Summit, leaders restated their support for the WTO’s objective of reducing trade barriers, resisting protectionist policies, establishing global trade standards, and enforcing a level playing field for global trade.\(^{44}\)

Most pertinent to this commitment, leaders at the Los Cabos G20 Summit declared reaffirmation to their standstill commitment and “pledge[d] to rollback any new protectionist measure that may have arisen, including new export restrictions and WTO inconsistent measures to stimulate exports.”\(^{45}\)

**Commitment Features**

G7 members have reaffirmed their commitment to fight against protectionism. To this end, G7 governments must enforce measures, which actively counter protectionist barriers.

With particular focus of the Brussels Declaration, G7 members will use the instruments of standstill and rollback.\(^{46}\)

Standstill measures are actions taken that oppose the enactment of new barriers to trade that constitute as protectionist measures. These measures includes the prevention of government-imposed restrictions, which affect fair trade — through export and import regulations — so that fair competition between states is diminished. Barriers, which are categorized as protectionist, are those that limit the global flow of goods, investments, and services.

The instrument of rollback simply entails the reversal and repeal of status quo protectionist measures.

For full compliance, G7 member state must both: (1) remove protectionist policies through rollback; (2) refrain from adopting insular policies that would additionally stifle free trade through standstill.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member introduces protectionist trade policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member removes already existing protectionist trade policies OR does not adopt any new protectionist trade policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member removes already existing protectionist trade policies AND does not adopt any new protectionist policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lead Analyst: Kaleem Hawa*

**Canada: +1**

Canada has fully complied with its commitment to keep their markets open and to fight all forms of protectionism.

On 5 August 2014 Canadian and EU partners signed the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA).\(^{47}\) Through this, Canadian industry will deal directly with EU markets. CETA is

\(^{44}\) G8 Lough Erne Leaders Communiqué, G8 Information Centre (Toronto) 18 June 2013. Date of access: 2 December 2013. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2013lougherne/lough-erne-communique.html


expected to increase bilateral trade in Canada by 20 per cent, increasing GDP by CAD12 billion in maritime fisheries.\textsuperscript{48}

As a part of the CETA, the Canadian province of Newfoundland and Labrador plans to remove minimum processing requirements (MPRs) on fishery exports. Former Premier Kathy Dunderdale confirmed this commitment in exchange for tariff free seafood imports in EU markets, by 2022.\textsuperscript{49}

On 25 July 2014, the Ontario minister of energy responded to complaints by the EU that Canada was not upholding their international free trade commitments through Canada’s Green Energy Act.\textsuperscript{50} Via rollback measures, the Ontario Power Authority (OPA) was then ordered by the Ontario minister of energy to remove the domestic content requirements in FIT and microFIT contracts signed by the OPA.\textsuperscript{51} This policy became effectively immediately upon the directive of the minister.\textsuperscript{52}

On 22 September 2014, Prime Minister Stephen Harper and President Park Geun-hye affirmed the Canada-Korea Free Trade Agreement (CKFTA), Canada’s first free trade agreement (FTA) in the Asia-Pacific region.\textsuperscript{53} The CKFTA will eliminate tariffs between both countries and reduce non-tariff measures which hinder free trade. Korea will remove tariffs on 100 per cent of non-agricultural goods and 97 per cent of agricultural goods in exchange for the removal of tariffs on 99.9 per cent of Korean exports to Canada.\textsuperscript{54} Ultimately, the CKFTA is expected to increase Canadian GDP by CAD1.7 billion.\textsuperscript{55}

Through the rollback of previous protectionist policies and by not adopting further protectionist measures in international trade, the Canadian government has actively enforced anti-protectionist policies and fully maintained their commitment to the G7 summit. Thus, Canada is given a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Conor Finan}

\textbf{France: –1}

Despite some clear signs of commitment to liberalization and European economic integration, France has actively introduced a protectionist policy, leading to an overall non-compliance with this commitment.


In May 2014 the French government issued a decree that gives it the power to head off any foreign takeovers that are seen as hostile in strategic sectors.\textsuperscript{56} Attempting to assuage concerns about protectionism, the French Ministry of Finance stated that “the new measures will be applied selectively and proportionately, taking into account each situation.”\textsuperscript{57} This move extended an original 2005 decree, which covered security and defence, to include energy, transportation, and water in response to foreign investment negotiations between Alstom and General Electric. Alstom, a French company, is heavily involved in electricity and rail markets.\textsuperscript{58}

June 2014 saw France recover from a downward trend in foreign direct investment, returning to the top ten in rankings of the most attractive countries for FDI.\textsuperscript{59} Fleur Pellerin, Minister of State for Foreign Trade, the Promotion of Tourism and French Nationals Abroad, commented that France “has moved up the Foreign Direct Investment Confidence Index two years in a row to be back among the leaders, a sign of international investors’ renewed confidence in the economic reforms begun by the government.”\textsuperscript{56}

On 2 December 2014, France announced its support for the European Union’s investment plan. The plan will focus on transportation, renewable energy, and the technology sector, and aims to create a long-term competitive edge in the world economy.\textsuperscript{60} Emmanuel Macron, the French minister of the economy, stated that the plan will “progressively bring our economies and our societies closer together and then return to our real European ambitions.” Macron also mentioned a plan to put forward a bill to the French cabinet which would complement the plan with domestic financial pledges.\textsuperscript{62}

On 17 February 2015, Prime Minister Manuel Valls announced that he would put an economic reform bill through parliament by decree.\textsuperscript{63} The bill, which focuses on liberalizing domestic economic practices, would allow shops to stay open on more Sundays, allow for more competition in

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\end{thebibliography}
the legal profession, and reduce red-tape barriers in job dismissal procedures.\textsuperscript{64} The move is largely in response to concerns voiced by the EU regarding France’s inflexible domestic economy.\textsuperscript{65}

In April 2015, France announced plans to increase financial transparency and stability in order to reduce the possibility for abuse of the tax system.\textsuperscript{66} This move, which takes into consideration the implications of foreign direct investment, works to improve relationships between tax and business authorities in order to avoid double deduction of loan interest, the false relocation of labour, and abuse of preferential tax systems.\textsuperscript{67}

Once again, despite its attempts at integrating more robustly with the European Union and liberalizing certain sectors of the domestic economy, the French Ministry of Finance has nevertheless adopted a significant protectionist policy through their extension of the 2005 decree allowing the government to prevent foreign investment. Thus, France receives a score of $-1$ on this commitment.

\textit{Analyst: Leila Martin}

\textbf{Germany: 0}

Germany has partially complied with its commitment to reduce protectionism and promote free trade. Although Germany has engaged in dialogue with other nations and suggested the possibility of future free trade agreements, no concrete agreements were reached in 2014.

On diplomatic visits to other nations, German Chancellor Angela Merkel frequently alluded to future bilateral free trade agreements, but did not confirm anything more concrete. During a 27 March 2014 visit to Canada, Chancellor Merkel stressed her support for the EU-Canada free trade agreement, but did not organize any follow-up bilateral action.\textsuperscript{68} On an 11 November 2014 visit to Pakistan, Chancellor Merkel focused on private-sector investment in the nation, but also emphasized the importance of concluding an EU-Pakistan free trade agreement in the future.\textsuperscript{69} On 14 November 2014, during a visit to New Zealand Chancellor Merkel stated that “[Germany] should work towards establishing a free trade agreement with New Zealand.”\textsuperscript{70} During a similar diplomatic visit to Australia, on 17 November 2014 Chancellor Merkel again referred to the importance of developing bilateral free trade relations with Australia in the future.\textsuperscript{71} Although Angela Merkel frequently refers

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
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to the importance of free trade, no tangible actions have been taken by Germany to act on the rhetoric.

Germany also expressed its willingness to support free trade at a number of summits and conferences. During an address at the European Family Business Summit, hosted in part by Germany, Angela Merkel emphasized a need for haste in concluding the Free Trade Agreements with both Canada and the United States.72 At a ministerial meeting of the G20 in Sydney, Australia on 18–19 July 2014, Germany supported the commitment to resist protectionism through standstill and rollback.73 In an 18 December 2014 statement, Chancellor Merkel reiterated the importance of concluding the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership again directly prior to a European Council meeting.74

Despite frequently referring to the importance of free trade for the German economy, a full compliance score cannot be given because Germany has not taken any concrete action in 2014 to actually implement anti-protectionist policies. Thus, Germany has been awarded a score of 0 for partially complying with the commitment.

Analyst: Duja Muhanna

Italy: 0

Italy has partially complied with its commitment to decreasing protectionism. Overall in 2014, Italy focused on implementing changes domestically to improve its economic growth and increase foreign trade but has fallen short of significantly limiting its pre-existing protectionist guarantees.

While most Italian trade centers around countries within the free trade European customs union, the Jobs Act proposed by Prime Minister Matteo Renzi aims to make structural changes to a rigid Italian job market.75 As one of the major reforms implemented, the Jobs Act made it easier to dismiss workers and create a single-tiered job market bulwarked by regional free trade that aimed at decreasing Italy’s high youth unemployment rates.76 According to the Italian government, the Jobs Act will pull the Italian economy out of recession, increase the employment rate, and attract international investment.77

On January 25, 2015 Italy’s cabinet approved new banking and investment measures outlined in the Legislative Decree No. 3. The legislation provides small and medium-sized businesses access to loans from the Italian Insurance Agency for Foreign Commerce but requires them to establish part of their business in Italy.78 While this limitation has hues of protectionism, the legislation eliminates an
existing requirement that non-resident foreign institutional investors be registered taxpayers in order to benefit the tax exemptions of their investment income.\textsuperscript{79}

There were numerous visits made by Italian government representatives to Latin America\textsuperscript{80}, China\textsuperscript{81}, and Canada in order to strengthen bilateral economic relations. Additionally, Italian companies continue to do business abroad, for example Italy’s MaireTecnimont secured a 1.7 billion euro contract to produce oil near Abu Dhabi.\textsuperscript{82} Italy is also hosting a Universal Exhibition in Milan that will promote international cooperation with a specific focus on food security.\textsuperscript{83}

While Italian government has made serious efforts to open up the Italian economy to foreign trade through bilateral visits as well as hosting their Milan 2015 expo, the introduction of Legislative Decree No. 3 and the maintenance of certain governmental protectionist policies inhibits full compliance with this commitment. Thus, Italy receives a 0 for partial compliance.

\textit{Analyst: Emma De Leeuw}

\textbf{Japan: +1}

Japan has fully complied with commitments to fight protectionism by repealing some current tariffs, strengthening foreign partnerships, and increasing investment.

Japan’s Revitalization Strategy, released in June 2014, outlined commitments to increasing foreign direct investment and improving National Strategic Special Zones; the plan aims to double FDI from JPY17 billion in 2012 to JPY35 billion.\textsuperscript{84} The government proposed reaching this goal by making the labor dispute resolution system more predictable and transparent and facilitating cross-ministerial collaboration to attract investment.\textsuperscript{85}

At the Asia-Europe Business Forum in October 2014, Prime Minister Abe indicated that his administration looked favourably upon reforming agricultural policy and increasing efficiency through agribusiness in order to compete on a global market.\textsuperscript{86} He also stated that Japan will “put an end to the regional monopolies in electricity that have been in place for 60 years and create a free and


dynamic energy market where innovation blooms” and noted that Japan has decreased its corporate tax rate.\(^7\)

Japan and Canada reached round seven of their economic partnership negotiations the week of 17-21 November 2014. The free trade agreement has been discussed since 2012, and has the potential to bring CAD4 billion in gains to both parties.\(^8\)

The Japan-Australia Economic Partnership Agreement entered into force on 15 January 2015 after fifteen rounds of negotiations. JAEPA further strengthens “the special strategic partnership” by reducing investment restrictions and increasing trade between the two countries.\(^9\)

On 2 February 2015, the Japanese government proposed a decrease in the tariff they place upon US pork imports through the Asia-Pacific free trade initiative; they proposed decreasing the current tariff (JPY482 per kilogram of pork) to JPY50 over the next ten years.\(^10\) This move is paired with a safeguard measure that will drastically increase the tariff on any pork imports that exceed the quota. Japan has indicated that it wants to retain its tariffs on rice, wheat, beef, dairy, and sugar, despite the Trans-Pacific Partnership’s goal of free trade.\(^11\)

Japan enjoyed a trade surplus in March 2015 for the first time since 2012, signaling increased external demand and some domestic recovery. The surplus of JPY229 billion was mostly due to exports of cars, electronic parts, and machinery.\(^12\)

On 3 April 2015 Abe’s Cabinet approved a bill to create agricultural reform by removing the privileges of a large agricultural lobby.\(^3\) The politically powerful Central Union of Agricultural Cooperatives, known as JA-Zenchu, has dominated Japan’s agricultural sector for 60 years. The new bill hopes to increase competition by returning autonomy to local co-ops, which would be governed by regional farmers. The government is planning further initiatives to double the amount of farmland that corporations are allowed to hold.\(^4\)

From 26–29 April 2015, Abe visited the United States, stopping in Boston and Washington, DC. He gave a speech on April 29 to a joint meeting of the US Congress entitled “Towards an Alliance of Hope,” which included support to following through with the Trans-Pacific Partnership and liberalizing Japan’s agricultural policy.95

In May 2015, advisors from the Obama administration indicated that Japan and the US are very close to reaching an agreement through the Trans-Pacific Partnership regarding free trade. Ministers from the 12 countries in the partnership will be meeting from May 26-29 to discuss the next steps in achieving free trade.96

Despite some reluctance in further repealing tariffs, Japan has been awarded a score of +1 for its progress involving negotiations with regional partners, its move towards repealing pork tariffs, and its lack of new protectionist regulations.

**Analyst: Leila Martin**

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitments to keep its markets open and to fight all forms of protectionism.

On 9 October 2014, negotiating directives were released for the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP); the UK actively participates in this EU-US agreement focused on freer international trade.97 This FTA would remove USD1 billion in international trade duties that UK businesses pay each year. This would also increase access for UK business to over 300 million American consumers.98 Further, it would reduce duplication costs for companies in regards to the similar safety procedures legislated by both countries. This is possible by demanding adherence to a single standardized set of instructions.99

The UK has maintained their commitments to international trade agreements geared at benefiting poorer countries. These include: Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs), Generalised System of Preferences (GSP), Generalised System of Preferences Plus (GSP+), and Everything but Arms (EBA).100 EPAs focus on providing tariff and quota free access to UK markets to ACP countries. GSP favours trade with, and reduces the import and export taxes on goods from, 176 developing countries and territories. For the 176 developing countries, GSP+ improves upon GSP grants for nations willing to adopt 27 particular conventions on human and labour rights, and environmental

regulations. EBA is designed specifically for the world’s poorest countries and grants tariff and quota free trade with UK markets.\textsuperscript{101}

On 1 June 2014, a Framework Agreement entered into force between the EU and South Korea as a result of the EU-South Korea FTA signed in 2010. The UK, as a part of the EU, has actively maintained their FTA with Korea. This FTA removes tariffs on industrial and agricultural imports and exports, with all tariffs being lifted on all goods, excluding select agricultural products, by 1 July 2016. Further, it focuses on eliminating non-tariff barriers to trade, particularly in regards to the automotive, pharmaceutical, medical-device and electronics sectors. This FTA also attempts to improve transparency between regulations and sustainable development, while improving access between markets.\textsuperscript{102}

The UK has successfully rolled back previous protectionist policies through the implementation of anti-protectionist initiatives. They have also maintained previous FTAs. By not adopting further protectionist policies, the UK has earned a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Conor Finan}

\textbf{United States: 0}

The United States has partially complied with the commitment on protectionism. While there is significant interest in decreasing protectionism within the United States as evidenced by efforts towards new free trade agreements, the persistence of some protectionist policies inhibits a full compliance ranking.

The United States has successfully pursued a variety of free trade arrangements with China this year.\textsuperscript{103} For example, the Agriculture Market Access in China was signed in December 2014 in an effort to promote an increase in American agriculture and food products.\textsuperscript{104} This is contrasted, however, with American unwillingness to become a member of the Chinese-led Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) despite its increases in membership across Europe and Asia.\textsuperscript{105} This, coupled with the introduction of the Trade Priorities and Accountability Act in an effort combat Chinese policies that increase the prices of rare earths, tungsten, and molybdenum, hints at an unwillingness towards fulsome free trade between the two nations.\textsuperscript{106}


In addition, the United States is still undergoing negotiations for the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), a free trade agreement between itself 12 Asian countries. Although President Barack Obama is a supporter of the agreement, there is considerable domestic opposition — mainly from within the Democratic party.\textsuperscript{107} In addition to opposition in the United States, there have been various disagreements between the Americans and the Japanese stemming from the TPP.\textsuperscript{108} President Barack Obama has requested to fast-track the TPP but has again faced significant domestic opposition stemming from concerns about Chinese currency manipulation.\textsuperscript{109} The resultant political impasse contributes to the partial compliance ranking.

In addition to the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the United States is currently negotiating the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) that would reduce tariffs between the US and European Union.\textsuperscript{110} The United States hopes to gain access to the European food markets while the Europeans want access to American financial services — both the parties are hesitant, however, to be too ambitious and hurt their own industries.\textsuperscript{111} Following the leak of a proposed draft in 2014, the negotiations have stalled and little is expected to be finalized before 2016.\textsuperscript{112}

The United States has pursued an ambitious free trade agenda with a significant focus towards decreasing foreign countries’ protectionist measures that undermine American exports. Despite this willingness to pursue free trade, it has been quite difficult to fully ratify these efforts into concrete action due to the divided political opinion within the United States and the emergent competitive wrangling between the US and China. Therefore, the United States receives a 0 for partial compliance with the protectionism commitment.

\textit{Analyst: Rehaan Khan}

\textbf{European Union: +1}

The European Union has fully complied with efforts to combat protectionism and open its markets. The EU retained its position as a leader in FDI and pursued several free trade agreements.

In July 2014 the European Union finalized Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) with several countries. Economic Partnership Agreements are designed to immediately and fully open up European Markets to trade with developing countries to help kick-start economic growth. In July, such agreements were signed with West African States, Fiji, the South African Development


Community and Cameroon. On October 16th 2014 an additional EPA was signed with the East African Community.

On August 5th 2014, the EU and Canada signed the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA). The agreement will eliminate custom’s duties on industrial goods traveling between Canada and Europe over a period of seven years. Significant liberalization will also occur in services and most food and agricultural products. However, some specific agricultural sectors will retain quotas or exemptions.

Since the G7 commitment was made, significant work has also been made in negotiating the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) with the United States as well as a free trade agreement with Japan. As a result of CETA and the potential TTIP, the EU has also committed to upgrading its existing free trade agreement with Mexico. The decade old Custom Union between Turkey and the EU will also be modernized.

On January 27th 2015 and February 5th 2015, the EU opened its market to environmental goods and goods from the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) respectively. Both agreements give goods from these two sources preferential access to the European Market.

Obama claimed in February 2015 that European scrutiny of major American tech companies constituted protectionism. The EU vehemently denied the charge, claiming that its competition probes into companies like Google are consistent with anti trust and competition laws.
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Over the reporting period, the EU also remained the top recipient and source of foreign direct investment worldwide. As a result of EU commitment to free trade and anti-protectionist measures, the EU has fully maintained their commitment to the G7 summit. Thus, the EU is given a score of +1.

*Analyst: Christian Medeiros*
3. Trade: Environmental Goods [21]

“We are committed to liberalizing trade in environmental goods and services, including through an Environmental Goods Agreement.”

2014 Brussels Declaration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

G7 members have, for years, consistently committed to eliminating subsidies, tariffs, and other barriers to trade. At the 2014 Brussels Summit, G7 members recognized the unique importance of environmental goods to the modern economy, and therefore committed to trade liberalization in this unique sector.124

Environmental goods include, “goods for air pollution control, cleaner and resource efficient technologies and products, environmentally preferable products based on end use and disposal characteristics, heat and energy management products, environmental monitoring products, analysis and assessment equipment, goods for natural risk management and natural resources protection, noise and vibration abatement products, renewable energy plants, management of solid and hazardous waste and recycling systems, goods for clean up or remediation of soil and water, and products for waste water management and potable water treatment.”125

In 2013, a number of World Trade Organization (WTO) members agreed to pursue an ambitious and legally binding Environmental Goods Agreement among themselves — seeking to build on the 2012 Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation’s list of environmental goods.126

Commitment Features

The commitment has two distinct parts. Member states have committed to liberalizing trade in environmental goods in a unilateral and bilateral context, as well as taking steps towards the conclusion of a broader Environmental Goods Agreement, such as that envisioned and currently pursued by a small sub-group of the WTO’s membership.

Full compliance with this commitment therefore requires that G7 members (1) liberalize trade in environmental goods in a unilateral and bilateral context through the elimination of subsidies, tariffs, and non-tariff barriers to trade, for example by announcing reduced tariffs on specific environmental goods as was done at the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation summit in 2012, and (2) that G7 members take concrete political steps towards concluding a wider Environmental Goods Agreement through the WTO or other forums, for example by joining, concluding, or remaining participants in successive rounds of WTO negotiations on this issue.

### Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member does not take steps towards liberalizing trade in environmental goods and services AND do not take concrete steps towards the conclusion of an Environmental Goods Agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member institutes trade-liberalizing measures in environmental goods and services OR takes concrete steps towards the conclusion of an Environmental Goods Agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Member institutes trade-liberalizing measures in environmental goods and services AND takes concrete steps towards the conclusion of an Environmental Goods Agreement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Canada: 0**

Canada has partially complied with its commitment to take concrete steps towards liberalizing trade in environmental goods and concluding a broader Environmental Goods Agreement.

On 8 July 2014, Canada’s Minister of International Trade, Ed Fast, announced Canada’s participation in the official launch of WTO Environmental Goods Agreement negotiations in Geneva, Switzerland.

On 27 August 2014, Canada’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Trade, and Development released a notice of intent to conduct an environmental assessment on the potential Environmental Goods Agreement. It aimed to assess the environmental impacts (in Canada) of a plurilateral Environmental Goods Agreement.

During 22-26 September 2014 at the Second Round of Negotiations on an Environmental Goods Agreement in Geneva, Canada presented environmental good product nominations in the categories of (1) air pollution control, and (2) solid and hazardous waste management.

---


On 20 February 2015, the Government of Canada concluded its preliminary public consultation on an Environmental Goods Agreement — intended to identify Canadian interests and help the Government of Canada prepare for further rounds of negotiation.\textsuperscript{132}

During the compliance period Canada has taken actions toward the conclusion of an Environmental Goods Agreement. It has not, however, implemented liberalizing measures in the trade of environmental goods. Thus, Canada has been awarded a score of 0.

\textit{Analyst: Freda Zhang}

\textbf{France: 0}

France has partially complied its commitment to liberalize trade on environmental goods and take concrete steps towards a conclusion of an Environmental Goods Agreement.

On 8 July 2014, France, under the European Commission, joined with other WTO Members to launch negotiations on WTO Environmental Goods Agreement.\textsuperscript{133}

From 4 June 2014 to 31 July 2014, France participated in the public consultation on Green Goods Initiative launched by the European Union on behalf its member states in preparation for further negotiations on the Environmental Goods Agreement.\textsuperscript{134}

During this compliance period France has participated in the discussions of Environmental Goods Agreement as a European Union member state, but has not taken concrete actions towards liberalizing trade in environmental goods per the Green Goods Initiative itself. Thus, France has been awarded a score of 0.

\textit{Analyst: Freda Zhang}

\textbf{Germany: 0}

Germany has partially complied with its commitment to liberalize trade in environmental goods and to take concrete steps towards the conclusion of an Environmental Goods Agreement.

Between 2008 and 2013, Germany’s average yearly export of environmental goods was USD100 billion, which made the country one of the highest exporters of these goods in the world.\textsuperscript{135} Despite this, in the 2014/15 cycle, Germany did not participate in any unilateral or bilateral initiatives to eliminate subsidies, tariffs, and non-tariff barriers to trade in environmental goods.

However, as part of the EU, Germany has been negotiating the Environmental Goods Agreement (EGA) with a number of other states to improve access to green technologies to other states by eliminating tariffs and reducing costs.\textsuperscript{136}

Therefore, since Germany has only partially complied with its commitment through participation in the EGA led by the EU, it has been awarded a score of 0.

\textit{Analyst: Emily Tsui}

\textbf{Italy: 0}

Italy has partially complied with its commitment to liberalize trade in environmental goods.

On 8 July 2014, the Government of Italy announced its participation in the WTO's Environmental Goods Agreement (EGA) negotiations, and publicly announced its “shared goal of global free trade in environmental goods.”\textsuperscript{137}

The first stage of talks and negotiations took place in Geneva over the course of 2014, and early 2015. It included five rounds of discussions between the members of the G7 and participating WTO members.\textsuperscript{138}

Italy, as part of the EU, has started discussions to reduce tariff and non-tariff barriers to trade in environmental goods. The agreement, however, remains in the negotiating stage. No liberalization of trade in green goods has been implemented. Therefore, Italy is awarded a score of 0 for partial compliance.

\textit{Analyst: Ujwal Ganguly}

\textbf{Japan: +1}

Japan has fully complied with its commitment to liberalize trade in environmental goods and to take concrete political steps toward concluding a wider Environmental Goods Agreement.

On 19 January 2015, the World Trade Organization (WTO) announced that Japan had taken the lead in contributing to the implementation of APEC List of Environmental Goods Agreement (54 items), which commits to a tariff rate reduction of 5% or more by the end of 2015.\textsuperscript{139}

On 23 February 2015, Japan announced a tariff reduction in solar-energy.\textsuperscript{140} The tariff for solar-power investment applications approved between April 1, 2015 and June 30, 2015 will be cut to 29

---


Yen per kilowatt hour from the current rate of 32 Yen per kilowatt hour.\textsuperscript{141} The tariff will be cut again to 27 yen per kilowatt hour beginning July 2015.\textsuperscript{142}

Due to its unilateral tariff reductions and progress in implementing APEC’s Environmental Goods Agreement, Japan has been awarded a score of +1 for full compliance.

\textit{Analyst: Ji Won Chun}

\textbf{United Kingdom: 0}

The United Kingdom has partially complied with its commitment to liberalize trade in environmental goods and services, including through an Environmental Goods Agreement.

In a joint statement with the WTO on July 8, 2014, the government of the United Kingdom announced that: “Today, we are pleased to announce the launch of negotiations on the Environmental Goods Agreement (EGA), through which we aim to achieve our shared goal of global free trade in environmental goods. We will now engage in intensive negotiations, meeting regularly in Geneva, to discuss the substance of the agreement, including product coverage.”\textsuperscript{143} Additionally, the statement noted that “In this process we are committed to work together and with other WTO Members similarly committed to liberalization that are interested in joining our ambitious efforts. We are convinced that this WTO initiative will … support its mission to liberalize trade.”\textsuperscript{144}

Throughout 2014 and early 2015, the United Kingdom participated in five rounds of negotiation on an environmental goods agreement between the members of the G7 and participating WTO members. The talks focused on removing tariffs on a list of 54 products on which the member countries of APEC (Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation) have agreed to reduce their tariffs to 5 per cent or less by 2015\textsuperscript{145}

The UK has started discussions to reduce tariffs and non-tariff barriers through a multilateral Environmental Goods Agreement. However, this agreement remains in negotiation. No liberalization of trade in green goods, either unilaterally or bilaterally, has been implemented. The United Kingdom, therefore, has partially complied with its commitment and is awarded a score of 0.

\textit{Analyst: Ujwal Ganguly}

United States: 0
The United States has partially complied with its commitment to liberalize trade in environmental goods and to take concrete steps toward concluding a wider Environmental Goods Agreement.

On 12 July 2014, the United States, the European Union, China and 11 other governments begin trade negotiations to eliminate tariffs on solar panels, wind turbines, water-treatment equipment and other environmental goods under an Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation framework. The same countries are currently working to expand that list considerably.

Due to its participation in negotiations towards a comprehensive Environmental Goods Agreement, the United States has been awarded as score of 0 for partial compliance.

Analyst: Ji Won Chun

European Union: 0
The European Union (EU) has taken significant steps towards concluding a multilateral Environmental Goods Agreement. It has not, however, taken unilateral action towards reducing tariffs on environmental goods. The European Union is therefore awarded a score of 0.

The EU is currently negotiating the Environmental Goods Agreement (EGA) with 16 other members of the World Trade Organization (WTO). Talks began in July 2014 with the goal of eliminating tariffs on a broad range of environmental goods, including services linked to these goods, in order to ultimately make the acquisition of these goods cheaper. If successful, tariffs would be cut on almost CAD1 trillion of environmental goods and would affect 86% of trade in renewable energy infrastructure goods, clean water filtration systems, and air pollution control technologies.

The sixth round of negotiations occurred from 4-8 May 2015, where the list of environmental goods was finalized. A draft agreement is expected to be presented during the 10th WTO summit from 15—18 December 2015. If accepted by the WTO, it may become a legally binding plurilateral agreement that will receive “Most Favoured Nation” status.

---

As the EU has demonstrated efforts to liberalize trade through negotiation of the EGA, it has been awarded a score of 0.

*Analyst: Emily Tsui*

“[Under the Rome G7 Energy Initiative, we will] implement concrete domestic policies by each of our governments separately and together, to build a more competitive, diversified, resilient and low-carbon energy system.”

Brussels G7 Summit Declaration

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>−1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

The 2014 Rome G7 Energy Initiative for Energy Security was formulated following the recent developments in Ukraine and the use of energy as a means of political coercion and threat to security.\(^\text{154}\)

Energy security has often been interrelated with many other issues such as economic growth, transparency in energy markets, reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, diversification of energy fuels, and efficiency in energy systems in prior G8 commitments.\(^\text{1}\) However, a broad commitment to global energy security incorporating multiple components was first addressed at the 2006 St. Petersburg Summit, where member states recognized associated global energy challenges such as growing energy demand, environmental protection, and economic growth.\(^\text{155}\)

At the 2008 Hokkaido Summit, member states reaffirmed their support for the tone set at St. Petersburg by adopting commitments towards energy efficiency and diversification.\(^\text{156}\) Since then, subsequent summits have addressed associated issues of economic sustainability, growth, and security across multiple commitments.

The Rome G7 Energy Initiative was adopted as the central guiding focus in the energy agenda at the 2014 Brussels Summit. Member states agreed to utilize the principles set out by this initiative as a guide for policy implementation and immediate action in energy emergency plans, collaboration with international organizations, and self-assessments.\(^\text{157}\)

Commitment Features

This commitment, which is part of a broader energy-focused agenda, focuses on the identification and implementation of domestic policies both locally and globally for the development of an effective low-carbon energy system in accordance with the 2014 G7 Rome Energy Initiative.\(^{158}\)

The 2014 G7 Rome Energy Initiative focused on the development of a lasting and concrete change to strengthen energy security at both the regional and global level.\(^{159}\) To foster this change, a broader energy security strategy is required with collective responsibility to address the issues of a globalized energy market. Under this focus the Initiative proposed a list of 7 principles as a set of guidelines for national and regional level decisions.\(^{160}\) These core principles are as follows:

- Development of flexible, transparent and competitive energy markets, including gas markets.
- Diversification of energy fuels, sources and routes, and encouragement of indigenous sources of energy supply.
- Reducing our greenhouse gas emissions, and accelerating the transition to a low carbon economy as a key contribution to sustainable energy security.
- Enhancing energy efficiency in demand and supply, and demand response management.
- Promoting deployment of clean and sustainable energy technologies and continued investment in research and innovation.
- Improving energy systems resilience by promoting infrastructure modernization and supply and demand policies that help withstand systemic shocks.
- Putting in place emergency response systems, including reserves and fuel substitution for importing countries, in case of major energy disruptions.

In line with these guiding principles, compliance to this commitment requires policy implementation by the member state individually as well as in tandem with other states, to foster the development of a “more competitive, diversified, resilient and low-carbon energy system.”\(^{161}\)

Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member does not implement domestic policies based on the G7 Rome Energy Initiative core principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member implements domestic policies based on the G7 Rome Energy Initiative EITHER individually OR in partnership with other G7 members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member implements domestic policies based on the G7 Rome Energy Initiative core principles both individually AND in partnership with other G7 members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lead Analyst: Daniel Szulc


Canada: 0

Canada has partially complied with its commitment to implement concrete policies for the development of a low-carbon energy system. Canada has implemented some policies based on the G7 Rome Energy Initiative on an independent basis.

On 22 September 2014, the Environment Minister Leona Aglukkaq announced that three measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) in cars and trucks would be undertaken by the Government of Canada to reduce GHG emissions and air pollution.\footnote{Government of Canada Takes Further Action to Reduce Greenhouse Gases (GHGs) and Air Pollution from Cars and Trucks, Government of Canada (Ottawa) 22 September 2014. Date of access: 27 April 2015. http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?mthd=index&crtr.page=1&nid=8865298\_ga=1.22623992.253778377.1416427706}


Steps to increase energy supply as well improving competition have been made, but not in line with a low-carbon energy system. Minister of Natural Resources Greg Rickford stated on 16 January 2015 that the completion of the Seaway and Flanagan South pipelines enhance North American energy security by helping to double the amount of Canadian oil supplied to the U.S. Gulf coast.\footnote{Minister Rickford: new oil pipeline projects mark significant milestone in Canada’s contribution to energy security, Government of Canada (Ottawa) 16 January 2015. Date of access: 27 April 2015. http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?mthd=advSrch&crtr.mnthndVl=&crtr.mnthStrtVl=&crtr.page=11&nid=921889&crtr.yrndVl=&crtr.kw=environment&crtr.yrStrtVl=&crtr.yrndVl=&crtr.dyStrtVl=&crtr.dyndVl}

In the support of a low-carbon energy system, Natural Resources Canada announced on 16 February 2015 that the government would give an additional CAD4.5 million to the ecoENERGY program for the development of clean energy technology.\footnote{ecoENERGY innovation initiative announced, Government of Canada (Ottawa)16 February 2015. Date of access: 27 April 2015. http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?mthd=advSrch&crtr.mnthndVl=&crtr.mnthStrtVl=&crtr.page=9&nid=933519&crtr.yrndVl=&crtr.kw=environment&crtr.yrStrtVl=&crtr.dyStrtVl=&crtr.dyndVl}


On 2 March 2015 Michelle Rempel, minister of state for western economic diversification, announced a federal investment of CAD0.45 million for the University of British Columbia towards the commercialization of technologies that will support sustainability in the oil and gas industries.\footnote{Harper government supports innovation in clean technology, Government of Canada (Ottawa) 4 March 2015. Date of access: 27 April 2015. http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?crtr.sj1D=&crtr.mnthndVl=4&mthd=advSrch&crtr.dpt1D=&nid=941019&crtr.lc1D=&crtr.tp1D=&crtr.yrStrtVl=2015&crtr.yrndVl=2015&crtr.dyStrtVl=2015&crtr.dyndVl=2015&crtr.kw=%22natural+gas+export+licences%22&crtr.ynvDl=27
}
announced investments totalling over CAD20.6 million for eight clean technology projects in Alberta.\(^{169}\)

A number of measures to enhance safety have been introduced. Greg Rickford announced the introduction of the Pipeline Safety Act on 8 December 2014.\(^{170}\)

On 14 April 2015, Rickford indicated that discussions with the United States on oil and gas emissions were moving forward.\(^{171}\) However, on 23 April 2015, Prime Minister Stephen Harper announced that US emissions targets would not be met and that greater regulatory measures to meet GHG emissions cuts would be required.\(^{172}\)

On 21 April 2015, the Canadian Minister of Finance Joe Oliver helped the liquefied natural gas industry by extending the accelerated capital write-offs for the industry and expanding the maximum length of export licenses to 40 years.\(^{173}\)

In the 2015 federal budget, CAD80 million is to be provided over five years to the National Energy Board for safety and environmental protection.\(^{174}\) CAD30.8 million will be provided for measures to enhance the safety of marine transportation in the Arctic and further strengthen marine incident prevention, preparedness, and response in waters south of the 60th parallel.\(^{175}\)

Thus, Canada is awarded a score of 0 for partial compliance by only implementing domestic policies in line with the G7 Rome Energy Initiative on an independent basis.

**France: 0**

France has partially complied with its commitment to emissions reduction and to transitioning to a more diversified, competitive and resilient low-carbon energy system. Thus, it has been given a score of 0. On 30 July 2014, France’s Environment Minister, Segolene Royal, tabled the Energy Transition Bill.\(^{176}\) The law, if passed, will codify the country’s commitments to transition to 32% renewable

---


Germany is not on track to meet its 2020 emissions reduction goal due to its sustained reliance on lignite.\textsuperscript{185} Germany has surpassed that goal, as of 2014.\textsuperscript{186} The bill thus includes tenets that would make the insulation of buildings more efficient and incentivize owners to focus on builder energy positive constructions.\textsuperscript{179} In addition, a 30 percent tax credit off the cost of improvements made will be awarded to homeowners who implement energy efficient changes in their homes.\textsuperscript{180} Energy vouchers will be issued to low-income households to help them pay their increased energy bill, or to finance an energy positive home improvement.\textsuperscript{181}

In addition, France has announced that the financial institution Caisse de Dépots would help fund more energy efficient municipal transportation projects if the Energy Transition Bill passes.\textsuperscript{182} Moreover, a rebate program will be set up to incentivize citizens to purchase more fuel efficient cars.\textsuperscript{183}

France has received a score of 0 for partial compliance in implementing domestic policies based on the G7 Rome Energy Initiative core principles.

\textit{Analyst: Mary Anderson}

**Germany:** +1

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to transition towards a more competitive, diversified, resilient and low-carbon energy system, and has coordinated its efforts within the EU, thus it has been awarded a score of +1.

Germany has made considerable efforts towards accomplishing the goals set out in its 2009 National Renewable Energy Action Plan (NREAP). The NREAP codified Germany’s commitment to an 18\% goal percentage of renewables in their energy mix by 2020. Germany has surpassed that goal, as of 2015 renewables made up 26\% of the country’s energy mix.\textsuperscript{184}

Germany is not on track to meet its 2020 emissions reduction goal due to its sustained reliance on lignite.\textsuperscript{185,186} As a result, on 3 December 2014, Germany’s cabinet approved the Climate Action

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{177} French Energy Transition Bill Debate Heats Up, Euractiv March 10, 2014. Access Date: April 28, 2015. \url{http://www.euractiv.com/sections/energy/french-energy-transition-debate-heats-308920} \\
\end{flushright}
Programme (CAP). The CAP has set a cap on the overall emissions of the energy sector at 4.4 million tonnes per year, anticipating that this will result in a reduction in emissions by heavily polluting industries. Additionally, the country made amendments to its Energy Transition (Energiewendung) in August, setting new target corridors for photovoltaic and wind energy, at 2.5-3.5GW and 2.4-2.6GW respectively. If these targets are exceeded, generators of photovoltaic and wind energy will be subjected to lower feed-in tariffs.

Moreover, in 2014, Germany agreed to open its domestic markets for the import of renewable energy from abroad. Although it has not reached the target for energy generation interconnectedness set by the EU in 2002 (10% per state), Germany has agreed to make 5% of its future auctions open to foreign energy projects.

For its full compliance towards a more competitive, diversified, resilient and low-carbon energy system, Germany has been awarded a score of +1.

**Italy: 0**

Italy has taken a number of steps towards implementing and fostering domestic policies based on the G7 Rome Energy Initiative and thus has partially complied with its commitment to the development of a more competitive, diversified, resilient and low-carbon energy system.

Italy held the Presidency of the EU from July 2014 to December 2014 and was responsible for shepherding the EU’s plan for the Paris 2030 program for climate change and energy. The aims of the Italian Presidency of the EU were set out beforehand. EU leaders agreed on a 40 per cent cut in greenhouse gases by 2030, a mandatory 27 per cent reliance on renewable energy sources, and an optional 27 per cent improvement in energy efficiency.

On 29 August 2014, Italian Council of Ministers approved the decree Sblocca Italia (“restart” or “unlock” Italy). Plans included the encouragement of energy exploration and low emission

---

vehicles. The Minister of Economy and Finance presented a progress report on structural reforms, including to the energy sector and environment, in February 2015. Infrastructure improvement needs have been identified regarding natural gas pipelines — import and national transmission networks, the storage of natural gas and regasification terminals.

On 26 January 2015, the Industry Deputy Minister Claudio de Vincenti stated that the government planned to reduce subsidies to solar power producers. Italy is aiming to achieve a 10 per cent reduction in energy prices, bringing them closer to the EU average.

On 6 March 2015 the EU Environment Council approved the 40 per cent domestic reduction of greenhouse gases by 2030, which was agreed to under the Italian Presidency of the EU in October 2014.

For its domestic work Italy has been awarded a score of 0. Membership of the EU ensures Italy implements the G7 Rome Energy Initiative core principles; however, Italy has not fostered any initiatives together with other G7 member states.

**Analyst: Johan Krijgsman**

**Japan: –1**

Japan has not complied with its commitment to implement domestic policies to build a more competitive, diversified, resilient, and low-carbon energy system.

On 14 April 2015, Japan announced that its carbon dioxide emissions had increased 1.1 percent from the previous year. This was the highest emissions on record and was due in part to the closure of Japan’s nuclear power plants several years before. Japan also decreased the price per watt of solar energy to JPY 27 per kilowatt-hour which has resulted in the decreased the production of solar power.

On 30 April 2015 Japan proposed to cut its greenhouse gas emissions by up to 26 percent by 2030 compared to 2013 levels or 25.4 percent compared to 2005 levels. This commitment is lower than the United States and European Union’s commitments of 26-28 percent and 35 percent respectively from 2005 levels.

---

Japan receives a score of −1 for not adopting domestic policies that build a more competitive, diversified, resilient and low-carbon energy system, either individually or with other G7 states.

**Analyst: Reid Dobell**

### United Kingdom: 0

The United Kingdom has partially complied with its commitment to build a more competitive, diversified, resilient, and low-carbon energy system. It has implemented multiple domestic policies in line with the G7 Rome Energy Initiative; however, it has not fostered any partnerships with other G7 members.

On 14 February 2015, the leaders of the UK’s three largest political parties joined together to oppose climate change. They promised to end coal burning at power stations unless it used new clean up technology. They also agreed to accelerate the transition to a competitive, energy efficient low carbon economy.

On 17 February 2015 Energy and Climate Change Secretary Ed Davey announced proposals to establish the world’s largest wind farm offshore at Dogger Bank. The department said the farm’s capacity of up to 2.4 gigawatts (GW) could power around two million homes.

On 26 February 2015, the UK auctioned government subsidy payments amongst renewable energy suppliers. This served as a follow up to the electricity market reforms announced by the Energy and Climate Change Department, which became law on 1 August 2014.

On 18 March 2015 Chancellor George Osborne provided tax incentives in his 2015 budget to the North Sea oil industry (facing declining output as well as lower oil prices). Minister Matthew Hancock from the Department of Energy and Climate Change advised in a written response to the Environmental Audit Committee’s inquiry into environmental risks of fracking, that the

---


government’s approach takes into account health and safety concerns as well as environmental considerations and undertakings (e.g. carbon budgets).\textsuperscript{212}

In the light of these actions, the United Kingdom has been awarded a score of 0 for the implementation of domestic policies following the G7 Rome Energy Initiative aims.

\textit{Analyst: Johan Krijgsman}

**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to the 2014 G7 Rome Energy Initiative. Since the 2014 Summit, the U.S. has committed to improving domestic energy as well as facilitating international discussions on energy.

On 29 July 2014, the White House held a methane stakeholder roundtable, after which Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz “announced several new initiatives as DOE’s part of the larger Administration Strategy to Reduce Methane Emissions.”\textsuperscript{213} These initiatives include (1) Efficiency Standards for Natural Gas Compressors; (2) Advanced Natural Gas System Manufacturing R&D Initiative; (3) ARPA-E MONITOR Program; (4) Providing Loan Guarantees for New Methane Reduction Technologies; (5) Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Proposed Policy on Cost Recovery for Natural Gas Facilities Modernization.\textsuperscript{214}

In September 2014, the United States held the fourth annual US-EU-Japan Conference on Critical Materials for a Clean Energy Future.\textsuperscript{215} The conference facilitated discussion between energy “officials and experts” from the three countries in order to address how to best maintain an “adequate supply of critical materials for a clean energy future.”\textsuperscript{216} The conference highlighted the United States’ commitment to “continue to pursue an integrated research plan that addresses critical materials challenges, in addition to collaborating with interagency and international partners.”\textsuperscript{217}

On 21 April 2015, the White House released the Quadrennial Energy Review (QER) to investigate how to best “modernize the Nation’s energy infrastructure to promote economic competitiveness, energy security, and environmental responsibility.”\textsuperscript{218} The review includes the US Department of Energy’s Partnership for Energy Sector Climate Resilience, which encompasses a partnership of 17 American energy companies to improve U.S. energy infrastructure climate resistance.\textsuperscript{219} The review


also comprises a U.S. Department of Agriculture project that will spend USD72 million on “six new rural electric infrastructure projects including major investments to drive solar energy.”

Additionally, the QER recommends a variety of programs to invigorate and fortify US energy infrastructure.

Thus, the US earns a score of +1 for its full compliance to the 2014 G7 Rome Energy Initiative.

Analyst: Raajan Aery

**European Union: 0**

The European Union has partially complied with its commitment to the 2014 G7 Rome Energy Initiative. It has adopted legislation to improve energy efficiency within the European Union, but has not worked with other G7 members to promote bilateral or multilateral energy reform.

On 22 January 2014, the European Commission released a memo outlining a proposed market stability reserve that “is intended to function to the benefit of companies that have made and will make low-carbon investments.” However, this proposal has yet to pass into legislation.

On 23 October 2014, the European Council adopted legislation proposed by the Commission on climate and energy objectives for 2030. This legislation aims to improve energy efficiency in European Union countries by a minimum of 27 per cent by 2030. The bill was passed with the intention of promoting “new opportunities for businesses, affordable energy bills for consumers, increased energy security through a significant reduction of natural gas imports and a positive impact on the environment.” Although, the logistics of the deal “were left vague or voluntary” and do not clarify the methods as to how these goals will be met.

Thus, the European Union earns a score of 0 for partial compliance.

Analyst: Raajan Aery

---

5. Climate Change: Low-Carbon Economies [45]

“We therefore remain committed to low-carbon economies with a view to doing our part to limit effectively the increase in global temperature below $2^\circ C$ above pre-industrial levels.”

*Brussels G7 Summit Declaration*

### Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>−1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Background

The first address on climate change was featured in the 1978 Bonn and 1980 Venice summits; however, these negotiations were directed towards energy security rather than the environment.227 Focus on the environment came in 1992, with the signing of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro.228 This was done with the objective of stemming atmospheric pollution, particularly greenhouse gas concentrations.

Discussions regarding the environment developed further at the 2002 Kananaskis Summit with the incorporation of sustainable development regarding agricultural practices and water resources, however, significant focus was placed on development in Africa and not a global effort.229

With further addresses at the 2005 Gleneagles Summit by UK Prime Minister Tony Blair and commitments made at the 2007 Heiligendamm Summit, increased awareness and attention was placed on climate change, in particular on the reduction of pollutants and the steps necessary to stem the rise in global temperatures due to global warming.230,231

Continued support for a global effort came at the 2009 Copenhagen meeting of the G8 member states and parties of the UNFCCC at the 15th Conference of Parties (COP-15) to establish a successor to the Kyoto protocol commencing in 2012.232 Though the assembly was unsuccessful in...
establishing a legally binding agreement, a list of 12 principles, referred to as the Copenhagen Accord, with the focus of climate change mitigation and adaptation, was created.\textsuperscript{233}

The focus of climate change mitigation and adaptation is a shared focus by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). The IPCC was created in 1988 and has provided the G8 with five reports to aid policy makers on the scientific basis and need for action regarding climate change.\textsuperscript{234} The fifth and most recent assessment from September 2013 to November 2014 consists of three Working Group reports and a Synthesis Report.\textsuperscript{235} This report was used as the basis for the 2014 G7 Brussels Declaration on climate change and calls for urgent and concrete action. It forms the ground work for this commitment as well as the larger climate agenda directed towards the development and adoption of a “2015 global agreement [with legal force under the convention applicable to all parties] that is ambitious, inclusive and reflects changing global circumstances.”\textsuperscript{236}

In addition, the 2014 Brussels Declaration reaffirmed the G7 commitment to the Copenhagen Accord and the mobilization of USD 100 billion per year by 2020 to address climate mitigation and adaptation in developing countries.\textsuperscript{237}

**Commitment Features**

This commitment focuses particularly on the development and support of low-carbon economies in accordance with the views of the IPCC to stem the rise in global temperatures below 2°C above pre-industrial levels.\textsuperscript{238}

In line with IPCC views, a low-carbon economy is one which develops and supports global mitigation to limit global warming to annual emissions of 15 gigatonnes of carbon dioxide.\textsuperscript{239}

To accomplish this mitigation a collective effort across multiple fronts and countries is required. The IPCC Fifth Assessment focuses particularly on the global energy, transportation, infrastructure, and industry sectors to address this issue.\textsuperscript{240} However, to achieve such a global effort the mitigatory needs of developing nations must also be met in addition to the establishment of appropriate policies and institutions as stated in the 2014 IPCC Fifth Assessment Synthesis and third Working Group Report.\textsuperscript{241}

Compliance to this commitment thus requires both the implementation of mitigatory policies as well as financial support for mitigatory needs of developing countries to foster the development of a global low-carbon economy.

\textsuperscript{234} IPCC: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Date of Access: 19 February 2015. http://www.ipcc.ch/organization/organization.shtml#UqEGxGzEwI
### Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member takes no significant legislative OR funding action to implement a low-carbon economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member takes EITHER significant legislative OR funding action to implement a low-carbon economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member takes significant legislative AND funding action to implement a low-carbon economy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lead Analyst: Daniel Szulc*

### Canada: +1

Canada has fully complied with its commitment to contribute to the development and support of low-carbon economies in accordance with the views of the IPCC to stem the rise in global temperatures below 2°C above pre-industrial levels.

On 24 November 2014 Prime Minister Stephen Harper pledged CAD300 million to the United Nations Green Climate Fund to help developing countries mitigate the consequences of climate change. The allocated funding will assist the world’s poorest countries to invest in clean energy technologies and to overcome climate change’s adverse effects.

On 12 March 2015 the government of Canada released the *Ozone-depleting Substances and Halocarbon Alternatives Regulations*. The proposed regulations would align with Canada’s international commitments to decrease the use and production of substances that cause ozone depletion. These regulations would replace the *Ozone-depleting Substance Regulation 1998*, and they include: (1) phasing out the use of hydrochlorofluorocarbons, (2) introducing a “permitting and reporting system” to monitor the amounts of hydrofluorocarbons that are imported, manufactured, and exported, and (3) assisting exempted users with the transport of methyl bromide.

Furthermore, on 15 April 2015 at an international meeting in Bangkok, Canada, the United States, and Mexico submitted an amendment to the *Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer*

---


(1987) to reduce the production and consumption of HFCs.\textsuperscript{250} Under the amendment, an estimated 90,000 megaton reduction in HFC emissions could result by 2050.\textsuperscript{251} The reduced figure would be approximately twice the current global yearly production of greenhouse gas emissions.\textsuperscript{252}

The federal government also continued its ecoENERGY program, which will invest a total of CAD195 million between 2011 and 2016 towards improving Canada’s energy efficiency. The ecoENERGY program includes projects to encourage efficient buildings, housing, equipment, industry and vehicles.\textsuperscript{253}

On 15 May 2015, Environment Minister Leona Aglukkaq announced that Canada plans to reduce its greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 30% by 2030, based on 2005 levels.\textsuperscript{254} As per this announcement, Canada has formally submitted its target to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. Minister Aglukkaq also noted the government’s intention to “develop new regulatory measures under its responsible sector-by-sector approach,” including in the oil and gas, electricity, chemicals, and fertilizer sectors.\textsuperscript{255}

Thus, Canada has fully complied with the commitment to a low-carbon future. It has made significant funding contributions to promoting a low-carbon economy at home as well as in developing countries. Canada has also proposed regulations for ozone-depleting substances in accordance with its commitments at the 19th Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol in September 2007, and continues to undertake domestic projects to mitigate the effects of climate change.

\textit{Analyst: Maria Alexiou}

\textbf{France: +1}

France has fully complied with its commitment to the development of a low-carbon economy to stem the increase in global temperatures to below 2°C above pre-industrial levels.

On 21 August 2014 the Ministry of Ecology, in conjunction with non-profit energy and environment groups, held five inter-regional meetings on carbon.\textsuperscript{256} These meetings aimed to inform professionals about the “balance sheet greenhouse gas carbon action plan” and how it can be used as a tool for action. Furthermore, during the 17 September 2014 meeting, the legislative and regulatory


frameworks and the technical and financial assistance of the plan were set out to promote the reduction of carbon dioxide emissions and energy consumption of businesses.\textsuperscript{257}

France has worked to establish good relations with other countries to aid the development of a clean and low-carbon economy. On 17 September 2014, President Francois Hollande and King Abdullah II of Jordan reiterated their commitment to deepen the Franco-Jordanian economic partnership.\textsuperscript{258} The two leaders reviewed ways to increase bilateral trade and economic exchanges, with a particular focus on water and environment, energy efficacy and renewable energy, transportation, agro-industry, and education.\textsuperscript{259}

On 21 November 2014, France pledged a donation of EUR489 million and a zero-interest loan of EUR285 million to the Green Fund, a international tool to aid developing countries in developing low-carbon economies.\textsuperscript{260} The Fund will specifically aid the implementation of adaptation policies for the reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.\textsuperscript{261}

On 28 November 2014, French Prime Minister Manuel Valls declared the fight against climate change a “major national cause” for 2015.\textsuperscript{262} In order to limit worldwide carbon emissions, France seeks to influence a change in public support for exports of coal-generated power through an action plan entitled “Exemplary Administration,” which is to be implemented at the start of 2015.\textsuperscript{263} This action plan will focus on energy transition and encourage the use of agro-ecology products in public businesses.\textsuperscript{264}

On 11 April 2015, during the Prime Minister of India Narendra Modi’s official visit to France, the leaders underlined the importance of enhancing Indo-French cooperation on joint research, technology innovation, diffusion of clean energy, and efficiency solutions to help the transition towards a climate resilient and low carbon economy.\textsuperscript{265}

France has thus been awarded a score of +1 for contributing funding and developing legislative and regulatory frameworks to achieve and promote a low-carbon economy.

\textit{Analyst: Yufei Sun}


Germany: +1

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to climate change regarding the implementation of a low-carbon economy via both legislative and funding action.

On 15 July 2014 at the fifth Petersburg Climate Dialogue, through the International Climate Initiative, the Federal Ministry of Environment supported the drafting of a new climate target for 2015 with 19 other countries.266 Chancellor Angela Merkel also announced a contribution of EUR750 million to the Green Climate Fund (GCF).267

On 8 August 2014, within the framework of the International Climate Initiative (ICI), the Federal Environment Ministry made a contribution of EUR3 million for greater resource efficiency in industry and for improving recycling in India.268 In addition, on 1 September 2014 a new project aimed to protect coastal zones and ecosystems on the Pacific Islands from the impacts of climate change was launched.269

On 23 September 2014 at the New York Climate Summit, the Federal Environment Minister Barbara Hendricks announced that Germany has formed a new partnership with Norway and Peru to establish a new forest-protection partnership to reduce the CO₂ emissions from deforestation.270

On 3 December 2014, Germany’s cabinet approved a new national energy efficiency plan that will modernize and insulate buildings to reduce CO₂ emissions and meet their low-carbon climate targets.271 The package predicts reductions in the amounts of 25 to 30 million tonnes of CO₂ emissions.272 With this new plan, financial support of EUR1 billion in tax breaks and 200 million in low-interest loans will be provided.273 Cuts to transport emissions were also mentioned and would

---

be accomplished via incentives to increase the number of electric vehicles on the roads.\textsuperscript{274} Additionally, cuts to industrial emissions from three to eight million tonnes would be accomplished by improving recycling.\textsuperscript{275}

On 14 December 2014 at the COP20 Lima Climate Change Conference, the German Federal Environment Ministry and the British Department of Energy and Climate Change jointly launched the Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action (NAMA) Facility and provided initial funding of EUR70 million.\textsuperscript{276} The funds will support developing countries and emerging economies such as Burkina Faso, Peru, Thailand, and Tajikistan in the implementation of complex climate change mitigation measures.\textsuperscript{277}

For its significant legislative action and supporting funds to address the G7 commitment of climate change, Germany has been awarded a score of +1. It has a detailed plan for the reduction of CO\textsubscript{2} emissions, and has provided funding and monetary incentives to enhance the success of such a domestic action plan. In addition, Germany has performed significant action in terms of providing funding and establishing projects with developing counties to support the development of a low-carbon economy.

\textit{Analyst: Yufei Sun}

\textbf{Italy: \(-1\)}

Italy has not taken any significant legislative or funding action to implement a low-carbon economy.

On 24 September 2014, Prime Minister Matteo Renzi announced Italy’s intention to create more jobs through the green economy.\textsuperscript{278} He also expressed Italy’s commitment to enter into legally binding future commitments on climate change at the 2015 United Nations Climate Change conference.\textsuperscript{279}

Italy also signaled its interest in focusing on climate change issues during its Presidency of the European Union during the second half of 2014.\textsuperscript{280}

On 23 April 2015, Italian lawmakers were briefed on the 2015 United Nations Climate Change Conference by the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Nations. Italy intends to develop a new partnership with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in preparation for the Climate Change Conference.

Italy receives a score of −1 for not introducing any new legislation or funding action to comply with their commitment to limiting the increase of global temperature through establishing a low-carbon economy.

**Analyst: Reid Dobell**

**Japan: 0**

Japan has partially complied with its commitment to implement a low-carbon economy. Japan has put forth an action plan for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions; however, the plan lacks specific legislative support.

From 4 to 6 August 2014, in Bangkok, Thailand, the Ministry of the Environment of Japan (MoEJ) and the National Institute for Environmental Studies (NIES) convened the 12th Workshop on GHG Inventories in Asia (WGIA12). The goal was to develop and improve Asian countries’ GHG inventories and to enhance cooperative relations towards improving the accuracy of national GHG inventories across Asia. The workshop had succeeded in enhancing capacity-building on Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) and strengthening the network of Asian countries.

On 25 and 26 August 2014, the MoEJ held “The Twenty-Third Asia-Pacific Seminar on Climate Change” with the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade in Kanazawa. During the meeting, participants from the Asia-Pacific region (about 12 countries) had a technical discussion on the current formation and implementation of the “Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions: NAMA” in developing countries. The discussion discussed problems and solutions based on existing policies and achievements, as well as the idea of “Intended Nationally Determined Contributions: INDCs” relating the post-2020 framework.

In addition, at the UN Climate Summit in New York on 26 September 2014, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe announced Japan’s new pledge to promote technological innovation and diffusion to achieve the goal of reducing GHG emissions by 50 per cent by the year 2050, but no official action has yet to be taken.

---


On 15 November 2014, Japan and the United States made a collective pledge of USD1.5 billion funds to the Green Climate Fund to support the control of greenhouse gas emission and build climate resilience worldwide.\textsuperscript{288}

On 30 April 2015 the Japanese Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry and the Ministry of Environment announced that it plans to cut GHG emissions by roughly 26 per cent by 2030, aiming for a respectable but feasible goal with the help of expanded renewable-energy use and the return of nuclear power.\textsuperscript{289} However, the official plan will be released at the Elmau Summit.

Japan has been awarded a score of 0 due to its partial commitment towards the implementation of a low-carbon economy. Japan has made efforts towards the establishment of a binding action plan, yet no concrete details have been set forth as of yet. Financial support has however been pledged towards international initiatives that will aid the implementation of low-carbon economies in struggling economies.

\textit{Analyst: Yufei Sun}

\textbf{United Kingdom: +1}

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to effectively limit the increase in global temperature above pre-industrial levels by fostering a low carbon economy.

In the past year, the UK has continued its efforts to comply with its carbon budgets and targets plan.\textsuperscript{290} On 19 March the British government introduced the new Fluorinated Greenhouse Gases Regulations 2015.\textsuperscript{291} The regulations control the emissions standards of the refrigeration and air-conditioning industries predominantly, two sectors with historically high levels of greenhouse gas emissions.\textsuperscript{292}

On 24 March 2015, the Secretary of State for energy and climate change announced a pilot program with the UK Green Investment Bank to assist with the investment of the UK International Climate Fund. The secretary also noted that GBP200 million would be committed by the government to supporting renewable energy and energy efficiency projects in developing countries.\textsuperscript{293}

The UK thus receives a score of +1 for introducing emissions-limiting legislation in targeted sectors and creating a new initiative for reducing carbon emissions in developing countries.

\textit{Analyst: Reid Dobell}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied with its pledge to remain committed to low-carbon economies with a view to limiting effectively the increase in global temperature below 2°C above pre-industrial levels. This was done through the proposal of comprehensive domestic and international plans to limit and decrease greenhouse gas emissions, and to encourage the free trade of environmental goods. In addition, the U.S. funded the initiatives of developing states to mitigate the effects of global warming and pursue greener economies.

On 2 June 2014 the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proposed the Clean Power Plan, under the Clean Air Act, to create carbon pollution standards for existing power plants.294 The plan aims for a 30 per cent decrease in carbon pollution below 2005 levels by the power sector by 2030.295 Under the plan, states can choose how they will restructure their energy sectors to lower their overall carbon intensity and meet state-specific goals set by the EPA.296 The four “building blocks” of the plan are: (1) increase the efficiency of fossil fuel power, (2) increase the use of low-emitting power sources, (3) increase the use of zero- and low-emitting power sources, and (4) use electricity more efficiently.297 According to Janet McCabe, the EPA’s top climate change official, if states fail to submit their own customized plans the EPA will force them to comply with a federal “model rule.”298

On 8 July 2014 the United States began negotiations within the World Trade Organization (WTO) for an Environmental Goods Agreement (EGA) among the United States, Australia, Canada, China, Costa Rica, the European Union, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, Norway, Singapore, Switzerland and Chinese Taipei. The goal of the proposed agreement is to reduce tariffs on 54 environmental goods among these states—which are responsible for 86 per cent of the world’s trade in such goods.299 Tariffs on environmental goods can be as high as 35 per cent,300 and cutting tariffs on these goods could improve access to the technologies that states require to build greener economies.301

On 11 November 2014 President Barack Obama made a joint announcement with China which outlined a plan to decrease greenhouse gas emissions.302 The United States agreed to lower their

---

greenhouse gas emissions from between 26 to 28 per cent below 2005 levels by 2025.\textsuperscript{303} China announced its own goal to cap its carbon emissions around the year 2030 and to double its portion of zero-carbon energy to 20 per cent.\textsuperscript{304} Both states also agreed to deepen their bilateral clean energy cooperation.\textsuperscript{305} They have agreed to (1) expand their joint clean energy research and development initiatives, (2) undertake a large carbon capture and storage project in China, (3) enhance cooperation to decrease the use of harmful hydrofluorocarbons, (4) launch an initiative for “climate-smart/low-carbon cities,”\textsuperscript{306} and (5) promote the trade of eco-friendly technologies.\textsuperscript{307}

In addition, the United States contributed to mitigating the effects of global warming in developing countries by contributing USD3 billion to the Green Climate Fund (GCF) on 15 November 2014.\textsuperscript{308} The GCF investments will help some of the poorest countries in the world to decrease carbon pollution, enhance resilience to climate change, and promote sustainable long term growth.\textsuperscript{309} The fund will target both emissions mitigation and climate resilience activities, and will include a board with an equal number of developed and developing countries for a high degree of collaboration.\textsuperscript{310}

For its significant legislative and funding initiatives towards creating a low-carbon economy domestically and in developing countries, the United States has been awarded a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Maria Alexiou}

\textbf{European Union: +1}

The European Union has fully complied with its pledge to remain committed to low-carbon economies with a view to limiting the increase of global temperature below 2\textdegree C above pre-industrial levels. This was done primarily through funding and programming to promote environmental transportation, research, infrastructure, and industry.

On 2 December 2014 the European Commission invested EUR54 million into the “Interreg” program aiming to increase cooperation between Austria and Germany and prioritize protecting the


Alpine environment through cross border initiatives. Approximately EUR16.7 million was allocated to "conserving and protecting the environment and promoting resource efficiency."

On 17 December 2014 the European Commission announced its adoption of a EUR9 billion investment package to promote Portugal’s economy focusing on resource-efficiency and climate resilience from 2014-2020. The “Sustainability and Efficiency in the Use of Resources” program, worth EUR2.65 billion, will promote a switch to a low-carbon economy. This will focus on urban areas through projects such as the promotion of sustainable urban transportation. The results of the project are expected to include recycling and reusing over half of the Portugal’s urban waste, increasing the production of renewable energy by over 50 per cent and decreasing emissions by 80,640 CO2 equivalent tons per year.

On 18 December 2014 the European Commission approved seven “Operational Programmes” for Slovakia for 2014-2020. The total amount pledged was approximately EUR13.8 billion, and a key priority of the program is to support the shift to a more competitive and low-carbon economy. Under the “Quality of the Environment” priority, EUR 4.3 billion was allocated to tackle issues relating to climate change. The priorities include the responsible use of natural resources, flood protection, risk management relating to climate change and the support of energy-efficient solutions in all sectors. Among the expected results are improved wastewater treatment for over 200,000

---

citizens, and increased renewable energy sources to 15.5 per cent of Slovakia’s gross energy consumption.\textsuperscript{319}

On 19 December 2014 the European Commission adopted a program to increase transnational cooperation within the EU’s Northern and Arctic members and their neighbours. Finland, Ireland, Sweden, and the United Kingdom will partner with the Faroe Islands, Iceland, Greenland, and Norway to tackle common challenges.\textsuperscript{320} In addition, these countries will cooperate with partners from Canada and Russia. The EU’s total contribution to the Northern Periphery and Arctic 2014-2020 Programme was over EUR50 million.\textsuperscript{321} One of the funding priorities of the program is to foster “energy-secure communities through the promotion of renewable energy and energy efficiency.”\textsuperscript{322}

On 22 January 2015 the European Commission approved a EUR63 million investment from the EU Cohesion Fund to extend Bratislava’s tram from the city centre to the most populated borough of Petrzalka.\textsuperscript{323} The planned 2.4 km double track tramway will have three new stops and benefit 470,000 people.\textsuperscript{324} This project will reduce the number of cars on the road, and will “boost the city’s economic competitiveness and will help the country meet its climate change targets.”\textsuperscript{325}

On 5 February 2015 the EU Commissioner for Regional Policy Corina Creţu attended the 20th Conference of Presidents of the EU’s Outermost Regions and discussed assisting the EU’s peripheral regions to focus resources and investments on economic development and to increase the use of renewable energies to face climate change.\textsuperscript{326} The nine peripheral regions are Guadeloupe, French Guiana, Martinique, Mayotte, Reunion, Saint-Martin, the Azores, Madeira, and the Canary Islands.


Over EUR6.6 billion of Structural and Investment Funds were pledged for 2014-2020 to assist these economies to become more self-reliant and to surpass economic and environmental challenges.  

On 13 February 2015 the European Commission adopted a new interregional cooperation plan for Ireland and Wales, which includes adapting the Irish Sea and coastal communities to climate change. The total amount pledged was EUR79 million with EUR27.7 million allocated for climate change initiatives, including the creation of 24 private, public and non-profit organizations and 10 research institutions to exchange knowledge for better climate change response and adaptation.

Also on 13 February 2015, the European Commission pledged EUR288 million to increase cooperation across the Spain-Portugal border with the priority of increasing environmental protection initiatives, and in particular, flood-risk management.

Due to the European Commission’s funding and programming actions in the areas of environmental infrastructure and legislation, they have been awarded a score of +1 for positive compliance in support of a low-carbon economy to stem the rise of global temperatures due to climate change.

*Analyst: Maria Alexiou*

---


6. Climate Change: Climate Finance [49]

“We reaffirm our support for the Copenhagen Accord commitments to mobilize USD 100 billion per year by 2020 from a wide variety of sources, both public and private, to address the climate mitigation and adaptation needs of developing countries in the context of their meaningful and transparent mitigation actions.”

2014 Brussels G7 Summit Declaration

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

On 7–18 December 2009 the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) met in Copenhagen for the 15th Conference of the Parties (COP-15). Though primary emphasis was made on drafting a successor to the Kyoto Protocol, discourse on sustainable development and climate mitigation led to the Copenhagen Accord.

The Accord recognizes the immediate action necessary to combat the increasing severity and frequency with which climate events are occurring. The Copenhagen Accord provides the basis for which the G7 members form their commitment towards climate financing, by directly addressing the agreement to raise USD100 billion per year by 2020 in efforts to help developing countries cut carbon emissions.

As a direct product of the Copenhagen Accord, the Copenhagen Green Climate Fund (GCF) was established within the UNFCCC framework, officially approved at COP−17 by the UNFCCC in December 2011. The Fund was initiated with the intent of assisting developing countries in adaptation and mitigation strategies to address climate change issues.

Directly quoting from the document, the Accord aims to ameliorate mitigation actions and transparency on implementation by “mobilizing jointly USD100 billion a year by 2020 to address the needs of developing countries.”

The source of funding was generalized to allow for facilitated financial flow towards the Copenhagen Green Climate Fund. The Accord does not mandate

contributing solely towards the Fund, only indicating that “a significant portion of such funding should flow through the Copenhagen Green Climate Fund.”

**Commitment Features**

The commitment will require contribution towards the Copenhagen Green Climate Fund or other climate financing when directly referenced to aiding developing countries. The fulfillment of contributing towards the USD100 billion will implicitly be considered a reaffirmation of support for the Copenhagen Accord and will not require an additional statement by the member.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member does not contribute or pledge to the mobilization of USD100 billion for climate financing by 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member pledges to the mobilization of USD100 billion for climate financing by 2020 but does not contribute or sign the pledged amount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member contributes to the mobilization of USD100 billion for climate financing from public or private sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada: 0

Canada has partially complied with its commitment to the Green Climate Fund.

On 20 November 2014, Environment Minister Leona Aglukkaq announced that Canada would contribute CDN300 million to the Green Climate Fund.336 This pledge was considered significant, as Canada had previously been seen as a major obstacle in achieving a new global deal in 2015.337 Nevertheless, to date no direct Canadian public or private funding has been received by the GCF.338 Moreover, the federal government failed to mention climate change efforts in its most recent 2015 federal budget plan.339

Canada has not contributed towards the GCF’s USD100 billion goal. Accordingly, Canada has received a score of 0.

*Analyst: Zoe Smale*

France: +1

France has fully complied with its commitment to support the Copenhagen Accord commitments by contributing to the mobilization of USD100 billion per year by 2020.

---

On 14-15 July 2014, the French Minister of Ecology, Sustainable Development and Energy headed the French delegation to the Petersberg Climate Dialogue V. At the meeting, Ministers discussed how to accelerate climate negotiations and augment action in their respective countries.340

On 23 September 2014, French president François Hollande pledged that France would contribute EUR750 million to the United Nations Green Climate Fund. The contribution will be made over four years (2015-2018).341

On 14 April 2015 Hollande made a joint statement with the Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi to cooperate closer and work to reach a global climate agreement at the Paris Climate Conference. 342

In January 2015, the United Arab Emirates and France announced a partnership to fund renewable energy projects in developing countries. The Abu Dhabi Fund for Development and France’s L’Agence Francaise de Development are reviewing projects and will announce their first project later this year.343

In February 2015, the French government announced plans to halt the subsidizing of coal power plant construction in developing countries. Funding will only be available for plants with Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) technology. 344

In March 2015, French Parliament approved a new commercial zoning law requiring that rooftops be partially covered in plants or solar panels.345

In November 2015, France will host the twenty-first session of the Conference of the Parties (COP) in Paris. At the United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP21/CMP11), governments have agreed to the ambitious goal of reaching a new universal climate change agreement. 346

France has fully complied with the commitment of mobilizing funds in accordance with the Copenhagen Accords. As a result, it has been awarded a score of +1.

*Analyst: Benjamin Crase*

**Germany: +1**

Germany has complied with its commitment to support the Copenhagen Accord commitments by contributing to the mobilization of USD100 billion per year by 2020.

On 29 April 2015, the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety made a joint announcement with Danish and UK counterparts calling for project

---

http://www.bmub.bund.de/en/topics/climate-energy/climate/international-climate-policy/detailansicht/artikel/petersberg-climate-dialogue-v-documents/?tx_ttnews%5BbackPid%5D=3845

341 Hollande pledges $1 billion to climate change fund, France 24 (Paris) 11 October 2014.  

342 India and France Vow to Make Paris a Success, UNFCCC Newsroom (Bonn) 5 May 2015.  
http://newsroom.unfccc.int/lima/india-and-france-vow-to-make-paris-a-success/

http://gulfbusiness.com/2015/01/uae-france-ink-deal-fund-renewable-energy-projects/#.VUraDtpVikp

344 France to end subsidies for coal plants abroad, Bellona Europa (Oslo) 5 May 2015.  

345 France decrees new rooftops must be covered in plants or solar panels, The Guardian (London) 5 May 2015.  

346 France Sets out Goals for Paris 2015, UNFCCC Newsroom (Bonn) 5 May 2015.  
http://newsroom.unfccc.int/unfccc-newsroom/france-sets-out-goals-for-paris-2015/
proposals for financing climate change mitigation projects in the developing world. The EUR85 million available is being administered as part of the NAMA (National Appropriate Mitigation Action) Facility, which was launched in 2012 by Germany and the UK. The NAMA aims to promote the implementation of ambitious projects targeted at reducing greenhouse gas emissions.\[347\]

On 14–15 July 2014, the German Minister for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety co-chaired the Petersberg Climate Dialogue V, which was hosted in Berlin. At the meeting, Ministers discussed how to accelerate climate negotiations and augment action in their respective countries.\[348\]

On 16 July 2014, German Chancellor Angela Merkel pledged EUR750 million to the United Nations Green Climate Fund. Germany’s pledge was the first major pledge the now-operational fund has received since it was established in December 2011.\[349\]

Germany has fully complied with the commitment of mobilizing funds in accordance with the Copenhagen Accords. As a result, it has been awarded a score of +1.

Analyst: Benjamin Crase

Italy: 0

Italy has partially complied with its commitments towards the Green Climate Fund.

Following the Climate Summit held in New York in September 2014, countries were urged to propel their contributions to the USD100 billion Fund. Italy pledged a total of EUR250 million (equivalent to USD334 million) as of 30 April 2015.\[350\] This figure would place it seventh in the list of contributors in terms of total value pledged and last in terms of per capita contribution with a total of USD6 per citizen.\[351\]

Nevertheless, the figures stated above merely represent announcements and declarations. Italy has yet to sign any official document, which would actualize the announced pledged.\[352\] Therefore Italy has partially complied receiving a score of 0.

Analyst: Fabio Ponti

Japan: 0

Japan has partially complied with its commitment to the Green Climate Fund (GCF).

Japan’s Joint Crediting Mechanism, established in August 2013 to help assist developing countries in reducing carbon emissions, has proposed 24 projects in 2014.\[353\] Both private and public investments


\[351\] http://www.lastampa.it/2014/12/14/scienza/ambiente/inchiesta/decolla-la-finanza-climatica-il-fondo-verde-per-il-clima-raggiunge-quota-miliardi-di-dollari-1b1MguxOFiezp9P6ByPHI/pagina.html

are being used to fund these missions. While many of these plans are not scheduled to commence work until mid-2015, the first registered JCM project began on 31 October 2014.

On 16 November 2014, Japan made a pledge of USD1.5 billion towards the Green Climate Fund, subject to National Diet approval. Mr. Takayuki Miyashita represented Japan at the Conference and announced the details of Japan’s contribution to the GCF. This commitment is significant, making up 15 per cent of all contributions pledged to date. This pledge has yet to be signed however, which has hindered the GCF’s ability to invest in developing countries.

On 19 February 2015 Japan asked the United Nations GCF to help pay for special coal-fired power stations that will reduce the carbon dioxide output by 25 per cent. This request was made alongside the Australian government and reaffirms their commitment to reduce greenhouse gas omissions.

On 30 April 2015, Japan proposed to cut greenhouse gas emissions by 26 per cent by 2030. While this is a good start, analysts working with GCF argue that Japan is lagging behind the US and EU with its proposed emissions cuts.

Japan has taken action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions but has yet to sign away the USD1.3 billion that was pledged. Japan is thus awarded a score of 0 for partial compliance.

**Analyst: Zoe Smale**

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment towards the Green Climate Fund (GCF), pledging and signing GBP720 million for the fund.

On 20 November 2014, the Department of Energy and Climate Change announced its pledge and commitment of GBP720 million towards the Green Climate Fund.

Energy and Climate Change Secretary Ed Davey announced that the funds will be towards efforts in aiding vulnerable populations that have exacerbating issues as a direct result of climate change pressures.
Davey mentioned protecting low-lying islands and coastal settlements from the impact of rising sea levels as an example of a priority on the climate aid agenda.

In contributing GBP720 million, the United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment earning a score of +1.

**Analyst: Nicholas Chong**

**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied in committing towards the goal of USD100 billion for the Green Climate Fund (GCF) by 2020.\(^{363}\)

President Barack Obama on 15 November 2014 announced the goals put forth by the United States to specifically target carbon pollution reduction and strengthen resilience in developing countries, particularly those of vulnerable regions.\(^{364}\)

On 15 November 2014 President Obama announced the intentions of the US to contribute USD3 billion towards the GCF.\(^{365}\)

The contribution of USD3 billion has demonstrated that the United States has fully complied with its commitments for climate finance, thus earning a score of +1.

**Analyst: Nicholas Chong**

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to the Green Climate Fund (GCF), taking steps towards lowering emissions and making a contribution towards the targeted USD100 billion goal.

In November, the European Union committed USD3 billion for mitigation efforts in developing countries between 2014 and 2020, and has pledged up to EUR $14 billion in grants from the EU budget and the European Development Fund (EDF) in the next six years.\(^{366}\) This is in line with their goal of investing at least 20% of the EU’s budget in climate-relevant actions between 2014 and 2020.\(^{367}\)

Alongside the Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA), the European Union has specifically announced a commitment of US$2.5 billion to be channeled to developing countries between 2014

---


and 2015.\textsuperscript{368} The European Investment Bank (EIB) has also committed to setting aside at least 25 percent of total activity for climate change between 2014 and 2016.\textsuperscript{369}

The European Union began blueprints for global climate change projects after 2020 in February 2015. The European Commission (EC) published its vision for global climate action post 2020, setting out the European Union’s position on the agreement to be signed in Paris in December 2015.\textsuperscript{370} The European Union’s primary objective is to limit global warming to 2 degrees and to begin a transition towards more sustainable societies.\textsuperscript{371} Specifically, the European Union has set out a binding, economy-wide domestic reduction target of at least 40% greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 2030, and a reduction of emission of 80% domestically by 2050.\textsuperscript{372}

As of May 2015, the EU member states have pledged 4,745.0 towards the green climate fund, and have signed 3,667.7.\textsuperscript{373}

In taking steps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and contribute to the USD 100 billion goal needed for climate finance, the European Union has shown full compliance and is awarded a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Zoe Smale}
7. Development: African Infrastructure [64]

“[We will continue working with governments and citizens in Africa to] improve infrastructure, notably in the energy sector.”

G7 Brussels Summit Declaration

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

On 5 June 2014, the G7 Brussels Summit issued a declaration reaffirming their commitment to sustainable development in an African context in lockstep with the African Union as a necessary partner in the process of reforming the Africa Partnership Forum.374 Recently, G7 member nations have publicly committed themselves to “inclusive and resilient growth” in Africa, linking these efforts to good governance, transparency, trade liberalization, and, most relevantly, energy infrastructure strengthening.375

This is part of an existing trend. At the 2005 Gleneagles Summit, where Official Development Assistance (ODA) to Africa was one of the highest profile issue areas, leaders pledged to improve African trade through three major initiatives, one of which was the mobilization of investment in infrastructure.376 Stemming from the 2005 Hong Kong Ministerial Conference of the World Trade Organization (WTO), the 2008 Hokkaido Summit saw member states reaffirming their support for “Aid for Trade” with a special focus on Africa. There, states committed to mobilizing governmental organizations, multilateral institutions, and regional development banks towards infrastructure and capacity building in African nations.377 At the 2012 Camp David Summit commitments to infrastructure development were strengthened when member states declared their support for increased coordination between the African Regional Economic Communities (RECs) and the African Union on issues of energy and trade — a key priority underpinning this 2014 commitment.

Commitment Features

This commitment, which is part of a broader trade and African-focused agenda, focuses on working with governments to identify potential partnerships between the private sector, international financial institutions, and domestic polity, and to invest in energy-related infrastructure projects.

Members will be assessed on their work to improve upon earlier commitments to energy infrastructure development in an African context. This includes working towards the establishment or upgrading of infrastructure for energy transport and storage; promotion of energy production, supply, use, transmission, and transit services; and investment in energy transportation routes and means of transport.378

To achieve full compliance, a member must work with governments and citizens in Africa to promote infrastructure development while also devoting some effort and resources to energy sector infrastructure development in particular.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>−1</td>
<td>Member does not take actions to promote infrastructure development in Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member takes actions to promote infrastructure development in Africa BUT does not take actions to promote African infrastructure in the energy sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member takes actions to promote infrastructure development in Africa, INCLUDING in the energy sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lead Analyst: Kaleem Hawa*

**Canada: 0**

Canada has partially complied with its commitment to promote energy infrastructure development in Africa. The Canadian Government has taken some actions to promote infrastructure development, but only one partial action to promote energy infrastructure in particular.

Between the days of 18–27 June 2014 the Canadian Minister of International Trade Ed Fast travelled to Burkina Faso, Madagascar, South Africa and Tanzania on a trade mission. The purpose of the trade mission was to focus on the energy and extractive sectors of the four countries, and included 26 delegates from businesses and organizations from these two sectors.379 While the trip was meant to focus on energy infrastructure development, there was no specific reference or commitment to it by the Government of Canada or the Canadian delegation.380

On 16 September 2014, the Canadian Embassy in the Democratic Republic of Congo opened a health centre in Kinshasa. This is part of an effort on the part of Canada to improve health infrastructure in the Democratic Republic of Congo.381

On 18 September 2014, the Canadian Minister of International Development Christian Paradis committed to supporting development in Africa while also announcing that Canada was going to provide funding to the African Development Fund.382 However, he did not make specific reference to this money being used for infrastructure development, saying that it was instead for "sustainable

---

economic growth.”383 While it is possible that sustainable economic growth includes infrastructure development, the promise is too vague.384

On 15 April 2015, the Canadian Minister of International Development Christian Paradis signed a Mutual Accountability Framework for International Cooperation (MAFIC) with Seth Terkper, the Ghanaian minister of finance.385 MAFIC reaffirmed the Canadian Government’s commitment to the Development Partners Compact on Leveraging Partnership for Shared Growth and Development (“The Compact”).386 The Compact refers to infrastructure development, including energy infrastructure.387 However, the MAFIC made no specific commitments to energy infrastructure development, or any commitments on behalf of the Canadian Government towards infrastructure development in Ghana.388

Despite partial commitments to building infrastructure, the Canadian government has done little foster complete commitments to African energy infrastructure development in particular. Thus, Canada is awarded a score of 0 on this commitment to African energy infrastructure development.

**Analyst: John Nicholson**

**France: +1**

France has fully complied with its commitment to promote infrastructure development in Africa with particular attention to the energy sector.

On 10 October 2014, France signed an agreement on inter-governmental nuclear cooperation with South Africa. The agreement aims for the “deployment of French nuclear technology in South Africa,” according to the South African Department of Energy, and includes research, skills development, and localization.389
On 16 November 2014, the Agence Française du Développement (AFD) began work on four infrastructure projects in Cameroon. Totalling EUR 443 million of investment, the projects deal primarily with urban development in the city of Douala.390

On 2 March 2015, the AFD announced that three new projects had been approved by the Nigerian federal government, two of which involve infrastructure development. Investments in urban development for the city of Lagos will total USD100 million, while investments in water infrastructure in Ogun State will total approximately USD33 million.391

On 23 April 2015, the AFD announced a commitment of USD55 million to the Ugandan energy sector, an increase from USD21 million during the previous year. The additional funds will be allocated to ongoing electrification programs.392

Thus, while not all French investment in African infrastructure involves the energy sector, it constitutes a significant focus and France stands in full compliance with its commitment scoring +1.

Analyst: Colin McEwen

Germany: +1

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to promote infrastructure development in Africa, focusing on the energy sector.

On 21 November 2014, the German Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) announced new initiatives totaling approximately EUR72 million in cooperation with South Africa to assist the development of South Africa’s renewable energy potential, alongside HIV prevention and governance reform. The sharing of technical expertise in wind and solar industries will be a particular focus.393

On 3 December 2014, the German-African Infrastructure Forum hosted its second annual conference in Munich. The conference included representatives from the governments of Bavaria, Germany, Botswana, South Africa, Cote D’Ivoire, and their respective private sectors. Presentations featured infrastructural progress and future plans on a wide array of topics, including railways, energy, port traffic, and urban development.394

On 21 February 2015, Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier travelled to Kenya with a delegation of business and academic representatives. Following a meeting with President Uhuru Kenyatta,
Steinmeier said that he expects new opportunities for cooperation in the fields of oil, gas, infrastructure, and telecommunications.\footnote{395}

On 8 April 2015, the government-owned KfW Development Bank announced a loan of EUR300 million to the South African public utility ESKOM. The funds will be used to connect renewable energy projects to the electricity grid, two of which were also funded by KfW.\footnote{396}

Thus, though German interest in African infrastructure is varied, the energy sector forms a significant component. Germany has fully complied with its commitment earning a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Colin McEwen}

\textbf{Italy: 0}

Italy has partially complied with its commitment to support sustainable infrastructure development in Africa, with a focus on the energy sector. Although Italy has promoted dialogue between Italian and African leaders on energy infrastructure and provided support for generalized African infrastructure projects, Italy has failed to engage in concrete energy infrastructure development projects.

Throughout 2014, Italy engaged in constructive dialogue with African leaders on development concerns, but this resulted in few actual agreements. From 5 to 8 January 2014, Italian Foreign Minister Emma Bonino travelled to Ghana and Senegal, where she visited previously financed development projects and discussed the potential for continued development cooperation, but did not form any tangible agreements.\footnote{397} The Italy-Africa Initiative held on 21 February 2014 spurred conversations on how Italy could serve as a model for African agricultural development, but there were no further commitments made that would help this occur.\footnote{398}

On 13-14 October 2014 Italy directly engaged with the issue of energy infrastructure in Africa, at the Italy-Africa Ministerial Conference on Energy. The purpose of the Ministerial Conference was to discuss investment prospects in renewable and electrical energy in Africa, with a focus on crafting partnerships between Italian and African firms in those sectors.\footnote{399} It is unclear whether tangible projects were agreed to as a result of this conference.

\begin{footnotesize}
\end{footnotesize}
However, Italy did fund generalized infrastructure development projects in 2014. On 27 November 2014, the Italian government provided a grant of EUR 20 million to Niger to improve rural infrastructure in the Tahoua region.\textsuperscript{400}

Although Italy has engaged in a variety of conferences with African leaders which discussed energy infrastructure development and has funded general infrastructure projects, they have failed to directly promote tangible projects relating to energy infrastructure development. Thus, Italy receives a 0 for its partial compliance with this commitment on African infrastructure.

\textit{Analyst: Sarah Harrison}

\textbf{Japan: +1}

Japan has fully complied with its commitment to work with governments and citizens in Africa to improve infrastructure, notably in the energy sector.

At the 60\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of the Bandung Conference on 23 April 2015, Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe pledged to contribute to the infrastructure development of African countries.\textsuperscript{401} In his speech, Abe promised to promote “high-quality infrastructure investment” in Africa at both government and private sector levels.\textsuperscript{402}

On 13 March 2015, Japanese Prime Minister Abe announced a raft of new initiatives to support Kenya’s energy sector and infrastructure.\textsuperscript{403} Japan will pledge 33 million USD to finance Kenya’s geothermal power development, high-end infrastructure projects in the pipeline, and other projects.\textsuperscript{404}

On 1 October 2014, officials from the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) attended a ceremony to celebrate the completion of the Bagamoyo road widening project in Tanzania.\textsuperscript{405} The JICA Grant-aid project, Widening of New Bagamoyo Road, has alleviated severe traffic congestion by widening and upgrading the 12.9 km Mwenge-Tegeta section of the New Bagamoyo Road from two to four lanes.\textsuperscript{406} In addition to upgrading the road pavements, the drainage system was also improved by properly managing storm water to ensure smooth traffic flow even during the rain seasons.\textsuperscript{407}

\textsuperscript{400} Italy-Niger: Deputy Minister Pistelli and Minister Cissé sign an agreement for a rural infrastructure development and market access project, Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation (Rome) 27 November 2014. Date of Access: 12 May 2015.
On 24 September 2014, Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe stated that the Government of Japan would implement roughly USD 6.5 billion of assistance for infrastructure development in Africa.\textsuperscript{408} In his address at the Second Japan-African Economic Communities Summit at the United Nations, Shinzo said “Japan is already implementing the equivalent of roughly USD 2.3 billion in projects at present.”\textsuperscript{409}

On 15 August 2014, the Japan International Cooperation Agency reported that a JICA project to repair the Gulu-Atiak-Numule road connecting Uganda and South Sudan is keeping supplies, such as food and gasoline, flowing from Uganda to war-torn South Sudan.\textsuperscript{410}

During the second half of 2014, Japan’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) approved energy aid projects in Tanzania and Uganda. The MOFA budgeted USD 36.94 million for the Project for Reinforcement of Power Distribution in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.\textsuperscript{411} The project aims to meet growing energy demands in Tanzania’s commercial capital by repairing existing distribution facilities and substations.\textsuperscript{412} In Uganda, the MOFA is leveraging Japanese expertise to boost power supply and stability in the Kampala metropolitan area. The USD 21.11 million project will improve power transmission and distribution facilities in the national capital.\textsuperscript{413}

In line with promises made during the Fifth Tokyo International Conference on African Development in Yokohama, Japan’s energy infrastructure projects reaffirm the country’s continued commitment to Africa. The 2013 high-level donor conference concluded with Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe’s pledge of pouring JPY 14 billion in aid to the continent over the next five years.\textsuperscript{414} Half of the amount, Abe explained, will go to developing Africa’s infrastructure, particularly energy and transport.\textsuperscript{415}

Thus, Japan has been awarded a score of +1 for taking actions to promote African development, particularly the energy sector.

\textit{Analyst: Duja Mubanna}

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to build and promote African energy infrastructure.


On 12 January 2015, the United Kingdom Minister for the Middle East and North Africa Tobias Ellwood led a trade delegation to Egypt. The delegation included companies from the energy sector. Its aim was to encourage United Kingdom investment in Egypt.\footnote{Foreign Office Minister Leads British Trade Delegation to Egypt, UK Government (London) 12 January 2015. Date of Access: 27 April 2015. https://www.gov.uk/government/news/foreign-office-minister-leads-british-trade-delegation-to-egypt}  

As a result of the trade delegations sent to various countries in Africa, the United Kingdom has been awarded a score of +1 for its role in promoting energy infrastructure development in Africa.  

Analyst: John Nicholson  

United States: +1  

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to support sustainable infrastructure development in Africa, with a focus on the energy sector.  

During 2014, the United States Trade and Development Agency (USTDA) engaged in a range of bilateral agreements to support and promote infrastructure development in Africa. On 5 March 2014, the USTDA signed a Memorandum of Understanding with Botswana which outlined a commitment on the part of the United States to aid Botswana in improving its procurement practices for large-
scale infrastructure projects. This partnership was extended to directly involve the energy sector on 23 June 2014, when the USTDA awarded a grant to Botswana’s Ministry of Minerals, Energy, and Water Resources which will provide funding for two senior advisers to improve the Ministry’s procurement policies in preparation for upcoming water and energy procurements. On 12 December 2014, the USTDA signed a Memoranda of Cooperation with Eko and Ikeja Electricity Distribution Companies, formalizing their partnership with the recently privatized Nigerian electricity distribution companies.

The USTDA also directly aided in the development of renewable energy infrastructure in Africa throughout 2014. On 7 March 2014 the USTDA awarded a feasibility study grant to Solafrica, to evaluate the cost effectiveness and profitability of constructing a solar power plant in South Africa. On 8 April 2014, the USTDA provided a grant to NextGen Solawazi Limited to support the implementation of a solar power plant in Tanzania.

Furthermore, the director of the USTDA announced two new energy projects after the conclusion of the US-Africa Energy Ministerial on 4 June 2014, which aim to replace diesel fuel with environmentally sustainable alternatives in South Africa and Tanzania. On 6 June 2014, the USTDA authorized grants for three further renewable energy projects in South Africa. The USTDA also supported projects led by Power Africa, a United States government initiative focused on the development of clean energy in sub-Saharan Africa, by providing funding for two projects aimed at developing hydropower capabilities in Tanzania and Rwanda, on 12 December 2014.

Finally, the USTDA aimed to further business cooperation in the energy sector, and actively participated in forums with leaders involved in African energy development. In partnership with Power Africa, the USTDA Director, the US Secretary of Commerce, and 20 US energy companies engaged in an Energy Business Development Mission to West Africa, during the week of 19 May 2014. The purpose of the mission was to help “sub-Saharan African leaders identify solutions for increasing electricity access” while also connecting “U.S. industry leaders to export opportunities in

---

Ghana and Nigeria.\textsuperscript{430} The week concluded with the USTDA signing grants for three additional energy projects in Nigeria, on 22 May 2014.\textsuperscript{431}

The United States is in full compliance with its commitment to support energy infrastructure development in Africa. During 2014, the US engaged in a variety of bilateral agreements on infrastructure development with African states and private sector companies, provided direct financial support for sustainable energy projects in the form of grants, and promoted dialogue between leaders in the American and African energy sectors. Thus, the United States has been awarded a +1 for full compliance.

\textit{Analyst: Sarah Harrison}

\textbf{European Union: +1}

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to further infrastructure development in Africa. It has done so with explicit focus on the energy sector.

On 3 November 2014, the European Commission announced the Electrification Financing initiative (ElectrIFi), which aims to provide “sustainable energy services” to 500 million people by 2020. As part of the Initiative, the Commission hopes to leverage investments between EUR 15 million and EUR 30 million to infrastructure projects in Sub-Saharan Africa, among other developing regions.\textsuperscript{432}

In April 2015, as part of ElectrIFi, the EU announced partnership with private equity group Electricity Access Fund. The fund intends to invest up to USD60 million in energy farms in Sub-Saharan Africa between 2015 and 2025. The EU is one of several contributors to the fund’s investment pool.\textsuperscript{433}

On 10 May 2015, The EU announced a grant agreement with the East Africa Community worth more than USD92 million. The grant contributes to furthering “sustainable economic development by promoting integrated markets and development investment.”\textsuperscript{434} The grant also aims to help African states combat terrorism in the region.\textsuperscript{435}

On 27 May 2015, the EU Delegation to Africa announced a USD6.2 million contribution to the Somalia Stability Fund. The fund will be used to help Somalia’s federal government to rebuild local infrastructure and support economic stabilization. The fund will likely be used for “road


\textsuperscript{431} USTDA Director Announces New Cooperation Activities in Nigeria, United States Trade and Development Agency (Washington, DC) 22 May 2014. Date of Access: 10 May 2015.

\texttt{http://www.sunwindenergy.com/photovoltaics/electrifi-ec-to-boost-clean-energy-financing-africa}


\textsuperscript{434} East Africa: EU Hands Over 85 Million Euro to Secretariat, East African Business Week (Kampala), 10 May 2015.

\textsuperscript{435} East Africa: EU Hands Over 85 Million Euro to Secretariat, East African Business Week (Kampala), 10 May 2015.
rehabilitations, [the construction of] airstrips, water points and markets,” among other infrastructure projects.\textsuperscript{436}

The EU has furthered African infrastructure investment with particular reference to energy. Therefore, the EU has been awarded a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Jerome Newton}

8. Deauville Partnership [70]

“We confirm our strong commitment to the Deauville Partnership.”

The Brussels G7 Summit Declaration

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

On 26-27 May 2011, the G8 launched the Deauville Partnership in reaction to the events of the Arab Spring, with the goal of securing transition “towards free, democratic and tolerant societies” for some of the Middle East and North African countries (MENA).437

Participation in the Partnership is not limited to G8 members and the transition countries (TCs), but also includes international financial institutions, international organizations, and other states. A list of the main participants is provided in Table D:

Table D: Countries and International Institutions in the Deauville Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Country Members</th>
<th>Transition Country Members</th>
<th>International Financial Institutions</th>
<th>International Organizations (Supporters)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

At the 2011 Deauville Summit, the G8 emphasized the idea that the democratic transitions of participating Arab countries needed to be supported both politically and economically. They noted that: “This Partnership is based on two pillars: a political process to support the democratic transition and foster governance reforms … and an economic framework for sustainable and inclusive growth.”

At the 2012 Camp David Summit, the G8 reaffirmed its commitment to the Deauville Partnership by committing to take further specific actions in these two areas. In order to support the economies of transition states, the G8 agreed to work to promote economic stabilization and job creation in TCs, as well as to encourage trade and investment both between G8 countries and the TCs, and between the TCs themselves. They also decided to take steps to help the TCs make “reforms that promote transparency, accountability, and good governance.”

In 2013, G8 members pledged to maintain their commitments to the Deauville Partnership through measures such as providing aid to the MENA Transition Fund and participating in the Arab Forum on Asset Recovery.

**Commitment Features**

The 2014 Brussels commitment reaffirms the G7’s belief in the importance of supporting TCs in their efforts to make both political and economic reforms. Given that these two elements of the Partnership are of equal significance, it is vital that analysis of the G7’s efforts consider whether members have taken efforts to strengthen old initiatives or developed new ones in both the political and economic areas of the Partnership.

In the political arena, the G7 has dedicated itself to helping TCs “improve governance.” Since no specific initiatives are mentioned, any efforts to aid a TC in the reduction of corruption or the intensification of political transparency and accountability will illustrate that the G7 has fulfilled the political aspect of this commitment.

Examples of concrete support can be drawn from previous G8 commitments regarding the Deauville Partnership. In 2012, the G8 noted that it would help the TCs attain membership in the Open Government Partnership (OGP). While Jordan and Tunisia already participate in this program, G7 members can help others achieve the conditions for eligibility, which includes evidence of a concerted effort towards the realization of: (1) fiscal transparency; (2) providing public access to...
information; (3) disclosing the salaries of public servants; and (4) permitting citizens to participate in the political process.\(^{448}\)

In 2013, the G8 committed to reaffirming “our high level of commitment to return stolen assets… including through participation in the Arab Forum on Asset Recovery.”\(^{449}\) This program was created in order to help Arab countries retrieve assets that were diverted for corrupt purposes by previous governments.\(^{450}\) Participation in the Third Arab Forum on Asset Recovery, which took place in November 2014, would thus also indicate continued support of a governance initiative.

The second part of the G7’s 2014 commitment involves a promise to continue supporting TCs economically by stimulating “inclusive growth and job creation” for young people and women.\(^{451}\) At the 2012 Camp David Summit, the G8 outlined a number of ways of promoting job creation in general including: (1) making contributions to programs aimed at providing people with the skills and/or education that they need to attain jobs; and (2) supporting small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs).\(^{452}\) However, G7 members will need to make contributions to similar initiatives targeted specifically at the aforementioned groups in order to meet this commitment. Examples of such programs that have already been launched include the Arab Women’s Enterprise Fund\(^{453}\) and Forsa.\(^{454}\)

One avenue of support that would count as a contribution towards both the political and economic aspects of the commitment would be a pledge of aid towards the MENA Transition Fund. Created in 2012, the program finances TC initiatives that aim to meet at least one of the following objectives: (1) job creation; (2) economic growth; (3) economic integration; and (4) good governance.\(^{455}\)

In conclusion, a G7 member must partner with TCs to both improve governance and support job creation for youth and/or women in recipient states in order to be in full compliance.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member NEITHER supports transition countries to improve governance NOR supports job creation in these states for youth and/or women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member supports transition countries to improve governance OR supports job creation in these states for youth and/or women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member helps transition countries to improve governance AND supports job creation in these states for youth and/or women.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lead Analyst: Sarah Beard*

---


\(^{452}\) Fact Sheet: G8 Action on the Deauville Partnership with Arab Countries in Transition, G8 Information Centre (Toronto) 19 May 2012. Date of Access: 11 March 2015. [http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2012campdavid/g8-transition-factsheet.html](http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2012campdavid/g8-transition-factsheet.html).


\(^{455}\) Objective and Scope, Middle East and North Africa Transition Fund (Washington DC). Date of Access: 11 March 2015. [https://www.menatransitionfund.org/content/objective-and-scope](https://www.menatransitionfund.org/content/objective-and-scope).
Canada: +1

Canada’s meaningful efforts to help transition countries (TCs) improve governance, and support job creation for youth and women in these states, result in the nation receiving a score of +1.

At the Fifth Steering Committee Meeting of the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) Transition Fund on 10 June 2014 and 11 June 2014, Canada pledged a sum of CAD5 million to the MENA Transition Fund. The objective of the MENA Transition Fund is to support socio-economic and political transformations in TCs, with a specific focus on advancing economic growth through policy and institutional reforms. Amongst other initiatives, contributions to the MENA Transition Fund are used to further financial inclusion and to enhance female labour force participation, which, in turn, aids job creation. This donation supplemented a sum of CAD15 million, which was pledged to the organizations on 21 November 2012.

Canadian Donor Chair Michael Callan described this additional sum, along with the development of a new donor outreach strategy, as an effort to initiate contributions from previous and potential donors.

From 1 November 2014 to 3 November 2014, Canada participated in the Third Arab Forum on Asset Recovery (AFAR III), leading a session concerning administrative freezes. AFAR is an initiative in support of asset recovery efforts by Arab Countries in Transition.

On 15 April 2015, Canadian Foreign Minister Rob Nicholson attended the G7 Foreign Minister’s Meeting in Lübeck, Germany. In a communiqué released at the end of the meeting, the Canadian Foreign Minister joined with other G7 states to commend the Deauville Partnership’s focus on “improving economic governance, enhancing financial inclusions, fostering job creation in particular for women and youth, closer regional integration and the involvement of civil society.”
Government of Canada also joined other nations in welcoming “the focus of the Deauville Partnership on … improving women’s economic role in the region.”

In conclusion, Canada has contributed to the improvement of governance in the TCs through its participation in AFAR III. Canada has also made an effort to stimulate job creation in the TCs through its further donations to the MENA Transition Fund.

Therefore, Canada receives a +1 for its full compliance with the commitment on the Deauville Partnership.

Analyst: Aditya Rau

France: +1

France has fully complied with its commitment to improve governance and support job creation for youth and/or women in transition countries (TCs).

Between 1 November 2014 and 3 November 2014, representatives from the Government of France attended the Third Meeting of the Arab Forum on Asset Recovery (AFAR III). This initiative was developed out of the G8 Deauville Partnership Asset Recovery Action Plan, which aims to help TCs retrieve assets that have disappeared due to corruption. In the Chairs’ Statement on the meeting, the participants noted, “the recovery of the proceeds of corruption through international cooperation is essential in helping restore integrity and public trust in government, and in sending a strong message that there can be no impunity for those who abuse their official positions.”

The French government's participation in this conference illustrates its commitment to helping TCs improve governance. On 10−12 February 2015, representatives of the Government of France attended the Sixth Annual Conference of the Governance Institutes Forum for Training (GIFT)-MENA Network. This illustrates a commitment by France to improving governance because one of the priorities of the meeting was to “provide Arab countries with ideas…that would help achieve greater policy coherence and performance in support of improved governance.” Although the conference was not specifically directed at TCs involved in the Deauville Partnership, representatives of the Governments of Tunisia and Yemen attended the meeting.

France has not made further contributions to the MENA Transition Fund during the compliance period. However, France has made efforts to improve governance and support job creation in TCs for women and youth through its contributions to the Union for the Mediterranean (UfM).

---

The UfM was created in 2008 as a means of reformulating the relationship between countries in Europe and the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{471} It is currently jointly led by the EU and Jordan,\textsuperscript{472} and involves several of the TCs involved in the Deauville Partnership. These include Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, and Tunisia.\textsuperscript{473}

In December 2014, the UfM announced the creation of the Mediterranean New Chance program (MedNC).\textsuperscript{474} This project, which is promoted in part by the French Ministry of Development, “aims at improving the employability of young people who dropped out of school before obtaining a degree and unemployed graduates” in Tunisia and Morocco.\textsuperscript{475} On 19 February 2015, the first group of students commenced the program, which teaches them skills including languages, information technology, and accounting.\textsuperscript{476} It will also provide them with working experience.\textsuperscript{477}

On 26 March 2015, the UfM held a workshop entitled “Women’s Economic Participation and ICT [Information and Communications Technology] in the Mediterranean Region: Constraints and Opportunities.”\textsuperscript{478} The French Ministry of Foreign Affairs provided support for this event.\textsuperscript{479} The workshop provided a place for discussions on the barriers preventing women from entering the ICT sector.\textsuperscript{480} It also produced a number of suggestions to help women overcome these obstacles. Conference participants concluded that new initiatives should be created to help women, including projects that: (1) increase “access to seed and venture capital programmes for women entrepreneurs”;


France has also undertaken a number of bilateral initiatives to improve the economies of TCs. While these initiatives will promote economic growth in general, those listed below do not specifically aid job creation for women and/or youth. Thus, they cannot count towards France’s compliance score on this commitment.
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On 14 March 2015, France, Egypt, and the United Arab Emirates issued a declaration on trilateral cooperation in support of development projects in Egypt.\textsuperscript{489} This agreement focuses on energy and urban transport sectors, as well as in the newly created Egyptian information and communication technology sector.\textsuperscript{490}

In conclusion, France has been awarded a score of +1 for its efforts to improve governance and job creation in the MENA region. It has taken action to improve governance by participating in AFAR III. It has also taken steps to promote job creation for women and youth in TCs through its work with the UfM.

\textit{Analyst: Mathieu Sitaya}

**Germany: +1**

Germany is in full compliance with the commitments of the Deauville Partnership by supporting the transition countries (TCs) in improving governance and job creation.

Germany assumed presidency of both the G7 and the Deauville Partnership in June 2014.\textsuperscript{491}

From 1-3 November 2014, representatives from the Government of Germany attended the Third Arab Forum on Asset Recovery (AFAR III).\textsuperscript{492} While the meeting was chaired by Egypt, Switzerland, and Tunisia, Germany participated in the Steering Committee that lent assistance to the hosts.\textsuperscript{493} By supporting this event, Germany illustrated a commitment to improving governance in TCs, since the return of misappropriated funds “is essential in helping restore integrity and public trust in government, and in sending a strong message that there can be no impunity for those who abuse their official positions.”\textsuperscript{494}

Germany has also illustrated a commitment to job creation in TCs for youth and/or women by contributing to the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) Transition Fund. On 11 December 2014, Germany pledged EUR4 million to the organization.\textsuperscript{495} KfW promised an additional EUR5 million.


on 23 December 2014.\textsuperscript{496} KfW is a German-owned development bank that acted as an “implementing agency of the Federal Republic of Germany” when contributing to the MENA Transition Fund.\textsuperscript{497} 

On 28 April 2015, the Government of Germany hosted a High Level Conference on Responsible Financial Inclusion for Social Inclusion and Stability.\textsuperscript{498} This meeting was part of an effort by Germany to achieve one of the priorities of their presidency of the G7. Financial inclusion is an important element of job creation because “access to responsible financial services…can help the unserved segments of the population, and SMEs [small and medium-sized enterprises] in particular, create and bolster savings, access credit and insurance, as well as transfer money in a cheaper and safer way.”\textsuperscript{499} The conference closed with the acceptance of the Deauville Partnership Action Plan for Financial Inclusion, which specifically noted that financial inclusion would provide women and youth with greater opportunities for employment.\textsuperscript{500}

Germany has also chaired meetings of the Deauville Partnership within the compliance period. On 25 September 2014, a Deauville Partnership Foreign Ministers’ meeting was held under the German Presidency in New York.\textsuperscript{501} The finance ministers of states involved in the Deauville Partnership also met on 9 October 2014.\textsuperscript{502}

Thus, Germany receives a +1 for its contributions to MENA, and for its participation in AFAR III. Moreover, Germany’s work on financial inclusion during its presidency of the G7 illustrates a strong commitment to the Deauville Partnership.

\textit{Analyst: Kate Motluk}


Italy: +1

Italy is in full compliance with the commitment to improve governance and support job creation for women and youth in transition countries (TCs).

Between 1 November 2014 and 3 November 2014, Italy participated in the Third Meeting of the Arab Forum on Asset Recovery, and agreed upon a set of asset recovery procedures. By supporting this event, Italy illustrated a commitment to improving governance in TCs, since the return of misappropriated funds “is essential in helping restore integrity and public trust in government, and in sending a strong message that there can be no impunity for those who abuse their official positions.”

In December 2014, Italy submitted its second Open Government Partnership (OGP) National Action Plan covering the years 2014 to 2016 to the organization. The OGP was founded in 2011 for the purpose of attaining “concrete commitments from governments to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance.” Italy joined in 2011, and presented its first action plan in 2012. However, while its continued work as a part of the OGP provides an excellent example for TCs, this action cannot count towards the scoring of this report because it does not directly contribute to improved governance in the MENA region.

On 17 June 2014, Italy formally established the first center for the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) International Academy for Tax Crime Investigation in Ostia. The Academy seeks to educate tax officials from several nations, including those from the transitional countries of the Deauville Partnership. The program consists of training officials in tracing the flow of money through complex systems involving both public and private enterprises. This initiative will help promote fiscal transparency in the region.


Development with a representative from the Government of Tunisia.\textsuperscript{511} The objective of this meeting, which involved over seventy participants, was to discuss “issues of key relevance for job creation, economic growth, and productivity through the promotion of entrepreneurship and SME development in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA).”\textsuperscript{512}

Two sessions of the meeting specifically focused on job creation for women and youth. The first of these was entitled “Fostering women’s entrepreneurship in the MENA region,” and recognized that access to higher education for women does not translate into increased participation in the labour force.\textsuperscript{513} The participants concluded that policies such as financial incentives and training were needed to increase the number of female entrepreneurs.\textsuperscript{514}

Another session concentrated on the issue of youth unemployment in the MENA region.\textsuperscript{515} The working group stated that youth unemployment partially stemmed from the weakness of the private sector in many MENA states.\textsuperscript{516}

Thus, Italy has been awarded a score of +1 for their contributions to improving governance and job creation in the MENA region. Italy has taken action to improve governance in TCs through its participation in AFAR III and through their creation of the International Academy for Tax Crime Investigation. They have aided job creation in TCs through their co-chairmanship of the Working Group on SME Policy, Entrepreneurship, and Human Capital Development.

\textit{Analyst: Tannishtha Pramanick}

\textbf{Japan: 0}

Japan has partially complied with its commitment to improve governance and support job creation for youth and/or women in transition countries (TCs) involved with the Deauville Partnership.

Between 1 November 2014 and 3 November 2014, representatives from the Government of Japan attended the Third Meeting of the Arab Forum on Asset Recovery (AFAR III).\textsuperscript{517} This initiative was developed out of the G8 Deauville Partnership Asset Recovery Action Plan, which aims to help TCs retrieve assets that have disappeared due to corruption. In the Chairs’ Statement on the meeting, the participants noted that “the recovery of the proceeds of corruption through international
cooperation is essential in helping restore integrity and public trust in government, and in sending a strong message that there can be no impunity for those who abuse their official positions.\textsuperscript{518} Japan’s participation in this conference illustrates its commitment to helping TCs improve governance.

On 26 October 2014, Kazuyuki Nakane, the Parliamentary Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan made a brief visit to Tunisia in order to monitor Tunisian election activities as part of the Japanese observer mission.\textsuperscript{519} These efforts coincide with Japan’s commitment to ensuring fair, transparent and peaceful parliamentary elections as a means of generating better governance in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region.\textsuperscript{520}

While Japan has taken the aforementioned steps to improve governance in TCs, it does not appear to have contributed new funds to the MENA Transition Fund within the compliance period. In 2012, Japan signed a contribution agreement with the MENA Transition Fund in which it pledged to donate USD4 million in 2013, 2014, and 2015.\textsuperscript{521} However, since Japan has not made a commitment to continue funding the MENA Transition Fund during the compliance period, these contributions cannot be considered as compliance with the commitment.

Japan has participated in a series of multilateral and bilateral meetings related to the Deauville Partnership and TC stability during the compliance period.

On 25 September 2014, Japanese Foreign Minister Fumio Kishida participated in the G7 Foreign Ministers’ Meeting.\textsuperscript{522} In their final communiqué, the ministers ‘pledged to continue the urgent work of the Partnership’ because of its key role in promoting economic growth and “in developing accountable, effective and transparent institutions, protecting human rights, [and] building open and inclusive societies.”\textsuperscript{523} The representatives also recognized the importance of providing further donations to the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) Transition Fund. Finally, the G7 states agreed to hold a meeting with members of civil society during 2015 for the purpose of increasing awareness of the Deauville Partnership within TCs.\textsuperscript{524}

The Government of Japan also participated in the G7 Finance Ministers’ meeting regarding the Deauville Partnership on 9 October 2014.\footnote{Deauville Partnership Meeting in Washington D.C., German Federal Ministry of Finance (Berlin) 9 October 2014. Date of Access: 13 May 2015. http://www.bundesfinanzministerium.de/Content/EN/Standardartikel/Topics/International_affairs/G7/Articles/2014-10-10-chair%20statement.html.} All G7 states, including Japan, noted their support for the priority of creating “access to responsible financial services, including microfinance and start-up financing” because it “can help the unserved segments of the population and [Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises] MSMEs in particular to create and bolster savings, access credit and insurance as well as transfer money more cheaply and safely.”\footnote{Deauville Partnership Meeting in Washington D.C., German Federal Ministry of Finance (Berlin) 9 October 2014. Date of Access: 13 May 2015. http://www.bundesfinanzministerium.de/Content/EN/Standardartikel/Topics/International_affairs/G7/Articles/2014-10-10-chair%20statement.html.} Therefore, the G7 declared its intention to collaborate with the Alliance for Financial Inclusion (AFI) and to research ways to meet this priority.\footnote{Deauville Partnership Meeting in Washington D.C., German Federal Ministry of Finance (Berlin) 9 October 2014. Date of Access: 13 May 2015. http://www.bundesfinanzministerium.de/Content/EN/Standardartikel/Topics/International_affairs/G7/Articles/2014-10-10-chair%20statement.html.}


On 18-22 November 2014, King Abdullah II Ibn Al Hussein of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan made an official state visit to Japan where he met with Prime Minister Shinzo Abe.\footnote{Japan-Egypt Summit Meeting, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan (Tokyo) 24 September 2014. Date of Access: 11 May 2015. http://www.mofa.go.jp/me_a/me1/eg/page3e_000243.html.} Abe informed King Hussein that Japan would be providing Jordan with JPY2.238 billion in grant aid for the refurbishment and expansion of the Balqa water networks, in addition to another JPY200 million
grant aid for the provision of Japanese small and medium enterprise products. Both leaders discussed the importance of empowering women and agreed to promote cooperation in this area in order to create sustainable and healthy economic development.

On 16 January 2015, during the Egyptian leg of his MENA region tour, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe met with Egyptian Prime Minister Ibrahim Mahlab where he expressed Japan’s appreciation with Egypt’s progress in improving democratic procedures. In addition, Prime Minister Abe thanked the Government of Egypt for making efforts to reform as well as promote “comprehensive developments regarding poverty, healthcare, and education.” Accompanying Prime Minister Abe on his tour of the region was an economic mission, which took part in the Ninth Joint Meeting of the Japan-Egypt Business Committee. President El-Sisi thanked Prime Minister Abe for his country’s support in the “construction of the…Egypt-Japan University for Science and Technology (E-JUST).”

On 18 January 2015, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe met His Majesty King Abdullah II of Jordan. During this meeting, Abe announced his government’s intention to provide Jordan with another loan of USD100 Million, “to support the stability of Jordan,” as well as further financial aid totalling USD28 Million through an unspecified international organization.

On 22 April 2015, Prime Minister Abe met with Egyptian Prime Minister Ibrahim Mahlab on the sidelines of the Asian-African Summit. During their meeting, Abe informed Mahlab that the Government of Japan would be providing Egypt with a grant of approximately JPY1.5 billion for the expansion of Cairo University Hospital. This aid comes on the heels of pre-existing loans issued in January 2015, which combined amount to approximately JPY43 Billion since the beginning of 2015. The Japanese Prime Minister also expressed his hope that the Egyptian parliamentary elections would be held without delay in a fair and transparent manner, ushering in a system of governance, “based on the will of the people.”

While Japan made statements supporting improved governance and job creation for women and youth at many of these conferences, it has not taken concrete action to support job creation for

vulnerable populations. Thus, Japan has been awarded a score of 0 for partial compliance with the commitment.

**United Kingdom: 0**

While the United Kingdom has contributed to improving governance in transition countries (TCs), it has failed to generate meaningful new programs focusing on job creation during the compliance period. For these reasons, the UK receives a score of 0.

Representatives from the UK attended the Third Arab Forum on Asset Recovery (AFAR III) from 1-3 November 2014. By supporting this event, the UK illustrated a commitment to improving governance in TCs because the return of misappropriated funds “is essential in helping restore integrity and public trust in government, and in sending a strong message that there can be no impunity for those who abuse their official positions.”

The UK has not pledged money to the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) Transition Fund during the compliance period.

While the UK focused strongly on women’s economic participation during its presidency of the G8 in 2013, its actions in this area during the current compliance period have been reduced. For example, the UK hosted an Arab Women’s Conference in June 2013 that discussed efforts to increase women’s economic participation in the MENA region. Moreover, the UK launched a mentoring program for youth and women in TCs in June 2013. On 31 January 2015, however, the Forsa program was officially concluded and no program has been proposed to replace it.

The UK has participated in a number of meetings of the Deauville Partnership where the importance of increasing employment opportunities for women and youth has been noted. On 25 September 2014, representatives from the UK participated in the Deauville Partnership Foreign Ministers’ meeting in New York. In the Chairs’ Statement, the states agreed that ‘The Partnership should concentrate its efforts on…great political and economic participation of women and youth.’

Britain was also represented at a meeting of finance ministers on the Deauville Partnership in

---

October 2014. Here, the chairs emphasized that creating employment opportunities for women and youth was vital in order to strengthen the economies of the TCs.

In conclusion, the UK has contributed to improving governance in TCs, but has not made further contributions to the MENA Transition Fund or other initiatives aimed at increasing job creation amongst women and youth in TCs. Thus, the UK receives a 0 for partial compliance with this commitment.

**United States: 0**

The United States has made significant efforts to support improved governance in transition countries (TCs), but it has not made further pledges to support the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) Transition Fund or other initiatives aimed at supporting job creation for youth and women during the compliance period. As a result, the United States is awarded a score of 0 for its partial compliance with the country’s commitment to the Deauville Partnership.

Between 1 and 3 November 2014, representatives of the US attended the Third Meeting of the Arab Forum on Asset Recovery (AFAR III). Moreover, the US was a member of the Steering Committee that supported the chairs of conference. The main aims of the discussions were to review the progress of states on the issue of asset recovery, and to suggest ways of improving this progress. During the talks, participants including the US reaffirmed their support for members of the Deauville Partnership in this area, and committed to providing technical assistance to these states for the purpose of asset recovery. Attendance at this conference illustrates an effort to improve governance in TCs because “the recovery of the proceeds of corruption through international

---


cooperation is essential in helping to restore integrity and public trust in government, and in sending a strong message that there can be no impunity for those who abuse their official positions.\(^{560}\)

In 2014, the US Department of Justice’s Asset Forfeiture and Money Laundering Section (AFMLS) and the Office of Overseas Prosecutorial Development, Assistance and Training (OPDAT) delivered courses on issues including “the investigation and prosecution of complex financial crimes, economic crimes, money laundering, and corruption; the use of asset forfeiture as a law enforcement tool…and international mutual legal assistance.”\(^{561}\) Over the course of 2014, they held one course on the margins of AFAR III, in addition to several courses in Egypt, and Yemen.\(^{562}\) However, while the program was specifically undertaken for the Deauville Partnership initiative, it was designed and began in 2013. Thus, it falls outside of the compliance period.

On 24 September 2014, President Obama addressed the Open Government Partnership (OGP). The OGP was founded in 2011 by eight states including the US for the purpose of attaining “concrete commitments from governments to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance.”\(^{563}\) During his statement, President Obama argued that the OGP needed to maintain its focus on the prevention of corruption and the retrieval of stolen assets in order to prevent instability, and to promote economic development and public trust in governments.\(^{564}\) Obama also emphasized the fact that “Here in the United States, we’ve been trying to lead by example.”\(^{565}\) Thus, the US committed to a series of initiatives including an effort to increase the transparency of government spending, and creating an action plan to deter corruption amongst American companies operating internationally.\(^{566}\) However, while this work illustrates a strong commitment by the US to improving its own governance, its efforts will not directly impact TCs.

The US has not pledged further contributions to the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) Transition Fund during the compliance period. It is important to note that the US committed to


govern

making a USD50 million grant on 23 April 2013.\textsuperscript{567} However, since this pledge falls outside of the compliance period, it cannot be counted as an effort to improve job creation for women and youth in TCs.

The US does fund a significant number of other programs specifically aimed at improving governance and empowering women in the MENA region. These programs include the US-Middle East Partnership Initiative (MEPI). MEPI’s projects include training for female entrepreneurs,\textsuperscript{568} and support for civil society organizations.\textsuperscript{569} Another example is USAID’s Business Reform and Competitiveness Project, which operates in Tunisia, and has trained female entrepreneurs.\textsuperscript{570} However, these projects commenced prior to the compliance period, and no information regarding further financial contributions towards the projects during the compliance period could be found. Thus, they cannot be included when measuring compliance for the US.

The US has participated in meetings of the Deauville Partnership where statements were made supporting job creation for women and youth.

On 25 September 2014, Under Secretary of State for Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment Catherine Novelli participated in the G7 Deauville Partnership Meeting for foreign ministers.\textsuperscript{571} The German Chair’s Statement from this meeting described the G7’s support for TCs in the development of policy programs to stabilize local economies, with a focus on “priority measures for growth with lasting job creation impact.”\textsuperscript{572} In particular, they pointed to the creation of economic opportunities for women and youth as a priority area.\textsuperscript{573} In addition, the foreign ministers concurred that the Deauville Partnership should seek greater engagement for civil society and private partnerships in order to heighten the Partnership’s effectiveness in TCs.\textsuperscript{574}

On 15 April 2015, US Secretary of State John Kerry attended the G7 Foreign Minister’s Meeting in Lübeck, Germany.\textsuperscript{575} In a communiqué released at the end of the meeting, Secretary Kerry joined with other G7 states to commend the Deauville Partnership’s focus on “improving economic


governance, enhancing financial inclusions, fostering job creation in particular for women and youth, closer regional integration and the involvement of civil society.” The US government also joined other nations in welcoming “the focus of the Deauville Partnership on...improving women's economic role in the region.”

The US has taken clear steps to improve governance in TGs, as evidenced through its participation in AFAR III. However, it has not pledged further money to the MENA Transition Fund during the compliance period.

As a result, this report awards the US a score of 0 for its partial compliance with Deauville Partnership commitments.

*Analyst: Aditya Rau*

**European Union: +1**

The European Union is in full compliance with its commitments to improve governance and support job creation for women and/or youth in transition countries (TCs).

Between 1 November 2014 and 3 November 2014, the EU attended the Third Meeting of the Arab Forum on Asset Recovery (AFAR III), and agreed upon a set of asset recovery procedures. These included: (1) establishing a defined framework for conducting intra-agency coordination to further the goals of asset recovery; (2) protecting assets from illegal dissipation and unaccountability by the creation of relevant instruments at financial centers; (3) allocating USD5 million collectively towards regional capacity building programs focusing on asset recovery. These measures will help improve fiscal transparency in the region by promoting greater accountability in asset management and protection in the Middle East and North African (MENA) region.

On 22 December 2014, the EU and the Council of Europe signed an agreement to create a program entitled “Towards Strengthened Democratic Governance in the Southern Mediterranean.” The two groups made a contribution of EUR7.4 million towards the program. The EU provided EUR7 million of these funds. The program is meant to act as the second phase of another program that concluded in 2014, and generally focused on Tunisia, Jordan, and Morocco. One
of its objectives was to prevent corruption and money laundering by improving legislation, and offering training workshops.585

The EU has also undertaken initiatives to improve job creation for youth through its continued involvement with the Union for the Mediterranean (UfM). The UfM was created in 2008 as a means of reformulating the relationship between countries in Europe and the Mediterranean.586 It is currently jointly led by the EU and Jordan,587 and involves several of the TCs involved in the Deauville Partnership. These include Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, and Tunisia.588

The European Commission and UfM jointly hosted a conference on engaging the private sector to stimulate inclusive growth in the economies of the Mediterranean countries on 24 October 2014.589 One of the topics discussed was youth unemployment.590

The EU has also contributed to job creation for youth in TCs through other measures.

On 2 April 2015, high-level officials from the European Union (EU) and other UfM member states participated in a meeting of the UfM where they agreed to approve a project on youth employability in the Mediterranean.591 The UfM announced that the initiative is “aimed at enhancing the competitiveness of both SMEs [small and medium-sized enterprises] and recent graduates, fostering youth employment … by providing structured training on employability skills.”592

On 29 April 2015 and 30 April 2015, Johannes Hahn, the member of the European Commission responsible for European neighbourhood policy and enlargement negotiations, announced the contribution of EUR28 million for the improvement of housing and infrastructure in 119 districts of

Tunisia. The European Commission noted, “part of those employed on renovation projects live in these neighbourhoods, thus allowing young people to enter the labor market.”  

The European Commission, along with other donors, contributed a total sum of EUR5 million to launch the EUROMED Invest initiative in May 2014. In a press release, the European Commission stated, “The project’s general purpose is to support the creation and the international development of MSMEs [micro, small, and medium-sized enterprises] in the five most promising sectors for job creation and economic spillovers: agrifood, transport and logistics, cultural and creative industries, water and green energies and tourism.” Some of EUROMED Invest’s projects are targeted at youth, illustrating a commitment to job creation for young people. For example, the program offers training for “young and new entrepreneurs.” However, as this initiative was created prior to the compliance period, it cannot be counted towards the EU’s compliance score.

The EU has also participated in meetings of the Deauville Partnership and reaffirmed their commitment to it.

For example, on 15 April 2015 the High Representative of the European Union attended the G7 Foreign Ministers’ Meeting in Lübeck, Germany to re-affirm the EU’s commitment to the principles of the Deauville Partnership. Here, the EU and the states of the G7 made a commitment to “fostering job creation in particular for women and youth.”

Thus, the EU has earned a score of +1 for its full compliance with the commitment. It has improved governance by participating in AFAR III, as well as by investing in programs to reduce corruption in TCs. It has also taken steps to support job creation for youth in TCs through its active participation in the UfM and through other bilateral initiatives.

Analyst: Tannishtha Pramanick
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9. Stolen Assets Recovery [80]

“We renew our commitment to the recovery and return of stolen assets.”

_G7 Brussels Summit Declaration_

**Assessment**

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

**Background**

Since 2008, G7 countries have made commitments on the recovery of stolen assets. In 2012, the Deauville Partnership was established in part to support Middle East and North African Countries (MENA) in addressing issues of corruption and to aid with transition towards stabilisation following the Arab Spring.599 Member countries agreed to help facilitate the recovery and repatriation of stolen assets through an Asset Recovery Action Plan, which aimed to identify and recover proceeds of corruption stowed abroad.600 In conjunction with this, countries have worked to create a national action plan, which serves as a road map to implement the Asset Recovery Action Plan.601

At the 2014 G7 Brussels Summit, member countries reiterated their commitment to help developing countries tackle tax evasion and illicit finance flow by “denying a safe haven to proceeds of corruption,” and “working to recovery and return stolen assets.”602 The G7 continues to work as part of the Deauville Partnership, the G20, and in conjunction with the Stolen Asset Recovery Initiative (StAR), which is a partnership between the World Bank Group and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) that supports international efforts to end safe havens for corrupt funds.603

As a part of this partnership, member countries supported and participated in the three meetings of the Arab Forum on Asset Recovery (AFAR) in 2012, 2013, and 2014. This Forum is intended to

---


bring together key individuals and institutions to discuss the challenges and expectations surrounding asset recovery in the Arab World.\textsuperscript{604}

**Commitment Features**

At the 2013 Lough Erne Summit, countries agreed to develop national action plans to actively address the issues of stolen assets. At the 2014 Summit in Brussels, member countries re-committed to continued support for the recovery of stolen assets, and agreed that the next step should be to implement the previously developed action plans.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>−1</td>
<td>Member makes no effort to coordinate with Middle East Asian Summit and North Africa members on asset recovery cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member coordinates with Middle East Asian Summit and North Africa members on individual asset recovery cases but does not take steps to develop a holistic national action plan on asset recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member develops a national action plan on asset recovery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada: +1**

Canada is in full compliance with the commitment to help return stolen assets to countries in transition by implementing a national action plan on asset recovery.

From 1 November 2014 to 3 November 2014 at the third meeting of the Arab Forum on Asset Recovery, the Chairs’ statement by Switzerland, Egypt, and Tunisia confirmed that the Canadian government was participating in the Third Arab Forum on Asset Recovery\textsuperscript{605} as part of the Deauville Partnership with Arab Countries in Transition during which methods for the continued recovery of stolen assets were discussed.\textsuperscript{606}

At the Forum, representatives from the Canadian government also chaired Session III — Administrative Freezes. Panelists at the session noted that the Canadian government had recently enacted a law which provides authority to impose an administrative freeze against money and property on its own initiative involving a country in transition or unrest. The Canadian government has ordered asset freezes of approximately 300 persons involved the seizure of approximately US 1.62 million relating to officials and former officials in Egypt, Tunisia and Ukraine.\textsuperscript{607}

The Canadian government published a guide in English, French, and Arabic detailing how the French legal system is related to asset recovery and how asset recovery is effective through mutual legal assistance.\textsuperscript{608}

Canada published an Asset Recovery Action Plan Implementation Road Map in 2013 on the StAR website. In this action plan, Canada has already fully implemented several commitments. Canada made asset recovery a top priority and it remains a top priority of the criminal law policy defined by the French government. In 2014 Canada continued to work towards full implementation and improvement of its Action Plan through the continued cooperation from the Department of Justice Canada, DFATD and the RCMP with Arab Spring countries seeking assistance in the recovery of stolen assets.

Canada committed to fully implementing a national action plan on asset recovery at the G7 Brussels Summit Declaration. Due to Canada’s full implementation of a national action plan on asset recovery, Canada has earned a score of +1.

**France: +1**

France is in full compliance with the commitment to help return stolen assets to countries in transition by implementing a national action plan on asset recovery.

From 1 November 2014 to 3 November 2014 at the third meeting of the Arab Forum on Asset Recovery, the Chairs’ statement by Switzerland, Egypt, and Tunisia confirmed that the French government was participating in the Third Arab Forum on Asset Recovery as part of the Deauville Partnership with Arab Countries in Transition during which methods for the continued recovery of stolen assets were discussed.

The French government published a guide in English, French, and Arabic detailing how the French legal system is related to asset recovery and how asset recovery is effective through mutual legal assistance.

France published an Asset Recovery Action Plan Implementation Road Map in 2013 on the StAR website. In this action plan, France committed to taking into account the importance of transition
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countries’ requests for case assistance involving stolen asset recovery. France made asset recovery a top priority and it remains a top priority of the criminal law policy defined by the French government. In 2014 France continued to work towards full implementation and improvement of its Action Plan through the creation of a centralised public registry to provide accurate and current information on beneficial owners.

France committed to fully implementing a national action plan on asset recovery at the G7 Brussels Summit Declaration. Due to the French government’s full implementation of a national action plan on asset recovery, France has earned a score of +1.

**Analyst: Mia Naylor**

**Germany: +1**

Germany is in full compliance with its commitments to the recovery and repatriation of stolen assets to countries in transition. On 12 November 2014, the Government of Germany ratified the United Nations Convention against Corruption, fulfilling the last of its obligations in regards to stolen asset recovery as outlined in its 2013 action plan implementation roadmap.

The German government has also provided bilateral assistance in the recovery of stolen assets to the fullest of its ability on all occasions it has been asked to do so, responding positively to assistance requests from both Egypt and Tunisia.

The German Government has also continued to support overall efforts to recover stolen assets at the international level through participation in the Third Arab Forum on Asset Recovery (AFAR III), and Seventh Global Forum on Transparency and Exchange of Information for Tax Purposes, at which the German government announced its intention to implement new standards on the automatic exchange of tax information by 2017. The Government of Germany will also be hosting the Fourth Arab Forum on Asset Recovery (AFAR IV) in the fall of 2015.

---

Germany has demonstrated engagement in international efforts to assist developing nations in recovering stolen assets, and global leadership in instituting new financial transparency reforms. Thus, Germany receives a score of +1.

Analyst Joseph Ramlochand

Italy: +1

Italy has been given a score of +1 for maintaining a prominent role in international efforts to increase financial transparency between multiple financial jurisdictions that will serve to aid in the locating and recovery of stolen assets. Much of these efforts have focused on providing aid to developing countries, with particular emphasis on many Middle East and North African (MENA) states.

Through the mechanism of its Asset Recovery Working Group, created in 2012, Italy has continued to “provide the fullest possible measures to support Arab countries in Transition seeking assistance in the recovery of stolen assets.” This was a commitment made by Italy and it has met that commitment to the greatest extent possible.

The Italian government was a participant at the 7th Meeting of the Global Forum on Transparency and Exchange of Information for Tax Purposes in Berlin, Germany on 28-29 October 2014. Their participation included a commitment to implement the “new standard on Automatic Exchange of Information (AE0I) by 2017.” Italy also committed to “pledging greater support to developing countries.” This commitment included the launch of the Africa Initiative, a “3 year project to raise awareness and build the tools to foster effective E0I” that Italy is involved with in conjunction with multiple global organizations including the World Bank and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Italy participated in the Third Meeting of the Arab Forum on Asset Recovery (AFAR III) in Geneva on 1-3 November 2014, where representatives from participating nations “endeavoured to identify how factors of progress could be more widely implemented in order to improve asset recovery proceedings in countries facing difficulties.” Furthermore, there was an emphasis on “building

bridges between lessons learned and their application,\textsuperscript{630} which demonstrates the intention to advance from preliminary planning stages to the application phase of asset recovery.

In an OECD Secretary General Report to G20 finance ministers report dated April 2015, Italy was deemed to be “largely compliant” with its commitment to aid in “work being undertaken for monitoring and implementation of the new standard of Automatic exchange of Information and progress on assisting developing countries to participate fully in the benefits of tax transparency and international cooperation.”\textsuperscript{631}

Further, on 14-15 May 2015, Italy hosted the 4th Global Forum on Transparency and Exchange of Information, which specifically focused on the cooperative efforts of the financial authorities of member countries in “implementing the new standard on automatic exchange of information.”\textsuperscript{632} This conference included eight MENA states.\textsuperscript{633}

As a result of Italy’s efforts to both assist MENA states and developing states with asset recovery and financial information transparency, and to develop a broad national plan in cooperation with other nations, Italy has been given a score of +1, which demonstrates full compliance with their commitments made at the 2014 Brussels Summit.

\textit{Analyst: Matthew Boissonneault}

\textbf{Japan: +1}

Japan has fully complied with its commitment to the recovery and return of stolen assets.

In 2013, Japan adopted an asset recovery action plan.\textsuperscript{634} While Japan achieved a number of the goals that are presented in this report prior to the beginning of the compliance period, there are still several steps that Japan must take to complete the implementation of this plan. For example, while Japan signed the United Nations (UN) Convention Against Corruption in December 2003, it has failed to ratify the treaty thus far.\textsuperscript{635} The Japanese parliament must make the necessary changes to its criminal code before the Government of Japan is able to ratify the agreement.\textsuperscript{636}


\textsuperscript{632} Global Forum 4\textsuperscript{th} Conference of the Competent Authorities, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (Paris), Date of Access: 30 May 2015 http://www.oecd.org/tax/transparency/gfmeetinginrome2015.htm#


However, Japan did participate in the Third Arab Forum on Asset Recovery between 1 November 2014 and 3 November 2014. During this meeting, participants both assessed the progress that states had made on asset recovery, and discussed ways of furthering these efforts. Japan’s actions indicate its commitment to the implementation of its asset recovery action plan, which pledges that Japan will “participate as appropriate in the Arab Forum on Asset Recovery.”

Japan has also taken other actions to recover stolen assets that are not included in its action plan.

Between 25 August 2014 and 26 August 2014, Japan participated in the annual general meeting of the Asset Recovery Interagency Network Asia Pacific (ARIN-AP). The ARIN-AP is a recent initiative that was created to enable professionals in the Asia Pacific region to share expertise and “increase the effectiveness of members’ efforts in depriving criminals of their illicit profits.” Japan’s involvement with this group illustrates its commitment to stolen asset recovery.

Japan also attended the Seventh Meeting of the Global Forum on Transparency and Exchange of Information for Tax Purposes between 28 October 2014 and 29 October 2014. While there, Japan committed to implementing the “new standard on Automatic Exchange of Information (AEOI)” by 2018. The AEOI is a “common standard for automatic exchange of financial account information.” The AEOI is important because it helps to reduce tax evasion.

In addition, Kosie Louw, the chair of the global forum, noted that Japan has also contributed to efforts to change the Terms of Reference for transparency and exchange of information (EOI) on
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request throughout 2014. Furthermore, the Global Forum labelled Japan as “compliant” with the international standard of transparency and exchange of information on request in April 2015.

Thus, Japan receives a +1 for the steps that it has taken to fulfill this commitment. It has created a national implementation plan, and has coordinated with other states through several international forums for the purpose of retrieving stolen assets.

**Analyst: Sarah Beard**

United Kingdom +1

The United Kingdom has demonstrated full compliance with its commitments to the recovery and repatriation of stolen assets. It has developed a holistic national action plan for asset recovery in coordination with countries in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA), and has further demonstrated continued support for the implementation of the developed plan.

The United Kingdom has fully implemented measures to fulfill over half of the commitments outlined in its 2013 asset recovery action plan implementation road map. The implementation of measures to address remaining commitments is ongoing and approaching completion. Among these efforts is continued UK support for the establishment of mechanisms that provide transparency for the administration and end-use of returned funds.

The government of the United Kingdom has also supported large scale plans to improve stolen asset recovery. The UK participated in the Third Arab Forum on Asset Recovery (AFAR III), where it expressed hope that its asset recovery guides would help Arab countries better cooperate with G8 countries or asset recovery. The UK further committed to take forward the asset recovery agenda as next president of the G8. In addition, the UK made similar commitments to asset recovery by becoming vice-chair of the PRG, a group drafting and proposing specific changes to the Terms of Reference and Methodology of the Global Forum on Transparency and Exchange of Information for Tax Purposes.

Finally, the UK has posted a Regional Asset Recovery Adviser to Egypt in order to provide legal advice and assistance to countries in the region. A delegation of Libyans serving on the Libyan Asset Recovery Committee were also brought to the UK for training and professional assistance.

In short, the UK has demonstrated substantive compliance with its commitments to the recovery of stolen assets for transitioning Arab states. It has developed a holistic national action plan for stolen asset recovery and has begun to implement this plan. The United Kingdom thus receives a score of +1.

**Analyst: William Hall**
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United States: +1

The United States is in full compliance with its commitments to the recovery and repatriation of stolen assets to countries in transition.

The United States reemphasized its commitment to stolen asset recovery through its international level participation in the Third Arab Forum on Asset Recovery (AFAR III). The United States also took part in the Ukraine Forum on Asset Recovery from 29-30 April 2014 to facilitate international cooperation for the early freezing, tracing and ultimate recovery of stolen assets, in support of the government of Ukraine.

The United States government continued its efforts to provide specialized training during post-transition years for asset recovery programs. The United States Department of Justice delivered four courses in Egypt in the winter of 2014 on key topics including financial investigations, financial document analysis and asset confiscation.

On April 2015, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Secretary-General Report to the G20 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors on Transparency and Exchange of Information for Tax Purposes ranked the United States as largely compliant in the implementation of new legal and regulatory frameworks for tax information. The United States further indicated to undertake automatic information exchanges pursuant to the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act in 2015 and entered into intergovernmental agreements with other OECD jurisdictions to adopt the necessary regulations.

The United States has demonstrated commitments in ongoing efforts to assist developing nations in recovering stolen assets, and awareness in pursuing new financial transparency reforms. Thus, the United States receives a score of +1.

Analyst: Rehaan Khan

European Union: +1

The European Union is in full compliance with its commitment to develop national action plans to actively address the issues of stolen asset.

On 29 July 2014, the European Commission released their “Commission Implementing Decision” on the Preparatory Action for Supporting Arab Spring countries to implement asset recovery to be financed from the general budget of the European Union. The European Union has agreed to adopt
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a preparatory action detailed in the Commission’s document in order to support Arab Spring countries implement asset recovery.\textsuperscript{656}

The overarching objective of the action is to “empower the governmental authorities, asset recovery practitioners and civil society in Egypt, Libya and Tunisia to fight corruption and money laundering by establishing an effective asset recovery capacity.”\textsuperscript{657} The more specific objectives of the plan include: 1) increasing institutional capacities and establish coherent national strategies on asset recovery; 2) developing an enabling, simplified and strengthened legal framework on asset recover, and; 3) enhancing legal expertise of law enforcement authorities and decrease the length of asset recovery cases.\textsuperscript{658}

In order to attain these objectives, the European Union has authorized a maximum amount of EUR2.74 million to be taken out of the general 2014 European Union budget to finance this preparatory action.\textsuperscript{659}

As required by the commitment, the European Union complied and implemented an action plan on asset recovery and has thus been awarded a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Larissa Parker}


10. Crime and Corruption [81]

“We remain committed to prevent the misuse of companies and other legal arrangements such as trusts to hide financial flows stemming from corruption, tax evasion, money laundering, and other crimes, ensuring that beneficial ownership information is available in a timely fashion to financial intelligence units, tax collection and law enforcement agencies, for example through central registries or other appropriate mechanisms, leading by example in implementing the Financial Action Task Force and other relevant international standards and our national action plans in line with the principles we agreed at Lough Erne.”

*Brussels G7 Summit Declaration*

### Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>−1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Background

At the 1989 Paris Economic Summit, G7 members addressed the need to produce economic growth and remove inefficiencies within the economy. This included the recognition of new techniques used in worldwide financial activities. The regulations surrounding these activities varied greatly between the countries and members addressed the need to strengthen these regulations.

In order to target the inefficiencies, G7 members founded the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering (FATF), which was given the responsibility of “examining money laundering techniques and trends, reviewing the action which had already been taken at a national or international level, and setting out the measures that still needed to be taken to combat money laundering.” The FATF currently produces annual reports and recommendations to increase the transparency of the financial system, in order to more easily detect criminal activity, and to provide countries with the capacity to take successful action against money launderers.

At the 2013 Lough Erne Summit, G8 members committed to the implementation of national Action Plans based on the transparency of ownership, control of companies, and legal arrangements. Since the Lough Erne Summit, G7 members have encouraged other world leaders to ensure their
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countries are meeting the standards of the FATF, saying that “greater transparency in this area will help developing countries.”

**Commitment Features**

The G7’s commitment to prevent the misuse of companies to hide financial flows relies heavily on the standards imposed by the FATF. In 2012, the FATF revised their previous recommendations to better combat money laundering and other financial corruption. These are divided into seven categories: (1) Polices and Coordination; (2) Money Laundering and Confiscation; (3) Terrorist Financing and Financing Proliferation; (4) Preventive Measures; (5) Transparency and beneficial Ownership of Legal Persons and Arrangements; (6) Powers and Responsibilities of Competent Authorities and Other Institutional Measures; and (7) International Cooperation.

The commitment also states that the standards outlined by the FATF should be implemented by G7 Members as Action Plans to, “set out the concrete action each of us will take to counter money laundering and tax evasion.” These plans were based on eight core principles: (1) Companies should know who owns and controls them; (2) Ownership information should be accessible to law enforcement, tax administrations and other relevant authorities, through central registries; (3) Trustees of express trusts should know the beneficial ownership of the trust; (4) Authorities should understand the risks to which their anti-money laundering is exposed and implement effective measures to target them; (5) The misuse of financial instruments and of certain shareholding structures which may obstruct transparency should be prevented; (6) Financial institutions should be subject to effective anti-money laundering obligations to identify and verify the beneficial ownership of their customers; (7) Dissuasive sanctions should be available for companies, financial institutions and other regulated businesses that do not comply with their respective obligations; and (8) National authorities should cooperate effectively domestically and across borders to combat the abuse of companies and legal arrangements for illicit activity.

In order to achieve full compliance, each member state must begin or continue to implement a national Action Plan which is based on the eight core principles set out by the FATF.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>−1</td>
<td>G7 Member does not establish an action plan to prevent the misuse of companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>G7 Member establishes, but does not implement, an action plan to prevent the misuse of companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>G7 Member establishes and begins to implement an action plan to prevent the misuse of companies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lead Analyst: Anthony Marchese*
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Canada: +1

Canada has fully complied with its commitment to the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) to prevent the misuse of companies and other legal arrangements to enable crime and corruption, through multiple channels.

On 1 February 2014, Canada’s amendments to its Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Regulations Act (PCMLTF) went into effect. Canada introduced multiple amendments to its PCMLTF as a means of ensuring FATF compliance, most concretely in its amendments relating to compliance on FATF Recommendation 5. Recommendation 5 states that financial institutions should not “keep anonymous accounts or accounts in obviously fictitious names and providing instances when financial institutions should verify the identity of their customers, including when there is a suspicion of money laundering or terrorist financing.” The aforementioned amendments include: 1) Beneficial ownership identification; 2) Collecting information on the purpose and intended nature of the business relationship; 3) Ongoing due diligence, and; 4) Enhanced measures in higher risk scenarios.

On 17 February 2014, Canada was removed from the requirement of a regular follow up process by the FAFT, citing Canada’s “significant progress” in moving towards compliance from FATF’s 2008 report. This report details Canada’s lack of compliance on key measures, including Recommendation 5. As a result of its compliance, Canada will subsequently be subject to a less frequent FATF review.

On 8 September 2014, Canada and the EU announced plans to sign a joint strategic partnership, with “enhanced cooperation in law enforcement to counteract terrorism, organized crime, cyber-crime and money laundering” being cited as items of advanced cooperation between the two governments.

On 13 February 2015, Finance Minister Joe Oliver — along with the G7’s other finance ministers — issued a joint statement requesting that the FAFT “put a specific focus on financing of terrorism” and to prepare a report by October 2015, detailing “progress made and proposals to strengthen all counter-terrorism financing tools.”

Thus, the Canadian government has been awarded a score of +1 for its full compliance with its commitment to prevent the misuse of companies and other legal arrangements such as trusts to hide financial flows stemming from corruption, tax evasion, money laundering, and other crimes.

Analyst: Laura Riina

---


670 6th Follow-up Report, Mutual Evaluation of Canada.


France: +1
France has fully complied with its commitment to prevent the misuse of companies though the establishment of guidelines meant to address both money laundering and corporate transparency in compliance with the recommendations of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF).

On 12 February 2015, the French financial and prudential regulatory authority released an updated version of its practical guidelines on anti-money laundering. Guidelines intended to inform the expectations of regulatory bodies in the insurance sector in relation to anti-money laundering and the prohibition of terrorism funding. A primary change in the updated guidelines was the addition of a new chapter dedicated to non-life insurance that extended aspects of the duty of vigilance to the majority of non-life insurance products, thus increasing commercial transparency.673

Further, France increased its monitoring of small bank account transactions in an effort to combat terrorist financing. In addition to several other measures which limit small bank account transactions, any cash deposit or withdrawal more than EUR10,000 in a month now signals the Tracfin (Traitements du renseignement et action contre les circuits financiers clandestins) anti-fraud and money laundering agency. In response to the 7 January 2015 attacks, Finance Minister Michel Sapin affirmed France’s commitment to “fight against the use of cash and anonymity in the French economy.”674

France has taken significant steps towards fulfilling the standards outlined by the FATF in regards to financial transparency legislation. Thus, France is awarded a score of +1 for full compliance.

Analyst: Emma Murray

Germany: +1
Germany has received a score of +1 for full compliance towards its commitment.

Since having been identified by the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) in 2010 to be insufficiently compliant with the Task Force’s core recommendations,675 Germany has come a long way in improving its efforts to combat crime and corruption. A June 2014 Follow-Up Report released by the FATF lauded the German government’s implementation of legal and policy reforms targeting previously identified areas of deficiency.676 and 2014-15 saw a continuation of proactive measures taken towards improving financial security and coordination with international anti-crime and anti-terrorism efforts.

One of five key European countries to sign on to the initial pilot stage of the initiative back in April 2013, Germany joined with 50 other countries on 29 October 2014 to sign a multilateral competent authority agreement committing its signatories to the automatic exchange of financial information.677
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The agreement, which is slated to enter into effect for Germany in September 2017, will utilize an OECD-established international standard to mandate party states to participate in the collection and multilateral exchange of financial account information from domestic financial institutions, marking an important step towards the bolstering of international efforts to combat money laundering and tax evasion.

In addition, in response to the European Commission’s appeal on 17 December 2014 for all its member states to join in its efforts to identify and eradicate multinational preferential tax schemes, Germany launched an investigation in early 2015 into possible illicit financial activities within its jurisdiction. In February 2015, German police raided the offices of Commerzbank, a German-based multinational bank, as part of a probe into the institutions possible involvement in money laundering and tax evasion practices. That same month, Royal Bank of Scotland subsidiary Coutts also came under investigation for the possible aiding and abetting of tax evasion. Such initiatives reflected Germany’s continued commitment to multinational efforts to counter global financial crime.

Both at home and abroad, Germany continued to demonstrate a willingness to spearhead the push to end global terrorism financing in 2015. On 4 February 2015, the German parliament passed a draft legislation pertaining to reforms of the country’s anti-terror laws. In addition to the strengthening of monitoring and prosecutorial mechanisms for potential participants in terrorism, the new legislation proposes to recognize terrorist financing as a stand-alone crime. Additionally, German Finance Minister Wolfgang Schäuble issued a joint statement with his French counterpart in March 2015 calling on the European Commission to introduce a continent-wide legislative structure for better regulation of cross-border financial flow and more expedient freezing of terrorist assets. In addition to enhanced monitoring of electronic currency outflows, the statement also called for improvements to regulatory and reporting mechanisms for the movement of alternative sources of financing such as gold, valuable gems, and prepaid credit cards.

Combined, these initiatives reflect a consistent, systematic German effort to introduce and maintain measures in compliance with the eight core principles set out by the FATF. Thus, Germany has been awarded a score of +1 in the commitment area of crime and corruption.

Analyst: William Zhang

Italy: –1

Italy has not complied in its commitment to establish an Action Plan to prevent the misuse of companies.

---

Italy has not taken any significant actions toward creating a national Action Plan that would abide by the 8 FATF core principles to prevent the misuse of companies for the purpose of money laundering and financing terrorism in this compliance cycle.

Thus, Italy has been awarded a score of $-1$ for non-compliance.

*Analyst: Spencer Adrian McMurray*

**Japan: 0**

Japan has partially complied with its commitment to prevent the misuse of companies though the establishment of an Action Plan addressing both money laundering and company transparency in compliance with the recommendations of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF).

In February 2014, Japan’s Financial Intelligence Center signed multiple Statements of Cooperation with foreign financial intelligence units, concerning the exchange of information on money laundering and terrorist financing. Agreements were reached with People’s Democratic Republic of Algeria, Principality of Monaco and Saint Martin. These agreements have established a framework whereby the Japanese Financial Intelligence Center can disclose details of suspicious transactions to foreign intelligence units. Any information is accompanied by documents specifying the restrictions on the use of the provided information.

However, on 27 June 2014, FATF issued a public statement expressing apprehension with regards to Japan’s continued failure to address insufficiencies outlined in the third mutual evaluation report agreed upon in 2008. FATF’s major concerns were as follows: (1) the incomplete criminalization of terrorist financing, (2) the lack of due diligence and other preventative measures in both financial and non-financial sectors, (3) the limited mechanism to freeze terrorist assets, (4) failure to ratify and implement the Palermo convention.

Although there have been steps made towards fulfilling the standards outlined by the FATF, Japan has failed to implement substantive changes to its financial transparency legislation.

For this reason Japan is awarded a score of 0 for partial compliance to its commitment to prevent the misuse of companies and other legal arrangements such as trusts to hide financial flows stemming from corruption, tax evasion, money laundering, and other crimes.

*Analyst: Emma Murray*

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom is in full compliance with its commitment on crime and corruption. It has established and begun to implement an action plan to prevent the misuse of companies and other legal arrangements to hide financial flows.

In October 2014 in Berlin, the UK was one of the first countries to sign agreements to bring into effect by 2018 a secured automatic exchange of information of financial accounts with over 90

---


countries. This automatic exchange of information will give the UK access to information on UK tax residences’ offshore accounts annually, including but not limited to, balances and interest. This will allow them to look through these structures to determine who has been hiding beneficial owners of accounts abroad and allow them to obtain evidence in order to prosecute them fully.

In addition, the UK government is heavily involved in the OECD’s BEPS Action Plan, and helped deliver the first phase of the project on time in September 2014. Through this, countries reached agreement on the first set of outputs including creating a country-by-country reporting template in order to improve transparency between MNCs and tax authorities, as well as developing rules to counter hybrid mismatch arrangements. The UK government further committed to concluding the BEPS project with its international partners in 2015. The goal of this project is to ensure that profits are taxed where the economic activities of a multi-national company are actually happening. On 20 September 2014, the UK government announced that in 2015 they will begin to implement the country-by-country reporting appropriate legislation within the UK in order to gain information on corporate profits, taxes and economic activity for risk assessment. Her Majesty’s (HM) Treasury, the UK government’s economic and finance ministry, released a document in March 2015 titled, “Tackling Tax Evasion and Tax Avoidance,” outlining the specific ways in which the UK was going to crack down on crime and corruption involving financial flows. This includes the addition of new criminal offenses and much larger financial penalties for offenders for up to 200 per cent of the amount of evaded tax and the possibility of the seizure of assets. On 1 April 2015 the UK government introduced a 25 per cent tax rate to counter the use of complex arrangements by multinational corporations (MNCs) to divert profits out of the UK. Further, new legislation will be introduced in 2016 that provides no guarantee for tax avoiders that criminal investigations will not be pursued.

---

In 2014 and 2015, HM Treasury and Home Office conducted the first National Risk Assessment (NRA) of money laundering (ML) and terrorist financing (TF) risks associated with the UK. This assessment was to ensure that the Government of the UK understands their ML/FT risks and can take steps to improve the domestic legislative and supervisory regime accordingly.\footnote{Anti-Money Laundering and Counter Terrorist Finance Supervision Report 2013-14, HM Treasury (London) 24 March 2015. Date of Access: 13 May 2015. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/anti-money-laundering-and-counter-terrorist-finance-supervision-reports/anti-money-laundering-and-counter-terrorist-finance-supervision-report-2013-14}

Thus, the UK has been awarded a score of +1 for its full compliance to its commitment on crime and corruption because of its continued provision of measures that comply with the eight core principles set out by the FATF.

**United States: 0**

The United States has partially complied with its commitment to prevent the misuse of companies via the creation and implementation of a national Action Plan emphasizing transparency of ownership, control of companies, and legal arrangements, as made and reinforced at the 2013 Lough Erne G8 Summit and the 2014 Brussels G7 Summit.

The United States laid out its national Action Plan immediately after the Lough Erne Summit. Following the Lough Erne Summit, the Office of the Press Secretary of the White House released a statement titled “United States G-8 Action Plan for Transparency of Company Ownership and Control.”\footnote{United States G-8 Action Plan for Transparency of Company Ownership and Control, Office of the Press Secretary of the Whitehouse (Washington) 18 June 2013. Access Date: 13 May 2015. https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/06/18/united-states-g-8-action-plan-transparency-company-ownership-and-control.} Within this document, the United States commits to updating national risk assessment, working towards comprehensive legislation, defining beneficial owners, collecting and verifying documentation, further regulating company formation agents, ameliorating accessibility of information, bettering customer due diligence standards for United States financial institutions, engaging in increased international cooperation related to beneficial ownership of companies, and releasing mandates that will emphasize transparency of transfers, exemptions, and liabilities. Thus, the United States can be said to have successfully established an Action Plan to prevent the misuse of companies.

Furthermore, since the 2014 Brussels G7 Summit, the United States has made further progress where comprehensively establishing its Action Plan is concerned. On 26 June 2014, the United States Senate passed a bill geared at creating transparency-related legal reforms in Delaware, one of the most prominent secrecy havens in the country.\footnote{147th General Assembly House Bill #327, Delaware.Gov (Delaware) 2014. Access Date: 13 May 2015. http://legis.delaware.gov/lis/lis147.nsf/vwlegislation/hb+327?opendocument.} The bill, titled “An Act to Amend Chapter 18, Title 6 of the Delaware Code Relating to the Creation, Regulation, Operation and Dissolution of Domestic Limited Liability Companies and the Registration and Regulation of Foreign Limited Liability Companies” — or, in short form, “House Bill #327” — amends the Delaware Limited Liability Company Act to ameliorate transparency of ownership by requiring that limited liability companies provide their communications contacts with records containing the names and addresses of all members and managers of the limited liability companies.

The United States’ dedication to establishing legislation to address money laundering and tax evasion is a vital first step for this country, given that it has repeatedly been deemed one of the most prominent homes to anonymous “shell” companies in the world, alongside Kenya. This dedication is
made clear not solely by House Bill 327, but also by the Incorporation Transparency and Law Enforcement Assistance Act, or S.1465, a bill that would require greater transparency with respect to company ownership, and that was, as of 19 June 2014, pending in both the U.S. House and the Senate. Reintroduced by Senators Carl Levin and Chuck Grassley, and cosponsored by Senators Dianne Feinstein, Tom Harkin, and Sheldon Whitehouse, this bill, though not enacted in a previous session of Congress, has been heralded by many as a step in the right direction.

These amendments and bill reintroductions, while significant, have been called insufficient by some, as House Bill #327 does not explicitly allow law enforcement to uncover the beneficial owners of companies, and S.1465 has yet to be enacted. Furthermore, the United States seems considerably behind other G7 members where implementing its anti-tax evasion and anti-money-laundering commitments is concerned, as it has not yet outlined how it will implement these commitments. Further, the commitments themselves do not put corporate ownership information into the public domain, and are thus ineffective in comparison to those measures put in place by, for example, the U.K., which has already announced that it will be creating public registries of beneficial ownership, and the European Parliament, which in March 2014 voted to approve revisions to money-laundering regulations that would require all 28 European Union Countries to create public registries of company and trust ownership.

Cumulatively, while the United States has established a national Action Plan to prevent the misuse of companies, it has not begun to implement it across all of its dimensions and is considerably behind other G7 members where enacting relevant legislation is concerned. As such, the United States has been awarded a compliance score of 0.

Analysts: Humayun Ahmed and Sophia Glisch

European Union: +1

The European Union is in full compliance with its commitment to prevent the misuse of companies and other legal arrangements (including trusts) via the implementation of a national Action Plan as per the standards of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF).

On 27 January 2015, Commissioner Pierre Moscovici welcomed the adoption of anti-tax evasion measures, including stringent tax planning methods. The European Commission introduced this measure as part of the anti-abuse clause of the Parent-Subsidiary Directive on 9 December 2014, and adopted the measure on 27 January 2015. Moreover, on 18 March 2015, the European Commission presented its Tax Transparency Package in an effort to tackle corporate tax evasion and problematic tax competition. This was done in order to: 1) ensure fair competition and increased burden-sharing between companies in all member states; 2) target companies that do not currently pay their fair share of tax, and; 3) prevent double-taxation.

---

On 10 February 2015, the European Council approved an agreement with the European Parliament to enforce more stringent regulations against money laundering and terrorist financing activities.\textsuperscript{702} The council not only implemented the standards recommended by the FATF, but also proposed even tighter measures enhancing directive scopes while taking into account the risks and limitations associated with anti-money laundering efforts, and putting into place improved standards for customer due diligence. Moreover, the Council implemented specific provisions to enhance transparency of beneficial ownership of companies. Transparency will be enhanced through central registries that will be accessible to competent authorities and financial intelligence institutions, including banks. Finally, the Council also provided measures to enforce sanctions.

Finally, on 20 May 2015, Vera Jourova, the European Union’s Commissioner for Justice, Consumers and Gender Equality, welcomed Parliament’s vote to finalize adoption of the Anti-Money Laundering Package (AML), to further cooperation among financial intelligence units across all member states of the European Union, and to establish policies concerning non-EU countries that have deficient anti-money laundering and counter-terrorist financing regimes.\textsuperscript{703} These adopted rules reflect the revised 2012 recommendation of the FATF. As part of this proposal, emphasis was put on prompt implementation of rules, and on ensuring that the new framework is effectively put into place.

Thus, the European Union has been given a score of +1 for its prompt and legally binding attempts to establish and implement an Action Plan that prevents the misuse of companies and other legal arrangements.

\textit{Analyst: Humayan Ahme}


11. Health: Muskoka Initiative on Maternal, Newborn and Child Health

[88] We remain committed to the Muskoka Initiative on maternal, newborn and child health.”

2014 Brussels Declaration

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

At the 2010 Muskoka Summit, the G8 members launched the initiative of funding for maternal, newborn, and child health (MNCH) in developing countries, congruent with two of the Millennium Development Goals and committed “USD 5 billion of additional funding for disbursement over the next five years.” In September 2010 a similar initiative “to accelerate progress on women’s and children’s health” received over USD 40 billion in pledges from developed and developing countries, along with the private sector, foundations, international organizations, civil society and research organizations which collectively launched the Global Strategy for Women’s and Children’s Health at the United Nations.

The 2013 Lough Erne Summit built on G8 global health commitments by affirming the urgency of new investments in global food and nutrition security, but did not make explicit MNCH commitments in its communiqué.

The 2014 G7 declaration includes a reaffirmation of the G7 commitment to maternal, newborn, and child health. By extension, the document commits G7 members to accelerate funding for new initiatives in this area.

Commitment Features

The Muskoka Initiative committed to “mobilizing $5 billion of additional funding starting in 2010 towards MNCH, in addition to $4.1 billion that G-8 members already contributed annually.”
funding commitments are intended to accelerate progress on Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 4 and 5 to reduce child and maternal mortality.\textsuperscript{708}

As a consequence, this commitment focuses on the mobilization and distribution of funding that each G8 member state has pledged to allocate to fulfill the Muskoka Initiative. Table E illustrates the unilateral financial commitment each G8 country has made and the intended period of disbursement. The last column indicates the funding that each member state should disburse in 2015 according to a 20 per cent per monitoring cycle expectation. This includes all G8 countries excluding the United States and the European Union, who have already fulfilled their commitments.

To this end, full compliance requires that G8 members with outstanding pledges concretely distribute 20 per cent or more of their total funding pledged for the Muskoka initiative. Initiatives so implemented must moreover address both elements of the commitment, namely: (1) maternal health, and (2) the health of newborns and children. This may include funding for MNCH priority areas such as basic nutrition, basic health care, STD and HIV/AIDS control, infectious disease prevention, and malaria control.\textsuperscript{709}

Funding can be distributed through bilateral, multilateral, or civil society channels, as long as it is explicitly directed at fulfilling the Muskoka Initiative and ultimately meeting MDGs 4 and 5.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G8 Member</th>
<th>Financial Commitment</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Funding that should be released in 2015 (minimum 20%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>CAD1.1 billion</td>
<td>2010–11 to 2014–15</td>
<td>CAD220 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>EUR500 million</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>EUR100 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>EUR400 million</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>EUR80 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>EUR 75 million</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>EUR15 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>JPY50 billion (approx. USD500 million)</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>USD100 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>GBP2.1 billion (approx. USD3.4 billion)</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>GBP420 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>USD 1.346 billion</td>
<td>Fiscal Year 2010–11</td>
<td>USD 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>USD70 million</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
<td>USD 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\begin{tabular}{|c|p{5cm}|}
\hline
\textbf{-1} & Member has distributed none or less than half of the funding promised and has not implemented initiatives to address all dimensions of the Muskoka Initiative. \\
\textbf{0} & Member has distributed over half the funding it has committed to this date and/or the initiatives being implemented only address one dimension of the Muskoka Initiative. \\
\textbf{+1} & Member has distributed all the funding they have committed to this date, AND has implemented initiatives that address both dimensions of the Muskoka initiative. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textit{Lead Analyst: Hayden Rodenkirchen}


Canada: +1
Canada has fully complied with its commitment to distribute funding for maternal, newborn and child health. Canada has also continued to implement initiatives that address both dimensions of Muskoka Initiative.

On 28 May 2014, Prime Minister Stephen Harper announced Canada’s financial commitment of CAD3.5 billion over 2015-2020 towards improving the health of mothers, newborns, and children at the global Saving Every Women, Every Child: Within Arm’s Reach summit in Toronto.\(^{710}\)

On 5 November 2014, Minister of International Development and for La Francophonie Christian Paradis announced an allocation of CAD370 million to the Partnership for Strengthening Maternal, Newborn, and Child Health, calling for new health project proposals that specifically aim to improve the lives of women, newborn, children.\(^{711}\)

On 30 November 2014, the Government of Canada announced its contribution of CAD150 million over the next five years towards the Micronutrient Initiative, which aims to support direct, evidence-based, and cost-effective nutrition intervention for women and children who have poor nutritional status. Of the announced financial commitment, CAD30 million (2014/15 and 2015/16) is a part of Canada’s CAD2.85 billion commitment made under the Muskoka Initiative (2010-2015).\(^{712}\)

On 25 February 2015, Prime Minister Harper announced Canada’s new funding support to the polio eradication initiatives made by World Health Organization, as well as the tetanus initiative made by UNICEF Canada and Kiwanis.\(^{713}\)

On 15 April 2015, Canada announced a CAD2.5 million investment in five health innovations in India through a partnership between Grand Challenges Canada and India’s Department of Biotechnology under the Ministry of Science and Technology.\(^{714}\)

During the compliance period Canada has taken actions to fulfill its commitment to the Muskoka Initiative. Thus, it has been awarded a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Freda Zhang}

France: 0
France has partially complied its commitment to distribute all funding they have committed to this date and have implemented initiatives that address the health of maternal, newborn, and children.

On 27 January 2015, Minister of Finance and Public Accounts Michel Sapin and Secretary of State for Development and Francophone Annick Girardin announced France's partnership with Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to fund EUR100 million of immunization and health programs in Africa’s Sahel region.715

During this compliance period France has fulfilled its commitment to distribute funding, but has failed to direct its initiatives towards both dimensions of the Muskoka Initiative. Thus, it has been awarded a score of 0.

Analyst: Freda Zhang

Germany: +1

Germany has made it clear they will continue to uphold its commitment to the Muskoka Initiative on Maternal, Newborn and Child Health made at the G8 summit in 2010.

On 5-6 November 2014, Berlin hosted the 12th International Dialogue on Population and Sustainable Development. The international conference brought together stakeholders from governments, NGOs, multilateral organizations and the private sector. The conference recommendations highlight the importance of keeping maternal and child health at the forefront of international focus. Special emphasis was placed on sexual education of girls to increase their knowledge prevention of unwanted pregnancy, HIV infections, and abuse.716

Germany has continued to disperse its committed funding of USD634 million to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria for 2014 - 2016 period.717 Germany has been the fourth largest donor of the Global Fund and continues to fund health programs in developing countries through bilateral projects in 27 countries throughout the world.718

On 27 January 2015, Development Minister Gerd Müller announced that Germany would provide a total of EUR500 million by 2020 to GAVI.719 GAVI is a vaccine alliance program whose goal is to mobilize USD7.5 billion to give an additional 300 million children in developing countries access to vaccinations. Müller explained that the program facilitates an exponentially lower price of vaccines in developing countries that will prevent infectious diseases.720

Germany’s commitment to continue contributions to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria and their most recent commitment to the GAVI vaccination initiative surpasses the

---

minimum 20% funding that should be released in 2015. Their focus on both maternal and child health is in full compliance, thus Germany receives a score of +1.

*Analyst: Amelia Cook*

**Italy: +1**

Italy has fully complied with its commitment to fund maternal, newborn, and child health programs under the terms of the Muskoka Initiative.

On 20 May 2015, Italy extended a three-year assistance loan through its international development agency of EUR21.5 million, in order to fund hospital improvements and health cooperation on matters of primary care in Bolivia.721

On 15 January 2015, Italy extended EUR16.1 million in aid to Ethiopia for basic health services improvement.722

On 27 January 2015, Italy pledged EUR100 million in direct funding to GAVI, the vaccine alliance, from 2016-2020. GAVI hopes to vaccinate approximately 300 million newborns with the combined European Union Commitment.723

In the 2014–15 fiscal year, Italy disbursed approximately EUR30 million to the Global Fund for the Fight against Aids, Tuberculosis, and Malaria, under the terms of its EUR100 million commitment to the fund over the years 2014-2016.724

This year, Italy has released more than the required EUR17.5 million towards maternal, newborn, and child health programs than its commitment under the Muskoka initiative requires. As such, Italy earns a full compliance score of +1.

*Analyst: Hayden Rodenkirkchen*

**Japan: 0**

Japan has partially complied with commitments under the Muskoka Initiative, by disbursing over half of the USD100 million in Maternal, Newborn, and Child Health funding committed for 2014–15. Japan has also implemented initiatives that address both dimensions of the Muskoka initiative: maternal health, and the health of newborns and children.

On 6 March 2015, Japan announced JPY1.013 billion in funding for the Republic of Rwanda to “improve water supply facilities in order to increase access to safe water in the Kayonza, Ngoma and Gatsibo districts of the Eastern Province.”725

---

On 19 March 2015, Japan announced JPY1.324 billion in funding for the “Project of the Small Towns Water Supply Development in Rift Valley Basin in Southern Nations, Nationalities and People’s Regional State.” The funding will support the construction of new water pipe supply facilities and the reparation of existing facilities, thereby improving access to clean water for residents.

On 30 March 2015, Japan announced up to JPY1.077 billion in funding for a project that “will provide facilities and medical equipment to Svy Rieng Provincial Referral Hospital to improve the quality of health care services in the province.” The initiative is intended to improve basic health care provisions, thereby improving children and maternal mortality rates in the province.

On 31 March 2015, Japan announced JPY2.362 billion in funding for four assistance initiatives in the Republic of the Union of Myanmar. The first initiative will support “The Program for Emergency Assistance to Children in Ethnic Minority Areas,” which “[provides] health care, education and protection services to women (pregnant/lactating) and children in displacement camps in Kachin, northern Shan and Rakhine States.” The second initiative will support “The Program for Emergency Assistance to Displaced Persons in Ethnic Minority Areas,” which provides shelters for internally displaced persons in displacement camps. The third initiative will support the “Program for Emergency Food Assistance in Ethnic Minority Areas,” which will provide food aid to internally displaced persons, thereby improving basic nutrition. Fourth, the funding will support “The Program for Emergency Assistance to Poor and Vulnerable Community in Ethnic Minority Areas and Yangon,” which provides infrastructure support, thereby improving access to clean water and preventing the spread of infectious diseases.

Thus, Japan has been awarded a score of 0 for partial compliance for distributing over half the USD 100 million in funding it has committed to this date and implementing initiatives that address both dimensions of the Muskoka initiative.

Analyst: James Flynn

United Kingdom: +1

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to fund maternal, newborn and child health initiatives under the Muskoka initiative.

On 11 September 2014, the United Kingdom’s Secretary of State for International Development announced a GBP30 million fund called “UK Aid Direct” specifically aimed at supporting development projects which focus on issues of newborn, maternal, and child health as enshrined in MDGs 4 and 5.

---


On 9 March 2015, the Government of the United Kingdom passed a bill legislating foreign aid disbursements of 0.7% of GDP each year. For Britain, this means approximately GBP11.4 billion will be disbursed each year, much of it towards maternal and child health initiatives.\footnote{UK Passes bill to honour pledge of 0.7% foreign aid target, the Guardian (London). 9 March 2015. Date of Access: 4 May 2015. http://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2015/mar/09/uk-passes-bill-law-aid-target-percentage-income}


The United Kingdom has disbursed funding towards maternal, newborn, and child health initiatives in line with its commitments under the Muskoka initiative. It is therefore awarded a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Hayden Rodenkirkchen}

**United States: +1**

The United States fulfilled its funding commitment to the Muskoka Initiative in 2011. Nonetheless, the United States continues to support Maternal, Newborn, and Child Health initiatives. It is therefore awarded a score of +1.

On 25 September 2014 Secretary of State John Kerry reaffirmed the United States commitment to combat AIDS globally. During his address at the UNAIDS symposium, he highlighted the importance of focusing on the impact of HIV/AIDS on children, young women, and vulnerable populations. Further, he announced a new partnership between PEPFAR (President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS relief) and the Children’s Investment Fund Foundation. Part of this partnership included the U.S. committing USD500 million in the coming year to PEPFAR.\footnote{Address by Secretary of State John Kerry at UN Headquarters. U.S. Department of State (Washington). 25 September 2014. Date Accessed: 27 April 2015. http://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2014/09/232164.htm}

On 2 April 2015, USAID announced new research that demonstrated simple vaccine treatments could help save lives of babies who are not born in hospitals. Mariam Claeson, Director of Maternal Newborn Child Health at the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation stated, “A simplified antibiotic regimen means more women in poor countries can access the critical treatment their newborns need to survive. We now have the opportunity to expand this effective, lifesaving treatment and save more newborns than ever before.” The research was funded in part by USAID and demonstrates their commitment to improving newborn health.\footnote{USAID Press Releases, USAID (Washington). 2 April 2015. Date Accessed: 27 April 2015. http://www.usaid.gov/news-information/press-releases/apr-1-2015-research-shows-simple-treatments-can-help-save-lives-babies-who-lack}
The United States’ commitments to funding for maternal and child health through USAID projects and other non-governmental organizations is in full compliance with their commitments made at the most recent G7 summit, thus the United States receives a +1.

Analyst: Amelia Cook

European Union: +1

The European Union has fully complied with its USD70 million 2014-15 financial pledge to the Muskoka initiative. The EU has also implemented initiatives that address both dimensions of the Muskoka initiative: maternal health, and the health of newborns and children.

In 2013, the EU fulfilled its USD70 million pledge to the Muskoka Initiative.

On 23 September 2014, the EU announced EUR50 million in humanitarian aid and EUR165 million for longer-term development initiatives in Syria and surrounding countries. The money will support medical emergency responses, sanitation and hygiene and protection, immunization campaigns against polio and measles, and other health needs.735

On 1 October 2014, the EU announced EUR40 million in financial assistance to help the Democratic Republic of Congo in “decreasing mother-to-child HIV/AIDS transmission, preventing gender-based violence, reducing child mortality and improving maternal health.”736

On 27 October 2014, the EU announced that it had thus far contributed over EUR800 million in financial support to combat the Ebola virus outbreak in West Africa. This support included contributions for humanitarian aid, support for Ebola research, and development assistance — including money to strengthen basic healthcare systems — for countries affected by the virus.737

Thus, the EU has been awarded a score of +1 for fully complying with its USD70 million financial pledge to the Muskoka initiative and implementing initiatives that address both dimensions of the Muskoka initiative.

Analyst: James Flynn

---

12. Health: Sexual and Reproductive Health and Reproductive Rights [89]

“In addition we are committed to ensuring sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights”

Brussels G7 Summit Declaration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

During the late 1990s and early 2000s, the efforts of the G8 regarding health were largely focused on the prevention and treatment of infectious diseases and supporting the improvement of national health systems. While undertakings like the fight against HIV/AIDS contributed towards sexual health, the protection of reproductive health and rights was not a stated goal of the summits.

Between 2005 and 2007, however, the fifth Millennium Development Goal (MDG) regarding the improvement of maternal health was enlarged to include the aim of achieving “universal access to reproductive health,” in addition to the reduction of the maternal mortality ratio.

At the 2007 Heiligendamm Summit, the G8 also expanded its health focus and took steps to address reproductive health care and rights in the context of attaining the MDGs. In addition to committing to “scale up efforts to reduce the gaps, in the area of maternal and child health care and voluntary family planning,” the G8 also agreed to encourage programs meant to inform girls about reproductive health.

But while the L’Aquila G8 Health Experts’ Report acknowledged achievements in the area of combatting infectious diseases, it argued that there was a need to “make more rapid progress towards the achievement of the MDGs concerned with maternal health” because, “the health-related MDGs are mutually linked and interdependent.” At this time, they agreed to take steps to promote

---

maternal health “including through sexual and reproductive health care and services and voluntary family planning.”

Nevertheless, in 2010 the United Nations Secretary General released a report stating that MDG five was in danger of not being met. At least partially in response to this, the G8 launched the Muskoka Initiative in 2010. Aimed at reducing both maternal and child mortality, the program’s goals include the provision of “sexual and reproductive health care and services, including voluntary family planning.”

The G8 reiterated its support for the Muskoka Initiative at both the Deauville Summit and at the Camp David Summit. The G8 also produced accountability reports tracking the implementation of this program in 2011, 2012, and 2013.

**Commitment Features**

Full compliance with this commitment requires that countries take steps to both protect reproductive rights and to provide services and/or information that promote sexual and reproductive health.

While the commitment does not define the aforementioned terms, the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development’s (ICPD) Programme of Action can provide guidance on this matter. Each state in the G7 participated in the ICPD, and adopted the final document. Furthermore, the European Commission stated in 2002 that, “All Member States of the Union endorsed the Programme of Action.”

In this document, reproductive rights are defined as: (1) “the basic right of all couples and individuals to decide freely and responsibly the number, spacing and timing of their children and to have the information and means to do so,” and; (2) “the right to attain the highest standard of sexual and reproductive health.”

The report then went on to define reproductive health in the following manner:

> Reproductive health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity, in all matters relating to the reproductive system and to its functions and processes. Reproductive health therefore implies that

---


people are able to have a satisfying and safe sex life and that they have the capability to reproduce and the freedom to decide if, when and how often to do so.\textsuperscript{750}

It also classifies having access to both family planning services and reproductive health care facilities as requirements for the maintenance of reproductive health.\textsuperscript{751}

Since this interpretation of reproductive health includes part one of the definition of reproductive rights, fulfillment of this commitment can be condensed to taking concrete steps to ensure reproductive and sexual health.

The ICPD defines sexual health as “the enhancement of life and personal relations, and not merely counselling and care related to reproduction and sexually transmitted diseases.”\textsuperscript{752} The World Health Organization (WHO) provides greater detail by noting that “sexual health is a state of physical, mental and social well-being in relation to sexuality. It requires a positive and respectful approach to sexuality and sexual relationships, as well as the possibility of having pleasurable and safe sexual experiences, free of coercion, discrimination, and violence.”\textsuperscript{753} This definition is important because it focuses on the link between sexual violence and a reduction in sexual health. Thus, efforts to prevent and combat sexual violence can be viewed as an effort to ensure sexual health.

### Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member has not taken concrete actions to ensure sexual health AND reproductive health and rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member has taken concrete action to ensure either sexual health OR reproductive health and reproductive rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member has taken concrete action to ensure both sexual health AND reproductive health and rights.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lead Analyst: Sarah Beard*

**Canada: +1**

Canada has taken concrete action to ensure sexual health and reproductive rights.

On 12 June 2014, John Baird, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, participated in the Global Summit to End Sexual Violence in Conflict.\textsuperscript{754} This conference was hosted by the United Kingdom (UK) and brought together representatives from governments, non-governmental organizations, amongst others, to discuss this issue.\textsuperscript{755} In particular, the Summit focused on both the need to ensure that


sexual violence does not go unpunished in times of war, and the need to support victims of sexual violence.756 Following the conference, Baird declared, “We all agree that commitments must be turned into action to end sexual violence in conflict. It is time to act.”757

Thus, on 6 October 2014, Baird announced a contribution of CAD5 million to aid the victims of sexual violence in Iraq. He noted that Canada would also provide the funding needed for the UN Human Rights Council in Iraq to employ an expert on sexual violence.758 Moreover, Baird declared that Canada would donate another CAD5 million “to partners, including Justice Rapid Response, a Canadian-created initiative, to investigate and prosecute crimes of sexual violence in ISIL-held territory.”759 In his speech, Baird further committed Canada to keeping the issue of sexual violence at the top of the agendas at the UN and G7 conferences.760

Given that the World Health Organization’s definition of sexual health requires that individuals not be faced with sexual violence, the aforementioned initiatives illustrate Canada’s commitment to ensuring sexual health internationally.

Canada is also a strong supporter of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria. On 2 December 2013, Canada declared that it would donate CAD650 million to the Global Fund between 2014 and 2016.761 However, since this pledge was made prior to the compliance period, this contribution cannot be counted towards the scoring in this report.

However, Canada has also taken steps to combat HIV/AIDS nationally. On 1 December 2014, the Canadian Institute of Health Research (CIHR), in partnership with the Canadian Foundation for AIDS Research (CANFAR), and the Ontario HIV Treatment Network (OHTN), announced three new research projects that have the objectives of investigating issues specific to men and boys with HIV/AIDS, and finding better treatments for the disease.762

Canada has also taken steps to ensure reproductive health and to protect reproductive rights.

In September 2014, the Government of Canada, along with Norway, the United States, and the World Bank, announced the creation of The Global Financing Facility in Support of Every Woman Every Child (GFF).763 This new funding mechanism is meant to increase support for reproductive,

maternal, newborn child, and adolescent health (RMNCAH) between 2015 and 2030. According to an executive summary about the program, “the GFF has a particular focus on issues (e.g. family planning...) and target populations (e.g., adolescents) that have historically been under-funded.”

Canada announced that it would contribute US$200 million to the GFF.

On 25 February 2015, Prime Minister Stephen Harper, in partnership with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, announced support for initiatives to end the preventable deaths of mothers, newborns, and children under the age of 5. In line with this goal, Stephen Harper announced a CAD20 million initiative to aid the WHO eradicate polio internationally. He also announced a CAD2.5 million plan to eliminate Maternal and Neonatal Tetanus. Finally, he announced a CAD20 million initiative to support research teams in sub-Saharan African countries resolve healthcare needs of mothers, newborns, and children.

On 10 April 2015, Nova Scotia, a province of Canada, announced that it would begin providing free vaccinations to all boys to combat the human papillomavirus (HPV). Their decision follows similar ones in Alberta and Prince Edward Island in 2013. While all Canadian provinces already vaccinate girls to protect them against cervical cancer, this step aims to prevent boys from developing other types of cancers of the reproductive system.

These efforts followed Canada’s announcement of the renewal of support for maternal, newborn, and child health in order to continue the work of the 2010 Muskoka Initiative in May 2014. While hosting the Saving Every Woman, Every Child Summit, Canada committed CAD3.5 billion to this goal for the 2015-2020 period.\(^774\) However, since this pledge was made prior to the compliance period, only the aforementioned efforts can count towards the maintenance of reproductive health and rights.

As of December 2014, only four per cent of Canada’s assistance went to sexual and reproductive health programming.\(^775\) This is less than the ten per cent target set by donor countries.\(^776\) Moreover, Canada does not offer universal coverage for birth control, unlike Britain, and other states within the European Union.\(^777\)

In conclusion, Canada receives a score of +1 for its contributions to ensure sexual health and reproductive health and rights. It has taken steps to ensure sexual health by combating sexual violence and HIV/AIDS. It has also moved to protect reproductive health and rights by supporting maternal health and expanding its efforts to protect against cancers of the reproductive system.

\textit{Analyst: Julia Martshenko}

\textbf{France: +1}

France has fully complied with its commitment to improve sexual health, as well as reproductive health and rights.

In June 2014, during the G7 Summit in Brussels, France issued a communiqué underlining its commitment towards sexual and reproductive health and rights. In the communiqué, the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Development stated that it welcomed the call for accelerating progress on this issue, made at the Saving Every Woman, Every Child Summit in Toronto, Canada.\(^778\) The Ministry of Foreign Affairs also reaffirmed its commitment to improving the health of women and children by promoting universal access to affordable, and high-quality health services that are necessary for general, sexual, and reproductive health.\(^779\) This includes strengthening health, education, and child protection systems, in addition to improving access to immunization through the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization (GAVI) efforts.\(^780\)

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\end{flushright}
Since that time, France has taken steps to protect sexual health. The World Health Organization (WHO) notes that sexual violence adversely affects an individuals’ sexual health.\textsuperscript{781} Thus, actions to prevent sexual violence can be viewed as actions to ensure sexual health.

On 13 June 2014, the French Minister of State for Development and the Francophonie, Annick Girardin, attended the Global Summit to End Sexual Violence in Conflict.\textsuperscript{782} The Global Summit was hosted by the United Kingdom with the objectives of increasing efforts to prevent sexual violence, and to respond to sexual violence with greater support for victims and greater accountability for perpetrators.\textsuperscript{783}

On 8 October 2014, France presented a decision concerning the issue of school-related gender-based violence (SRGBV) to the Executive Board of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).\textsuperscript{784} The summary of the Learning Without Fear initiative notes that “The draft decision invites UNESCO and its Member States to reaffirm their mobilization against SRGBV and all forms of violence in schools; to design and implement national policies and action plans; to promote, drawing on target 4.a of the final report of the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals, the creation of safe, non-violent, inclusive and effective learning environments for all boys and girls.”\textsuperscript{785} According to UNESCO and the United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative, SRGBV includes instances of sexual violence and harassment.\textsuperscript{786} On 16 April 2015, France, along with fifty-eight other states, adopted the text.\textsuperscript{787}

France has also pledged to contribute to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria between 2014 and 2016.\textsuperscript{788} On 15 July 2013, President François Hollande announced that France would donate EUR1.08 billion over this time period.\textsuperscript{789} However, since this pledge was made prior to the compliance period, it cannot be counted towards the scoring of this report.

France has also supported initiatives to ensure reproductive health and rights.


France is one of the top 25 member state financial contributors to UN Women. This is an entity created by the United Nations (UN) that aims to empower women and eliminate issues acutely affecting women, including sexual and reproductive health and rights. In 2014 overall, France donated over USD0.54 million in core donations, and USD2.14 million in non-core donations. This was a significant increase from the country’s donations in 2013.

In July 2014, the Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations, along with the Partnership for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health, hosted an event about why a sexual and reproductive health and rights target matters in the health goal. The event was created to bring about a discussion to include sexual and reproductive health in the post-2015 development agenda. During this event, the Counsellor to the Permanent Mission of France, Fabienne Bartoli, emphasised France’s commitment to making quality sexual and reproductive information, education, and services universally accessible.

Between 18 December 2014 and 19 December 2014, France also hosted the annual meeting of the Ouagadougou Partnership. The Ouagadougou Partnership was created in 2011 with the goal of providing one million women in West Africa with access to modern contraceptives by 2015.

At the Summit on Family Planning in 2012, France pledged to contribute EUR100 million to the Ouagadougou Partnership between 2011 and 2015. One of the main objectives of the conference was to take stock of progress. However, the Ouagadougou Partnership meeting also focused on

---

the creation of new goals. France noted that it “would like universal access to contraception and, more broadly, sexual and reproductive healthcare to be a priority in the post-2015 agenda.”

France has also called upon other member states at the UN to commit to the principles of the International Conference on Population and Development of Cairo and the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing. This included speeches made at special General Assembly sessions, and taking an active role in activities by the Commission on the Status of Women, an entity under the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).

Thus, France is awarded a score of +1 for being actively involved in initiatives surrounding advancing sexual and reproductive health and rights. It has taken steps to ensure sexual health by addressing the issue of sexual violence in conflict and in schools. It has also supported reproductive health and rights by hosting events calling for these topics to be included in the post-2015 framework, and by continuing its support for the Ouagadougou Partnership.

Analyst: Elizabeth Tudor-Beziés

Germany: +1

Germany has taken concrete action to ensure sexual health, along with reproductive health and rights.

On 31 July 2014, the German parliament announced its decision to increase Germany’s contribution to The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria from EUR200 million to EUR245 million for the 2014 period.

On 22 September 2014, German Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development Gerd Müller attended the Follow-Up to the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) at the United Nations (UN). While there, he declared, “Germany

supports the Cairo Programme of Action." This renewed the state’s support of a project that has the objective of providing “access to sexual and reproductive health, including family planning.”

Germany also hosted a side-event at the conference entitled “Education Matters: Empowering Young People to Make Healthier Choices.” Here, Minister Müller announced that Germany would make a contribution of EUR3 million to the Eastern and Southern Africa (ESA) Initiative. In 2013, twenty states in the ESA region committed to providing the youth of their states with greater access to sexuality education and sexual and reproductive health services, amongst other things. The Deputy Permanent Representative of Germany to the UN, Heiko Thoms, recognized that “Comprehensive sexuality education is essential to enable young people to protect themselves from unwanted pregnancy, HIV, and sexually transmitted infections.”

On 15 April 2015, the Deputy Permanent Representative of Germany to the UN, Heiko Thoms, made a statement at the 48th session of the Commission on Population and Development. At this time, he announced that Germany had decided to take steps to extend its Initiative on Rights-Based Family Planning and Maternal Health. This program was created in 2011 for the purposes of providing women with information and access to family planning and maternal health services. Ambassador Thoms noted that maintaining this program illustrates that Germany is “committed to
ensuring that more women can exercise their human right to decide when, with whom and how many children they wish to have.\footnote{815}

Germany has also taken steps to ensure that women’s reproductive rights are upheld within the country. On 6 March 2015, the German Bundesrat approved legislation that allows women over the age of 14 to buy emergency contraceptives without the need for a prescription.\footnote{816}

The German government has also hosted several conferences and made numerous statements in regards to the need to keep sexual and reproductive health and rights high on the global agenda following the conclusion of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in 2015.

In November 2014, Germany held the 12th International Dialogue on Population and Sustainable Development.\footnote{817} The theme of this year’s conference was the “ICPD and Beyond: Investing in Health and Rights,” and it resulted in the Berlin Call to Action. This document outlines the need for the post-2015 framework to include sexual and reproductive health and rights. In particular, the participants noted the need for a focus on attaining universal access to sexual and reproductive health services, providing youth with comprehensive sexuality education, and preventing gender-based violence.\footnote{818}

In a speech on 13 April 2015 at the 48th session of the Commission on Population and Development, the Deputy Permanent Representative of Germany to the UN, Heiko Thoms, advocated for sexual and reproductive health and rights to be adequately reflected in the post-2015 Development Agenda.\footnote{819} He also called for “comprehensive sexuality education as well as linking of HIV/AIDS and sexual and reproductive health strategies. Women and girls, like men and boys, must have full and affordable access to sexual and reproductive health information, services and supplies, information and education and be able to freely and responsibly decide on matters related to their sexuality.”\footnote{820}

Furthermore, on 16 April 2015, the Government of Germany hosted the 2015 International G7/G20 Parliamentarians conference in preparation for the 2015 G7 Summit. Entitled, “She Matters, Empowering Women and Girls to Lead Self-Determined, Healthy and Productive Lives,” the conference had the objective of getting parliamentarians “to advocate for increased G7 commitment

to international development cooperation and global health, namely in the area of sexual and reproductive health and rights.” During the meeting, the Director of World Health Organization Department of Reproductive Health and Research, Marleen Temmerman, called “for parliamentarians to play an active role in the process of development of the renewed Global Strategy for Women’s, Children’s and Adolescents’ Health.” Parliamentarians responded by calling for the 2015 G7 Summit to take these topics into account.

In conclusion, Germany receives a score of +1 for its actions to secure sexual health and reproductive health and rights during the compliance period. Germany has taken steps to ensure sexual health through its support for programs like the ESA Initiative, and Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria. It has also aided the achievement of reproductive health and rights by extending its Initiative on Rights-Based Family Planning and Maternal Health, and by altering its national legislation surrounding contraceptives. Finally, Germany has organized events and made statements emphasizing the importance of keeping sexual and reproductive health and rights on the global agenda.

Analyst: Julia Martshenko

Italy: +1

Italy has made a concerted effort to improve sexual and reproductive health and rights.

On 19 September 2014, Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Italian Chamber of Deputies, and the Council of Europe co-hosted the event “Safe from Fear, Safe from Violence,” both to applaud the entry into force of the Istanbul Convention, and to call on other states to sign the treaty. This Istanbul Convention commits states to taking steps to prevent and respond to all forms of violence against women, including sexual violence. While many articles of the convention are not specific to sexual violence, article 36 notes that states must enact legislation to outlaw sexual violence if they have not already done so. Moreover, article 25 notes that “Parties shall take the necessary legislative or other measures to provide for the setting up of appropriate, easily accessible rape crisis or sexual violence referral centres for victims in sufficient numbers to provide for medical and forensic examination, trauma support and counseling for victims.” During the conference, Italy, along with other parties to the treaty, issued a joint declaration. They noted that they: (1) “Welcome

the entry into force of the Istanbul Convention, the first legally binding treaty in Europe to offer a comprehensive framework to end violence against women and domestic violence; (2) commit to the implementation of the treaty; (3) “Urge other Council of Europe member states, non-members states, as well as the European Union, to become Parties to the Convention.”

The World Health Organization (WHO) notes that sexual health cannot exist where there is sexual violence. By taking action to support the Istanbul Convention, Italy has illustrated a commitment to ensuring sexual health. Italy has also taken steps to ensure sexual health by combating HIV/AIDS.

Between 1 July 2014 and 31 December 2014, Italy held the Presidency of the Council of the European Union (EU). When laying out its goals for the presidency, Italy noted that it would “invite its European partners to consider the outcomes and perspective of the fight against HIV/AIDS.” Accordingly, Italy chaired a ministerial conference on “The Fight to End HIV/AIDS: Ten Years After the Dublin Conference” during 27 November 2014 and 28 November 2014.

On 4 December 2013, Italy pledged EUR100 million to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria for the 2014-2016 period. However, this contribution cannot be counted towards the scoring of the report because it was pledged prior to the beginning of the commitment period.

Italy has also taken steps to ensure reproductive health and rights.

At the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization (GAVI) Pledging Conference in January 2015, Italy pledged an additional USD120 million for the 2016 to 2020 period. This brought the Italy’s total contribution for these years up to USD437 million. While GAVI supports many different types of vaccines, it has been providing the Human Papillomavirus (HPV) vaccine since 2013. The HPV vaccine helps strengthen reproductive health by preventing women from losing their fertility as a result of cervical cancer.

Between 2 October 2014 and 3 October 2014, the Italian Presidency of the Council of the European Union held a conference on women’s health that sought “to discuss … sexual health (sexually...

---

transmitted disease, endometriosis), reproductive health (preconceptional health, pregnancy, delivery and puerperium), female cancers (screening and health promotion, prevention of infertility). 837

Italy has also made a statement in support of the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD), which “recognized the centrality of sexual and reproductive health and rights to health and development.” 838 On 22 September 2014, Italy participated in the special follow-up session to the Programme of Action of the ICPD. Director General for Development Cooperation at the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation Giampaolo Cantini made a speech at the conference. 839 While mainly focused on population development challenges, Cantini noted Italy’s support for the ICPD Beyond 2014 Global Review. 840 He also declared, “Italy reaffirms the relevance of the principles of the 1994 Cairo Conference for the Development Agenda and its support for an acceleration of the implementation of the ICPD Programme of Action beyond 2014.” In particular, Cantini emphasized the need for mothers and youth to remain on the international agenda. 841

Thus, Italy receives a +1 for its support for sexual and reproductive health and rights. It has taken action to ensure sexual health by combating sexual violence and HIV/AIDS. It has helped ensure reproductive health and rights by supporting GAVI and hosting a conference on reproductive health.

Analyst: Kate Motluk

Japan: +1

Japan has fully complied with the commitment to ensure sexual and reproductive health, and to protect reproductive rights.

Between 10 June 2014 and 13 June 2014, representatives from the Government of Japan attended the Global Summit to End Sexual Violence in Conflict. 842 During the ministerial working day of the Summit, Senior Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs Nobuo Kishi, addressed the conference and

---


informed delegates about actions that the state had been taking to respond to sexual violence. Kishi noted that Japan was focusing on strengthening the judicial systems of states involved in conflict. He also made note of Japan’s recent contribution to the Trust Fund for Victims at the International Criminal Court (ICC). On 8 May 2014, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe announced that Japan would make a donation of EUR600,000 to this program. He also stated that EUR400,000 of this would be targeted at victims of sexual and gender-based violence. While this pledge cannot be counted towards Japan’s compliance because it was made just prior to the beginning of the compliance period, Japan’s participation in the summit illustrates that is committed to ensuring the sexual health of individuals living in conflict zones by responding to the problem of sexual violence.

On 10 April 2015, Japan contributed USD848,000 to implement a project to respond to gender-based and sexual violence against women in Palestine. Japan focused its aid in this area because incidents of sexual and gender-based violence tend to increase in areas that experience conflict. The project will therefore provide victims of gender-based violence with “legal aid, psychosocial services, and supporting shelters.” This program provides another illustration of Japan’s actions to maintain sexual health in conflict zones.

On 3 December 2013, Japan pledged USD800 million to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria for the 2014-2016 period. While this contribution cannot be counted towards the scoring of this report because the pledge was made prior to the beginning of the compliance period, it is important to note that Japan maintains a strong commitment to combatting HIV/AIDS.

Japan has also taken steps to protect reproductive rights and health.

---

On 1 April 2015, the Government of Japan contributed USD756,000 to support the United Nations Population Fund’s (UNFPA) efforts to provide women and children in Palestine with access to reproductive healthcare.\(^{852}\) In particular, the UNFPA will use the money to “ensure access to family planning, safe births, antenatal and post-natal care for pregnant women and women in the reproductive age.”\(^{853}\)

Moreover, Japan pledged USD3.22 million to the UNFPA to allow it to commence a project to provide women and children in South Sudan with access to reproductive healthcare and protection from gender-based violence.\(^{854}\) The ambassador of Japan to South Sudan, Takeshi Akamatsu, noted, “There are many unfortunate cases in which pregnant women do not have access to proper health treatment facilities and follow-up care following referral to tertiary health facilities. This is due to limited supply of equipment as well as lack of knowledge and skills of health workers.”\(^{855}\) This project will respond to these problems by providing training and equipment to health workers in the area.\(^{856}\)

On 20 July 2014, the Government of Japan co-hosted a meeting with the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) on the post-2015 framework for the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).\(^{857}\) Japan supports IPPF’s belief that universal health coverage (UHC) ought to include access to sexual and reproductive health, and has therefore been lobbying for UHC to be a central part of the post-2015 framework.\(^{858}\) Consul-General of Japan in Melbourne, Keiko Haneda, participated in the meeting and declared “We should accelerate our efforts towards UHC to attain SRHR (sexual and reproductive health and rights) through addressing health inequity, creating sustainable health systems, ensuring financial risk protection and realizing human security.”\(^{859}\)

Japan again lobbied for UHC at the 29th Special Session of the United Nations (UN) General Assembly.\(^{860}\) The Deputy Permanent Representatives of Japan to the United Nations, Hiroshi

---


Minami, recognized that “The tasks of ensuring maternal and child health … [and] providing sexual and reproductive health services … lay upon our shoulders.”

Thus, Japan has been awarded a score of +1 for its full compliance with the commitment. It has ensured sexual health by taking steps to prevent sexual violence. It has also ensured reproductive health and rights by contributing to reproductive healthcare and family planning programs in Palestine and South Sudan.

Analysts: Tannishta Pramanick and Sarah Beard

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully committed to the G7 initiative of improving sexual and reproductive health and rights.

On 13 June 2014, the UK hosted the Global Summit to End Sexual Violence in Conflict. The event was held in London. It involved “government representatives from over 120 countries, over 1000 experts, faith leaders, youth organisations, and representatives of civil society and international organisations.” The UK, along with other governments, committed to tackling the problem of sexual violence in conflict, and to transforming world attitudes towards this issue.

The Summit also launched the International Protocol on the Documentation and Investigation of Sexual Violence in Conflict, which established standards on how to collect the strongest possible information and evidence in order to convict past perpetrators, while still protecting and better supporting the victims. By hosting this event, the UK illustrated a commitment to protecting sexual health, which the World Health Organization (WHO) defines as “a state of physical, mental and social well-being in relation to sexuality.” In order for this state to exist, the WHO notes that individuals must not face sexual violence.

In addition, William Hague, the foreign secretary at the time, issued a statement to the British Parliament on 14 July 2014 that outlined the UK’s action plan to advocate for the Preventing Sexual Violence in Conflict Initiative (PSVI). First, he noted that the UK would seek to implement globally the International Protocol on the Documentation and Investigation of Sexual Violence in

---


Conflict. He also stated that the UK would train national authorities around the world in order to improve investigations and mount successful prosecutions. Moreover, he committed the UK to ensuring that international multilateral institutions adopt measures to address sexual violence in conflict.

While each of the aforementioned initiatives illustrate the UK’s commitment to ensuring sexual health, it is also important to note that the UK committed USD1.6 billion to The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria for the 2014-2016 period. While this pledge was made prior to the compliance period, and therefore cannot count towards the scoring, this contribution does amount to USD533 million per year in 2014 and 2015.

The UK has also taken steps to ensure reproductive rights and health.

On 6 March 2015, Justine Greening, the secretary of state for international development, announced that the UK had decided to invest GBP8 million in a project entitled AmplifyChange. This fund is meant to provide grants to aid grassroots activists who are focusing on sexual and reproductive health and rights. The themes of the organization include “access to comprehensive reproductive health services for socially and economically marginalized and vulnerable” and “addressing the causes of unsafe abortion including decriminalisation of abortion and supporting women’s rights to safe and legal abortion.”

Furthermore, the UK is a supporter of United Nations (UN) Women. In 2014, it contributed USD20.74 million to the organization.

Moreover, the Government of the UK has been funding the Sahil Girls’ club in Somalia to help young women learn about sexual reproductive health, gender-based violence, the risks of early

marriage, and the major issue of Female Genital Mutilation (FGM).877 This club has educated young women on these topics, and provided a safe space in which young Somali women feel comfortable speaking about such issues.878 However, it is not clear when funding for this program began, and therefore it cannot be counted towards the scoring of the report.

The UK has also participated in conferences regarding the issue of reproductive health and rights.

On 22 September 2014, the UK participated in a special assembly at the United Nations on International Conference on Population and Development’s (ICPD) future.879 Entitled ICPD Beyond 2014, the meeting reviewed global progress on the implementation of the Cairo Consensus, which “was remarkable in its recognition that reproductive health and rights…are cornerstones of population and development programmes.”880 The Director-General for Policy and Programmes in the Department for International Development, Nick Dyer, made a statement at the conference.881 He noted that issues still remain, and that “Many millions of women and girls are still unable to decide whether or not they have children and how many they have, and are denied the experience of safe and healthy pregnancy and childbirth.”882 He also announced that “the UK fully supports an approach for post-2015 which recognises that universal access to sexual and reproductive health and rights are essential…..”883

In April 2015, Ambassador Martin Shearman of the UK Mission to the United Nations delivered a speech at the Commission on Population and Development 48th session concerning the role of women in society. Ambassador Shearman stated that promoting, investing in, and protecting the reproductive health and rights of girls and women is fundamental to their empowerment.884 He also mentioned the strong link between sexual and reproductive health and

rights and the economy, stating that universal access to these health and rights will create economic benefits.885

Thus, the United Kingdom is awarded with +1 for its efforts in improving sexual and reproductive health and rights. The UK has ensured sexual health through its strong efforts to prevent and respond to sexual violence. It has also ensured reproductive health and rights through its contributions to AmplifyChange, and through its statements of support.

Analyst: Elizabeth Tudor-Beziés

United States: +1

The United States is in full compliance to the commitment of ensuring reproductive rights and reproductive and sexual health.

Between 10 and 13 June 2014, US Ambassador-at-Large for Global Women’s Issues, Catherine M. Russell, attended the Global Summit to End Sexual Violence in Conflict.886 US Secretary of State John Kerry joined her on 13 June 2014 to conclude the conference.887 At this time, he declared that the US would be undertaking new initiatives to prevent and respond to sexual violence. Kerry announced that the US would be “launching an accountability initiative to help survivors secure justice — to build the capacity of partner governments to prosecute the sexual violence crimes in countries that are ravaged by war and violence and insecurity.”888

On 22 September 2014, Secretary of State John Kerry stated that the US would contribute USD12 million to the Safe from the Start initiative. This program was created in reaction to the 2013 Call to Action on Protecting Girls and Women in Emergencies, which focuses on the issue of gender-based violence (GBV) in emergencies.889 When the project was launched in 2013, Shelly Pitterman, the United Nations Refugee Agency’s (UNHCR) regional representative in the US, noted that the Safe from the Start Initiative would allow the UNHCR “to add expert staff in emergency operations, create innovative programs to help prevent and respond more effectively to sexual violence, and refocus attention on the prevalence of sexual violence against forcibly displaced women and girls.”889 Since the World Health Organization (WHO) states that sexual violence undermines sexual health, the aforementioned actions illustrate that the US has taken strong steps to address the problem of sexual violence, and protect sexual health.


Moreover, on 31 July 2014, the US pledged a further USD30 million to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria. The US donated this amount in response to an additional commitment by the Government of Germany because it had “devised its pledge in a way that partially matches addition contributions by other donors.”

The US has also taken action to protect reproductive rights and health. On 11 May 2015, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and the Treasury jointly released a fact sheet warning insurance companies that women must have access to at least one of each of the eighteen distinct types of contraception as recognized by the Food and Drug Administration. This statement came in reaction to reports from the National Women’s Law Center and the Kaiser Family Foundation, which noted that insurance companies had often failed to provide women with a means of accessing free birth control despite the fact that this is required under the Affordable Care Act. The covered methods of contraception must be available to women with no insurer enforced cost-sharing measures beyond the original costs of the health insurance plans. Vice-President of the National Women’s Law Center, Gretchen Borchelt, noted that this statement “underscored that it [the government] will not tolerate these violations … It is now absolutely clear that … all unique birth control methods for women must be covered.”

Thus, the United States has been awarded a score of +1 for its efforts to ensure reproductive and sexual health and reproductive rights. It has taken steps to prevent and respond to sexual violence through a number of initiatives, while also ensuring that American women are able to decide if, and when, to reproduce, by ensuring access to free contraceptives.

Analyst: Tannishtha Pramanick

European Union: +1

The European Union has fully complied with the commitment to ensure sexual and reproductive health, and to protect reproductive rights.

The EU has taken actions to ensure sexual health by combating sexual violence.

---


On 12 June 2014, Catherine Ashton, the high representative of the EU for foreign affairs and security policy at the time, attended the Global Summit to End Sexual Violence in Conflict. On 26 June 2014, the EU signed an agreement with the DRC to provide EUR620 million in aid.

On 15 April 2015, Thomas Mayr-Harting, the head of the delegation of the EU to the United States, attended the United Nations Security Council Open Debate on Women, Peace and Security: Sexual Violence in Conflict. In a speech to the participants, Mayr-Harting announced that the EU had adopted a “Guide to Practical Actions at EU Level for Ending Sexual Violence in Conflict” in late 2014. He noted that this guide “includes thirty-six concrete initiatives ranging from human rights to conflict prevention and humanitarian aid.” Moreover, Mayr-Harting also publicized the EU’s decision to provide support to victims of sexual violence in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) through a new initiative commencing in 2015.

On 26 June 2014, the EU signed an agreement with the DRC to provide EUR620 million in aid.

Marta Latek, a member of the European parliamentary research service, noted, “health system

---

support (EUR150 million) and strengthening the rule of law (EUR160 million)…are of key importance in the fight against sexual violence and its consequences.905

The European Parliament (EP) awarded the Sakharov Prize for Freedom of Thought to Dr. Denis Mukwege on 22 October 2014.906 Mukwege founded the Panzi hospital in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and has dedicated himself to protecting victims of sexual violence.907 The EP noted that “The Panzi hospital offers psychological and physical care and the women are then helped to develop new skills to live and the girls to go back to school. Legal aid is also offered to take their assailants to court.”908 The Sakharov Prize includes a financial donation of EUR50,000 to the prizewinner.909

In reply to the EU’s annual report on human rights and democracy 2013, the EP adopted a resolution that includes a call for further action by the EU on the issues of sexual violence against women and reproductive rights. The EP condemned sexual violence and requested that the EU and all parties to the Council of Europe sign and ratify the Istanbul Convention.910 This treaty, which came into force on 1 August 2014, centres on preventing and responding to violence against women.911 Several clauses focus specifically on sexual violence. They include article 25, which calls for parties to provide support to victims of sexual violence through the creation of sexual violence referral centers.912 Article 36 requires that states create the legislation necessary to criminalize sexual violence, if they have not already done so.913

In the same resolution, the EP reaffirmed its commitment to reproductive health and rights. Clause 136 states that the EP “calls for the EU and its Member States to recognise the inalienable rights of women and girls to bodily integrity and autonomous decision-making as regards, inter alia, the right to access voluntary family planning.”914

---

The EU has taken other steps to protect reproductive rights and ensure reproductive health.

The EU pledged to donate an additional EUR25 million to Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance, during a replenishment conference on 26 January 2015 and 27 January 2015.915 The EU had already committed to providing EUR175 million in support for the years 2016-2020 in May 2014.916 Gavi currently operates a program to provide developing countries with access to the human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccine for free or at low cost.917 Since the definition of reproductive health requires that people have “the capability to reproduce,”918 the EU’s contribution to Gavi constitutes a commitment to ensuring reproductive health and rights. The treatment for cervical cancer leads to infertility in many cases,919 and HPV is the cause of 70 per cent of cervical cancer cases.920

On 8 January 2015, HRA Pharma announced that the European Commission had decided that all pharmacies across the EU must provide women with access to the emergency contraceptive ellaOne without the need for a prescription.921 A representative from HRA Pharma noted that “This is the first ever decision of its type regarding any oral contraceptive product applicable to all EU member states … This new ruling will empower over 120 million women across the whole EU to gain direct access to emergency contraception.”922 This action contributes to ensuring reproductive health and rights by allowing women to decide if they will have children.

On 22 September 2014, the EU participated in the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) Beyond 2014. The conference was meant to review global progress towards the implementation of commitments made at the ICPD in 1994,923 which included sexual and reproductive health and rights.924 At the meeting, a representative from the EU declared, “universal access to comprehensive sexual and reproductive health … is one of the highest priorities for the global agenda beyond 2014 and is essential to sustainable development and poverty eradication. Moreover, promoting and ensuring universal, affordable, and gender-sensitive access to comprehensive sexual and reproductive health, as well as to comprehensive evidence-based education on human sexuality, consistent with the needs and evolving capacities of the individual, is crucial to improving maternal, new-born and child health, to improving family planning and access to

---

quality modern methods of contraception … and to achieving gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls.  

Finally, it should also be noted that the EU has also worked to ensure sexual health through its contribution to the fight against HIV/AIDS. On 2 December 2013, the EU pledged to donate EUR370 million between 2014 and 2016 to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria. While this illustrates the EU’s previous commitment to ensuring sexual health, it cannot contribute towards the scoring of this report because the pledge was made prior to the beginning of the compliance period.

In conclusion, the EU receives a score of +1 for its full compliance with this commitment. The EU has taken steps to ensure sexual health by participating in the Global Summit to End Sexual Violence in Conflict, and by contributing to programs combating sexual violence. It has also taken action to ensure reproductive health and rights through its legislation on the emergency contraceptive ellaOne, and through its contributions to Gavi.

Analyst: Sarah Beard

“[We commit to] working together, in close cooperation with WHO, to develop a Global Action Plan on antimicrobial resistance.”

*G7 Brussels Summit Declaration*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background**

The dynamics of infectious diseases creates difficulty in addressing the health issue as microbial organisms develop resistance to drugs that are currently used. Though many communicable diseases have become manageable to monitor and contain, the increasing prevalence of drug-resistant strains require a reevaluation of policies and programs currently in place at a national and international level.

The construction of the global action plan was engendered utilizing existing response strategies to a wide variety of viral, parasitic, and bacterial diseases including HIV/AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis (TB). As antimicrobial resistance (AMR) affects a broader scope and scale of health issues beyond those aforementioned, the WHA outlined the imperative and immediate action required to increase applicability to other infectious diseases.927

On 19-24 May 2014, the Sixty-seventh World Health Assembly (WHA) adopted resolution WHA67.25 on antimicrobial resistance. The resolution demanded that the Director-General draft a global action plan to address the increasing burden of AMR, prompting global leaders to participate in the action plan produced.

In light of the recent Ebola outbreak, G7 leaders have brought to focus the need to directly address the WHA67.25 resolution through international cooperation with the implementation of a global action plan. To comprehensively set guidelines for an appropriate strategic approach, the WHO International Health Regulations (IHR) was referenced for the naissance of the action plan at the Brussels Summit.928

Strategic and Technical Advisory Group (STAG) meetings on AMR has provided an arena for dialogue between key actors and stakeholders of the health issue. The STAG-AMR meeting held on 24-25 February 2015 produced further methods and strategies for G7 members to engage in action against AMR. The members’ commitment to support the WHO towards an AMR global action plan will primarily examine adherence to the proceedings of the STAG-AMR meetings.

Commitment Features
The primary target of the commitment is to develop a global capacity to increase resilience and preparedness against infectious diseases exacerbated by AMR. The Brussels G7 Summit Declaration directly mentions compliance to the WHO’s International Health Regulations (IHR) and a global action plan to enhance antimicrobial resistance.

Reaffirmation of compliance to the WHO’s IHR can be demonstrated de facto by involvement in developing and implementing the global action plan. Although the IHR states a broad range of articles to which members should adhere, compliance will be measured by the member’s adherence to cooperation with the WHO towards a global action plan. Attendance of meetings without action towards developing and implementing the action plan will be considered as work in progress.

Cooperation on a global action plan for antimicrobial resistance will be judged based on the five strategic objectives outlined by the WHO as per the May 2014 WHA. Without necessarily requiring all constituents of the strategic objectives, particular attention will be given towards (1) improving public health awareness; (2) strengthening knowledge through surveillance and research; and (3) developing sustainable investment for increased investments in new medicines, diagnostic tools, vaccines, and other interventions.929

Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member is not involved in the development of a Global Action Plan on antimicrobial resistance NOR does it reaffirm support for its development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member reaffirms support for the development of a Global Action Plan on antimicrobial resistance, but does not actively engage in its creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member actively participates in the development of a Global Action Plan on antimicrobial resistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lead Analyst: Nicholas Chong

Canada: +1
Canada has complied with its commitments to combatting antimicrobial resistance (AMR) and infectious diseases, as stated in the G7’s commitment in the Brussels Declaration.930

In October 2014, Canada released a federal action plan in an effort to address the national issues regarding antimicrobial resistance. The government along with several of its public agencies outlined four actions that plan to limit, prevent and control the spread of antimicrobial bacteria. The framework also highlights the importance of leadership, surveillance, education and innovation in order to reach the objectives set out in the action plan.931 For instance, the federal plan has stated that during 2013-2014 CA$1 million was invested in stewardship programs, increasing from previous years.

However, an audit conducted by the Auditor General’s office from January 2011 to October 2014 that was released in April 2015 argues that the Canadian agencies and government have not done

---
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enough to combat the rise of AMR. The report underlines the lack of a national strategy and concludes that agencies, such as Health Canada and the Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC) have failed to fulfill responsibilities to mitigate the risks posed by AMR.

With that being said, Minister of Health Rona Ambrose has held meeting with leaders of various human and animal health organizations regarding AMR in March of 2015. During this meeting, Ambrose announced plans for a new $250,000 investment to a World Bank study for AMR as well as launching CARSS, Canadian Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance System. With an increase in investment efforts and initial strategy plans mapped out, Canada has qualified for a full compliance +1 rating.

*Analyst: Saad Hasnain*

**France: 0**

France has largely reaffirmed its commitment to a Global Action Plan concerning the management of antibiotic resistance and infectious disease but has not fully complied with the commitment on infectious diseases and a global action plan.

France continues to implement its “2011-2016 National Alert on Antibiotics Plan,” which built on previous plans from 2001-2005 and 2007-2010 with the common goal of managing antibiotic usage. The most recent plan remains in line with the infectious disease commitments outlined by the G7, particularly in its greater emphasis on surveillance, awareness and research relative to previous strategies.

In December 2014, France updated its antibiotic consumption calculation tools to include newly available antibiotics in order to maintain the effective tracking of drug delivery in hospitals.

On 18 November 2014, France continued its participation with the European Antibiotic Awareness Day with a national campaign, supporting efforts to reduce incidences of self-medication with antimicrobial drugs.

Furthermore, on 12 November 2014 France hosted its second annual conference presenting research into strategies to reduce antibiotic resistance with reference to both human and animal treatments.

France remains engaged with the European Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance Network (EARS-Net), contributing to a larger database of specific resistance figures.
Since June 2014, France has not enacted any major, novel initiatives towards a strategy for the management of antibiotic resistance, but has maintained and carried out previous plans. Thus France receives a compliance score of 0.

Analyst: Sam Walmsley

Germany: +1

Germany has complied with its commitment towards a Global Action Plan concerning the management of antibiotic resistance and infectious disease.

On 13 May 2015, Germany launched a new strategy entitled the “German Antimicrobial Resistance Strategy” (DART 2020), which endeavors to further efforts in this regard with greater emphasis on education for health care professionals among continued efforts in research, awareness etc.\(^1,2\)

Critics suggest that the report would do well to provide a more concrete strategy for dealing with the high usage of antibiotics in agricultural animals, thus building on regulations presented in the previous year that forces farmers to report drug consumption rates.\(^2\)

In an address to the WHO on 18 May 2015, Chancellor Merkel spoke to the importance of continued progress in the strategy to quell rates of antibiotic resistance, following a WHO survey report that found a problematic lack of national action plans.\(^3\)

Germany remains engaged with the European Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance Network (EARS-Net), contributing to a larger database of localized resistance rates.\(^4\)

In addition to presenting a new plan towards the combatance of antibiotic resistance and infectious disease, Germany has demonstrated its devotion to the promotion of similar strategies at a global scale. Thus Germany receives a full compliance score of +1.

Analyst: Sam Walmsley

Italy: 0

Italy has partly complied with its commitment to the creation of a Global Action Plan on antimicrobial resistance.

Italy is part of the list of countries that have demonstrated support towards the creation of the plan and the improvement of public health awareness.\(^939\) However, it has not been an active participant in the concrete development of a global action plan. The issue of antimicrobial resistance is pertinent to Italy: it leads in total consumption of antimicrobics (both animals and human beings) and is second only to France in consumption in human beings (621.6 tons).\(^940\)

Thus, Italy has been given a score of 0 because of participation in discussion, but lack of action towards an improved Global Action Plan against antimicrobial resistance.

Analyst: Fabio Ponti

Japan: +1

Japan has fully complied with its commitment to combat antimicrobial existence, with specific emphasis on developing sustainable investment for increased investments in new medicines, diagnostic tools, vaccines, and other interventions.

During the months of November and December 2014 Japan hosted expert scientists, clinicians, academics, and veterinarians from the UK and Japan to participate in a UK-Japan Antimicrobial Resistance Workshop held at the UK embassy in Japan. The workshop’s goal was to explore ways of tackling antimicrobial resistance in a collaborative manner. Topics discussed included drug discovery, antimicrobial stewardship, resistance in animals and the environment, and diagnostics.941

On 1 April 2015 the Government of Japan established the Agency for Medical Research and Development (AMED). Modelled after the National Institutes of Health in the United States AMED will act as a central hub for biomedical research and development in Japan. The agency has been granted a research budget of JPY140 billion and will have a staff of 300. Among the agency’s research goals are: drug discovery, medical devices, genomic medicine, and infectious diseases.942

United Kingdom: +1

The UK has fully complied with its commitment to combat antimicrobial resistance, with improving public health awareness, strengthening knowledge through surveillance and research, and developing sustainable investment for increased investments in new medicines, diagnostic tools, vaccines, and other interventions.

In July 2014 the United Kingdom’s Prime Minister David Cameron commissioned the Review on Antimicrobial Resistance. The Review operates independently of the UK government and the Wellcome Trust, who are co-funding and hosting the Review. In 2014 and 2015 the review will research the impact of antimicrobial resistance on the world economy if the issue is not tackled, ways to reduce the rise in resistance using genomics and computer science, how to boost development of new antimicrobial drugs, alternative therapies to reduce the rise in resistance, and the need for coherent international action. In the summer of 2016 the review will deliver a final report on recommended actions to be taken by the global community.943

During the months of November and December 2014 the UK participated in a UK-Japan Antimicrobial Resistance Workshop held at the UK embassy in Japan, which hosted expert scientists, clinicians, academics, and veterinarians from the UK and Japan. The workshop’s goal was to explore ways of tackling antimicrobial resistance in a collaborative manner. Topics discussed included drug discovery, antimicrobial stewardship, resistance in animals and the environment, and diagnostics.944

On 18 March 2015 the UK government and the Wellcome Trust announced the GBP195 million Fleming Fund in response to early recommendations by the Review on Antimicrobial Resistance.
The fund will be used in collaboration over the next five years to build laboratory capacity, surveillance networks, and response capacity in low- and middle-income countries.\textsuperscript{945}

On 18 November 2015 Public Health England is incorporating a new initiative called Antibiotic Guardian into this year's European Antibiotic Awareness Day. The initiative encourages members of the public and healthcare professionals to join the fight against antimicrobial resistance by making a pledge describing how they will make better use of antimicrobials.\textsuperscript{946}

\textit{Analyst: Gabriel Burke}

**United States: +1**

The United States of America has fully complied with its commitments to combatting antimicrobial resistance and infectious diseases, as stated in the G7's commitment in the Brussels Declaration.

In September 2014, US released a national strategy for combating antibiotic resistant bacteria.\textsuperscript{947} In this report, the United States government describes five goals that are interconnected in an effort to minimize the risks and impact of antimicrobial resistance.

The United States has prioritized slowing the emergence of antimicrobial resistant bacteria along with developing and innovating new surveillance systems to combat the nature of antibiotic resistant bacteria. In the final page of the action plan, the government outlines a clear set of goals that have a deadline set at 2020. The goals are outlined with respect to the CDC's Recognized Urgent Threats.

In response to the national strategy mentioned above, on 9 April 2015, the NIAID (National Institute for Allergy and Infectious Diseases) invested $11 million on nine different research projects for diagnosing antibiotic resistant bacteria.\textsuperscript{948} Of these nine ventures, three are firms while the remaining six are academic organizations.

With the commitment the United States has shown in dealing with antimicrobial resistance as well as the initiatives taken, they have complied with the responsibilities discussed in 2013’s G7 meeting and receive a full compliance score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Saad Hasnain}

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with developing a Global Action Plan against antimicrobial resistance.

Over the past year, the European Union has been involved in the development of solutions to antimicrobial resistance (AMR). There are various reforms in European laws as well as agreements on


\textsuperscript{947} National Strategy for Combating Antibiotic Resistant Bacteria, September 2014. Date of Access May 18 2015
https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/carb_national_strategy.pdf

targets in the next years that aim to reduce the spread of human and animal anti-microbial infectious diseases.\textsuperscript{949}

Since June 2014, the European Union has proposed for the development of various initiatives that improve the understanding of antibiotics and the impact of their production. The European Commission’s progress report against rising threats from AMR provides an overview on the progress made within the European Union. In October 2014, the report urges increased investment in antibiotic development.\textsuperscript{950} In order to ensure investment in the antibiotic industry remains stable, the COMBACTE programme aims to develop new sustainable business models.\textsuperscript{951} In addition to sustainable financial options, the European Union has also addressed the pollution created by pharmaceuticals by hosting a workshop in September 2014 which created the foundation for plans to be released in September 2015.\textsuperscript{952}

To increase public awareness, the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control has developed a surveillance network named the European Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance Network.\textsuperscript{953} Any outbreaks are recorded, this information is used to combat antimicrobial resistance and increased understanding.\textsuperscript{954} There is also Eurosurveillance a public scientific journal funded by the European Commission that tracks any developments related to anti-microbial infectious diseases.\textsuperscript{955} Within the European Union an annual Antibiotic Awareness Day takes place.\textsuperscript{956} Thus the European Union displays compliance to relevant commitments.

In regards to combating the spread of infectious diseases, on December 12, 2014, the World Health Organization released a draft of the global action plan on antimicrobial resistance. This report outlines an in depth plan to solve the increased threat of infectious diseases.\textsuperscript{957} The European Union concluded research in January 2015 on antimicrobial resistance from humans and food-producing animals.\textsuperscript{958} Therefore the European Union is active in developing solutions to the increasing threat of antimicrobial resistance.

\textsuperscript{950} Progress report on the Action plan against the rising threats from Antimicrobial Resistance, European Commission (Brussels, Belgium) 11 March 2015. Page 6, 18.
\textsuperscript{952} Progress report on the Action plan against the rising threats from Antimicrobial Resistance, European Commission (Brussels, Belgium) 11 March 2015. Page 16.
\textsuperscript{954} About the network, European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (Solna, Sweden) 2015.
\textsuperscript{955} About us, Eurosurveillance (Stockholm, Sweden) 2015.
http://www.eurosurveillance.org/Public/AboutUs/AboutUs.aspx
\textsuperscript{958} Joint interagency Antimicrobial Consumption and Resistance Analysis (JIACRA) Report, European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, European Food Safety Authority, European Medicines Agency 30 January 2015.
The Ebola outbreak in West Africa has prompted the European Union to create an EU Ebola Task Force. The EU Task Force works with the European External Action Service to provide on the ground humanitarian aid to affected countries.959 In October 2014, the European Union’s funding to combat Ebola was EUR 1 euros, however the European Union is estimated to have contributed over EUR 1.4 billion.960 Furthermore, on March 3, 2015 the European Commission stated its commitment to continue to support stable and sustainable developments to combat Ebola and other antimicrobial infectious diseases.961

The Sixty-eighth World Health Assembly took place in Geneva from May 18 until May 26. A major area of focus was combatting antimicrobial resistance through international cooperation and reinforced the efforts that were drafted in reports from December and February.962 Particularly, further emergency response measures and increase preparedness to fight Ebola.963

The European Union receives full compliance in working together with the WHO to develop a Global Action Plan on antimicrobial resistance. European initiatives have met their commitments by increasing public research, awareness and creating a sustainable environment for antimicrobial resistance. In addition to achieving increased understanding and development of anti-microbial resistance, the European Union has pledged to keep antimicrobial resistance a priority in the future.964

The efforts by the European Union in the past year have shown full compliance earning the organization a score of +1.

Analyst: Emma De Leeuw


“The G7 are committed to continuing to work with Ukraine to support its sovereignty and territorial integrity.”

2014 Brussels Declaration

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

Background

On 24 March 2014, following the accession of Crimea to the Russian Federation, the G7 leaders met in the Hague to “reaffirm [their] support for Ukraine’s sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence.” The G7 leaders’ official response to the Crimean crisis was published at this meeting in the form of “The Hague Declaration.” Leaders stated that they would not recognise the “illegal attempt to annex Crimean contravention of international law,” and collectively condemned Russia’s actions. Additionally, the G7 leaders pointed out that they had imposed sanctions against Russia and cautioned that they were prepared to intensify those sanctions to increasingly impact the Russian economy in the event that “Russia continues to escalate the situation.”

On 25 September 2014, the G7 foreign ministers welcomed the Minsk agreements reached on 5 and 19 September “as an important step towards a sustainable, mutually agreed cease-fire, a secure Russian-Ukrainian border and the return of peace and stability to eastern Ukraine with the establishment of a “special status” zone, which is to be empowered with a strong local self-government under Ukrainian law.” They also supported the role of OSCE to be “the monitoring mechanism in the implementation of the Minsk agreement.”

On 13 February 2015, the G7 leaders collectively endorsed the “Package of Measures for the Implementation of the Minsk Agreements” which “offers a way forward to a comprehensive, sustainable, and peaceful resolution to the crisis in eastern Ukraine.” The agreement outlines a plan to: implement a ceasefire, remove heavy weapons by both sides to create a safe zone, ensure the

---

release of detainees, ensure safe access to humanitarian assistance, withdrawal of all foreign armed forces, and reinstating full control of the state boarder to the Ukraine Government.\(^70\)

**Commitment Features**

The framework for support that was established at the meeting in The Hague and which was reaffirmed at the Brussels Summit intends to provide financial backing, technical assistance, and support in other areas, such as enhancing trade and strengthening energy security for Ukraine, as well increasing collective energy security.\(^71\) The support is provided with the intention of strengthening Ukraine’s position and increasing its own sovereignty and integrity separate from Russia.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member does not take any action to support Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member affirms Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity but does not take concrete action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member takes concrete action to support Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lead Analyst:* Beth Yando

**Canada: +1**

Canada is in full compliance with its commitment to support Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity.

On 4 September 2014 Prime Minister Stephen Harper announced two initiatives to support Ukraine and NATO allies against threats of Russian military action in the region.\(^72\) CAD 1 million will be allocated toward NATO Trust Funds to support Ukrainian military capabilities in areas of command, communication, control and computer capacities, and to implement NATO standard throughout Ukrainian forces.\(^73\) Additionally CAD 3 million will be allocated toward three NATO Centers of Excellence in cyber security, energy security, and strategic communications, whereby each center will receive CAD 1 million.\(^74\)

On 19 December 2014, Prime Minister Stephen Harper imposed additional economic sanctions and travel bans on 22 Russian and Ukrainian individuals, and export restrictions on the Russian oil

---


industry. These sanctions were imposed to support the “sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Ukraine.”

On 2 February 2015, Minister of National Defense Rob Nicholson announced Canada will join the US-Ukraine Joint Commission of Defense Reform and Bilateral Cooperation and provide assistance to the Ukrainian.

On 27 March 2015, Minister of Foreign Affairs Rob Nicholson announced additional contributions to the “Special Monitoring Mission (SMM) of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE),” in support of Ukraine’s sovereignty. The Special Monitoring Mission aims to “monitor and implement ceasefire provisions under the Minsk agreements.” Canada will contribute CAD 2 million and will send as many as 25 specialized personnel in security, human rights, the rule of law and media towards this special mission.

Moreover, on 27 March 2015 the Government of Canada announced disbursement of Canada’s second CAD 200 million low-interest loan to Ukraine in stabilizing its economy and supporting its economic development.

On 14 April 2015, Prime Minister Stephen Harper announced a plan to deploy 200 Canadian Armed Force personnel to Ukraine until March 2017 to deliver military training programs and support to the Ukrainian forces. The types of training will include “explosive ordnance disposal, improvised explosive device disposal, military police training, medical training, flight safety training, and logistics system modernization training.”

On 27 April 2015, Minister for Citizenship and Immigration Chris Alexander announced humanitarian assistance worth CAD 15 million, which will be given to Ukraine to support citizens of the Ukrainian.
who are immediately affected by the conflict by “improving [their] access to water, shelter and health, hygiene and protection services.”

On 28 April 2015, Canada transferred a new batch of non-lethal weapons, namely night vision goggles, to the Ukrainian National Guard as a part of the CAD 11 million Canadian Assistant package announced in November 2014. This military assistance aims to “enhance the capabilities of the Ukrainian armed forces in their fight to defend their country’s sovereignty and territorial integrity.” The Government of Canada also announced an additional contribution of CAD 19.7 million to support democracy in Ukraine. On the same day, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Chris Alexander, announced the implementation of Partnership for Local Economic Development and Democratic Governance project in support of municipal democracy and economic development in Ukraine. This project is aimed to promote “effective democratic governance and economic development at the local level in four different regions of Ukraine.”

Canada has taken concrete actions to support Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity. Therefore, Canada is awarded a score of +1.

Analyst: Pin Hui Chen

France: +1

France is in full compliance with its commitment to support Ukraine’s sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence.

Since the 2014 G7 Summit in Brussels, regional security in the Ukraine has been a top priority for France. France played a leading role in the implementation of the second Minsk Protocol on 12 February 2015, at which the leaders of France, Russia, Ukraine and Germany determined the “Package of Measured for the Implementation of the Minsk Agreement” in Minsk, Belarus. French President Holland confirmed that the agreement included issues of border control, decentralization and economic growth.

On 24 February 2015, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, Laurent Fabius met with the Ministers from Germany, Russia and Ukraine to discuss the stipulations agreed earlier that month. Minister Fabius’ issued a statement saying the four Ministers agreed that “the strict implementation of all provisions of the Minsk agreements starting from a comprehensive ceasefire and withdrawal of heavy

weapons” was of utmost importance.\(^{990}\) Fabius’ statement continued to detail that in order to ensure the withdrawal of heavy weaponry, the four ministers “call[ed] upon all parties to ensure full access of the OSCE to all areas… [and] to fully cooperate with the implementing its mandate, especially regarding the monitoring and verification of the withdrawal of heavy weapons.”\(^{991}\)

On 22 April 2015, President Hollande entered a bilateral agreement with the Ukraine in order to modernize its economy and energy sphere as well as foster economic growth within the country. In news releases from both countries, the Heads of State placed importance on enhancing bilateral trade, energy security, transport, food security, environmental protection and tourism.\(^{992}\) The Government of France has committed to sharing its experience, “in the sphere of banking supervision, customs control, administration of public enterprises and privatization,” as well as increasing “cooperation and exchange of experience in higher education, science, culture and sports.”\(^{993}\) The government of France also intends to strengthen bilateral cooperation in the fields of sustainable development and environmental protection in order to promote more efficient energy usage, city planning and agriculture.\(^{994}\) The two state leaders encouraged increased cooperation between their cities and Parliaments and agreed to form a Joint Economic Commission, which will meet in the first half of 2016.\(^{995}\)

Finally, France has also emphasized that any country who fails to respect the Minsk Agreement will be subdued to severe consequence. On 27 June 2014, French President Francois Hollande stated that Russia would face severe global political and economic consequences if it did not stop infringing on the regional security of Ukraine.\(^{996}\) He reaffirmed this at a joint news conference in Paris, President Hollande alongside German Chancellor Angela Merkel, stating “There are risks which will increase if the truce is not respected. Our attention must focus on full compliance with the ceasefire. Our intention is not to impose sanctions but to achieve peace in Ukraine.”\(^{997}\)

France has made several efforts to support and promote Ukraine’s sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence and has thus been awarded a score of +1.

*Analyst: Larissa Parker*

---


Germany +1

Germany is in full compliance with its commitment to take concrete actions to support Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity.

On 23 February 2015 Germany announced that it would release EUR10 million in emergency humanitarian aid for citizens affected by the ongoing conflict.\textsuperscript{998} Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier stated that efforts to prevent escalation of violence should “not stop us thinking about the people of eastern Ukraine.”\textsuperscript{999} Minister Steinmeier also formally invited numerous humanitarian organization to meeting at the Federal Foreign Office in order to coordinate effective implementation of future aid.\textsuperscript{1000}

On 13 April 2015 Minister Steinmeier invited the foreign ministers of France, Russia and Ukraine to a meeting at the Federal Foreign Office to discuss the Ukraine conflict.\textsuperscript{1001} The Minister stated that the purpose of the meeting was to continuing working towards defusing the Ukraine conflict and implementing the previously agreed upon Minsk Protocol.\textsuperscript{1002} The Minister continued to emphasize the importance of the Mink Protocol as more than a ceasefire, but also the basis for initiating a political process that would lead to peace. During the meeting all four ministers agreed to establish working groups to discuss humanitarian assistance, security issues, political process and economic reconstruction in eastern Ukraine.\textsuperscript{1003}

From 13–14 May 2015 Minister Steinmeier attended a NATO meeting in Antalya which focused heavily on the Ukraine crisis. At those meetings reaffirmed Germany’s solidarity with Ukraine and again reiterated the need to implement the Minsk Protocol.\textsuperscript{1004} During the meetings, Minister Steinmeier also took the opportunity to meet privately with Ukrainian Foreign Minister Pavlo Klimkin who was also in attendance.\textsuperscript{1005}

Germany has provided substantial aid in support of Ukraine and has also taken an active part in the political process that aims to de-escalate the conflict and lead to a peaceful resolution. Thus Germany has been awarded a score of +1.

\emph{Analyst: Elizabeth Yando}

**Italy: +1**

Italy is in full compliance with its commitment to continue working with Ukraine to support Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Italy allocated 2 per cent of the total EUR 1.61 billion raised by the European Union member states for Macro-financial Assistance (MFA I) and Micro-financial Assistance (MFA II) programs to Ukraine. The loans were directed to help manage the balance-of-payments and support economic stabilization of the country. On 20 May 2015, the European Union made the first disbursement to Ukraine in the amount of EUR 100 million. The second release of the funds occurred on 17 June 2014.1006

On 20 July 2014 Minister for Foreign Affairs Federica Mogherini held a telephone conversation with Ukrainian Minister of Foreign Affairs Pavel Klimkin regarding the crash of a Malaysian Airlines jet in Ukraine. During the discussion Mogherini offered assistance to send expert inspectors from National Air Security Agency of Italy.1007

On 17 October 2014 Minister of Foreign Affairs Federica Mogherini met in Milan with Pavlo Klimkin and Serghei Lavrov, the Minister’s of Foreign affairs in Ukraine and Russian, and with Didier Burkhalter, the chairperson of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. During the meeting, representatives from Italy along with France, Germany, Ukraine and Russia indicated that they were willing to provide military support to Ukraine in the form of personnel and drones as part of an effort to stabilize the region.1008

On 4 March 2015, Italian Prime Minister, Matteo Renzi, expressed a concern for Ukrainian sovereignty and his interest in termination of conflict between pro-Russian separatists backed by Russia and Ukrainian military forces. The Prime Minister also mentioned that Ukraine should continue implementing economic and political reforms and said that Italian companies are interested in investing into various industries currently owned by the Ukrainian government.1009

On 6-7 March 2015, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Italy, Paolo Gentiloni, attended informal meeting in Riga, Latvia along with other Foreign Ministers of the European Union (EU) members and discussed crisis in Ukraine. The High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy Federica Mogherini chaired the summit. Participants of the discussion agreed to continue providing financial support to Ukraine, as well as help with development and implementation of political and economic reforms.1010

Thus, Italy is in full compliance with its commitment to support sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine by providing financial assistance and help with development of economic and social reforms.

*Analyst: Julia Kochneva*

---

Japan: +1

Japan is in full compliance with its commitment to support Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Only July 17 2014, the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) announced the signing of a Japanese ODA loan agreement with Ukraine which would provide up to JPY 10 billion for Economic Reform Development Policy Loan.\textsuperscript{1011}

On September 24 2014, Japan imposed additional economic sanctions on Russia which restricts armed exports, and also restricts Russian banks from issuing securities in Japan.\textsuperscript{1012}

On February 24 2015, Japan and members of G7 countries initiated the “Package of Measures for the Implementation of the Minsk Agreements” to support Ukraine in finding a “comprehensive, sustainable, and peaceful resolution” to the crisis in its country.\textsuperscript{1013} Member countries of the G7 are committed to the Minsk Agreements, which call for a ceasefire. Under these agreements, the members, including Japan, condemn Russia’s illegal annexation of Crimea and expressed G7 will continue to provide financial assistance to Ukraine.\textsuperscript{1014} Further under these agreements, Japan and other G7 members are also ready to take measures against those who violate the agreement.\textsuperscript{1015}

As of April 1 2015, the total amount of aid and assistance given to Ukraine by Japan is USD 3 billion.\textsuperscript{1016}

Japan has taken concrete actions to support Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity. Therefore Japan is awarded a score of +1.

Analyst: Pin Hui Chen

United Kingdom +1

The United Kingdom is in full compliance with its commitment to take action to support Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity, and remains committed to in that support through non-lethal means.

On 10 February 2015 in a statement to the House of Commons, Foreign Secretary Philip Hammond issued a statement on Ukraine, condemning Russians actions and reiterating the United Kingdom’s support of Ukraine and the continued use of economic sanctions, and hopes for a peaceful resolution. In his statement Hammond says “the UK welcomes efforts to achieve a peaceful resolution of the situation in Eastern Ukraine … so Britain’s focus has been, and will continue to be,
ensuring that the EU remains robust, resolved and united on the maintenance of economic sanctions.”

On 23 February 2015 the United Kingdom announced that it would release GBP15 million in emergency humanitarian assistance for Ukraine. The aid will include funding to be given to the World Health Organisation and the Red Cross, and will also serve to provide food, blankets, emergency shelter and medical supplies for the more than one million displaced Ukrainian citizens.

On 6 March 2015 Defence Secretary the Right Honorable Michael Fallon announced a new package of GBP852,000 in non-lethal equipment to be given to Ukraine. The equipment will include helmets, night vision goggles, GPS units, laptops and first aid kits with the intention of providing an increase in Ukraine’s defensive capability and improved tactical situation.

On 15 April 2015 the government issued a call for project proposals to receive funding under the Conflict Stability and Security Fund. The fund is intended to support projects that will lead to peace-building and communications, strengthening relations between communities in conflict and communities in isolation, and to engage the Ukrainian citizens in the peace-building process. The aim is to implement the selected project by March 2016.

The United Kingdom has actively provided aid to support Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity, and is committed to providing support for programming that will aid in long term national stability. Thus, the United Kingdom has been given a score of +1

**United States: +1**

The United States is in full compliance with its commitment to support Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity.

On 19 December 2014, President Barack Obama issued an Executive Order imposing new sanctions on the Crimea region, controlled by Russia. This order states: (1) there may be no new investment in the Crimea region by a US person; (2) there may be no importation of goods or services from the Crimea region; (3) the sale of any goods or services by a US person to anyone anywhere in the Crimea region, and; (4) any approval by a US person for the above mentioned prohibitions.

---

On 5 February 2015, Secretary of State John Kerry travelled to Kyiv, to meet with Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko, Prime Minister Arseniy Yatsenyuk, Foreign Minister Pavlo Klimkin, and members of Ukraine’s parliament.1023 This meeting was intended to “highlight the United States’ steadfast support for Ukraine and its people” and to reaffirm the United States ongoing support of Ukrainian sovereignty.1024 During this visit Secretary Kerry announced that the United States Government intends to provide USD 16.4 million in new humanitarian assistance to help Ukrainian refugees and to support the Ukrainian Government’s humanitarian response to the ongoing crisis.1025

On 12 February 2015, the USA committed to sending more non-lethal aid to Ukraine in response to Russian-backed rebels breaking a cease-fire.1026 Along with this aid, the U.S. committed to sending USD 75 million in assistance which includes radios, radars and first-aid kits.1027

On 11 March 2015, Adam Szubin of the US Treasury Department stated that “if Russia continues to support destabilizing activities in Ukraine” the costs it faces in terms of sanctions and punishments from the West will continue to rise.1028

Thus, the United States has received a score of +1 for fully complying with its commitment to support Ukrainian sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Analyst: Mercedes Fogarassy

**European Union: +1**

The EU is in full compliance with its commitment to support Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity.

On 5 March, 2014, the European Commission proposed a package of financial support for Ukraine of EUR 11.175 billion1029 to be implemented between then and 2020. The proposed package consisted of macro financial assistance loans (which were supplemented by another EUR 1.8 billion loan, signed at the Riga Summit on 22 May 20151030) and grants, to the end of promoting economic stability and energy security in Ukraine,1031 as well as measures to provide humanitarian aid and combat corruption.1032

In addition, the commission outlined actions to facilitate trade between Ukraine and the EU. On 23 April 2014, the proposal of the Commission calling for the temporary removal of customs duties on

---

Ukrainian exports into the EU came into force, facilitating trade between the EU and Ukraine in advance of the implementation of those provisions of the Association Agreement (AA) pertaining to the establishment of a Deep Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA). This removal of duties was set to expire on 1 November 2014, but was extended until 31 December 2015 with the expectation that DCFTA portion of the AA will enter into force on 1 January 2016. On 27 June 2014, the EU and Ukraine signed the residual provisions of the AA, following the signing of its political provisions on 21 March 2014.

On 29 April 2014, the Commission adopted the “State Building Contract” programme, designed to assist both in remedying Ukraine’s urgent economic needs and in the preparation of Ukraine for substantial reforms (with respect to the AA/DCFTA) “through support to improved governance, the fight against corruption, judiciary reform and public administration reform.” The contract itself is worth EUR 335 million, with a complimentary EUR 10 million programme (intended to promote the civil society).

On 30 October 2014, with the arbitration of the EU, Ukraine agreed to the USD 4.6 billion “winter package,” allowing Ukraine to purchase gas from Russia by advance monthly payments without subjection to constraints on order quantity or any “take-or-pay” obligations. On 28 April 2014, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) that would enable gas flow from Slovakia into Ukraine was assented to by the relevant pipeline owners (the Slovakian Eustream and Ukrainian Uktransgaz).

This is in congruity with the stipulations of the 5 March 2014 support package put forward by the EU, calling for the “Modernisation of the Ukraine Gas Transit System and work on reverse flows, notably via Slovakia.”

The EU and its member states have given over EUR 139.5 million in humanitarian aid since the onset of the crisis in 2013, and additionally organized an airlift operation in January 2015 to deliver 85 tonnes of relief equipment (i.e. “blankets, sleeping bags, water containers, heaters, hygiene kits, and warm clothing”).

On 20 February 2014, the Commission conducted an in-depth examination of what flexibilities would be offered to Ukrainian citizens by the improved Visa Facilitation Agreement and Visa Code,

---

with the aim of allowing for issuing of Schengen visas to Ukrainian citizens at lowered/waived fees.\footnote{1042}

In light of Russia’s failure to withdraw from Ukraine, on 17 March 2014 the EU issued “travel bans and asset freezes against Russian and Ukrainian officials following Russia’s illegal annexation of Crimea.”\footnote{1043} On 24 March 2014, Russia was suspended from the G8,\footnote{1044} resulting in the EU hosting a G7 meeting on 4-5 June 2014 in place of the planned G8 summit in Sochi, Russia.\footnote{1045} The EU has since imposed a number of economic sanctions on Russia, notably stipulating that EU companies and nationals are not permitted to buy or sell new “financial instruments” (e.g. bonds, equity)\footnote{1046} with a maturity in excess of 30 days from five major (state-owned) Russian banks, three major Russian energy companies, and three major Russian defence companies. EU nationals or companies are also not permitted to make loans to any of the 5 Russian banks sanctioned. The EU maintains that these and many other sanctions on Russia will remain in place until the implementation of the Minsk peace agreements, which were signed on 12 February\footnote{1047} 2015.

Speaking at the eighth Kyiv Security forum on 28-29 May 2015, German foreign minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier assured that the EU would continue to support the stabilization of Ukraine, but contended that “there is no military solution to Russia’s war in eastern Ukraine.”\footnote{1048}

The above measures constitute concrete action on the part of the EU to fulfill their commitment to the support of Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity as per the Brussels Declaration of 2014. As such, the EU has earned a score of +1.

Analyst: Thomas Feore

\footnote{1047}{Conference speakers: Europe will keep sanctions while Ukraine needs to keep up reforms, Kyiv Post, Alyona Zhuk (Kyiv) 30 May 2015. Date of Access: 30 May 2015. https://www.kyivpost.com/content/kyiv-post-plus/conference-speakers-europe-will-keep-sanctions-on-russia-while-ukraine-needs-to-keep-up-reforms-389873.html}
\footnote{1048}{Conference speakers: Europe will keep sanctions while Ukraine needs to keep up reforms, Kyiv Post, Alyona Zhuk (Kyiv) 30 May 2015. Date of Access: 30 May 2015. https://www.kyivpost.com/content/kyiv-post-plus/conference-speakers-europe-will-keep-sanctions-on-russia-while-ukraine-needs-to-keep-up-reforms-389873.html}
15. Development: Syrian Refugees [114]

“We are committed to supporting the neighbouring countries bearing the burden of Syrian refugee inflows.”

*Brussels G7 Summit Declaration*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>+0.88</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background**

Protests against President Bashar Al Assad began in March 2011 and quickly descended into civil war between the Syrian Government and various opposition groups. Since then, turmoil within the country has spread throughout the region, causing millions to flee to safety. The Syrian conflict has killed more than 160,000 people to date, and has left 9.3 million people in need of humanitarian aid.

As of 2 March 2015, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees registered over 3.7 million Syrian refugees, who are currently being granted safe haven in Turkey (1.6 million), Lebanon (1.1 million), Jordan (600,000), Iraq (250,000), and Egypt (140,000). Countries continue to struggle to provide support for these refugees, as thousands continue to cross into their borders. The 2014 funding requirements to support the regional response to the influx of Syrian refugees, as stipulated by the UNHRC, is valued at USD3.7 billion. To date, only sixty-one per cent of this is has been committed, which represents a gap of almost USD1.5 billion.

Moreover, the 2015-2016 Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan in response to the Syria Crisis by the UNHCR, the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, and the United Nations Development Programme notes that the crisis has had unprecedented social and economic impacts on host countries such as, “affecting their stability and reversing years of hard-won development gains; exacerbating pre-existing vulnerabilities; overstretching basic social services such as health,

---

water, sanitation and education; aggravating unemployment; diminishing trade and investment; and creating competition for limited and declining resources.”

The situation in Syria continues to be a concern for G7 members and the international community at large. At the 2013 Lough Erne Summit, members established their commitment to “stop the bloodshed and loss of life in Syria and to support the Syrian people.” Members also acknowledged the vital role played by host countries in the surrounding regions “in dealing with the significant economic and security pressures they are facing as a result of the conflict and refugee influx.” Members also committed to provide USD1.5 billion in humanitarian aid to meet the needs in Syria and its neighbours.

**Commitment Features**

The commitment to support neighbouring countries bearing the burden of Syrian refugee inflows mainly focuses on assistance with the funding of these regional responses. Members decided to provide funding to “humanitarian actors that can reach those most in need, including across borders.” They also called on the international community to help fund the enormous needs of the appeal by the United Nations and the High Commissioner for Refugees.

G7 Members will primarily fund efforts by the UNHCR and UNDP, which in turn support national and international non-governmental organizations. The 2015-2016 Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP) integrates and coordinates the national plans of host countries, highlighting two objectives: (1) refugee protection and humanitarian assistance, and; (2) resilience and stability in vulnerable communities. Total funding requirements are set at USD5.5 billion, covering eight targets: (1) Protection of Syrian Refugees; (2) Food; (3) Education; (4) Health; (5) Basic Needs; (6) Shelter; (7) Wash; and (8) Livelihood and Social Cohesion.

To achieve full compliance, G7 Members must continue to provide direct support to host countries in the region, in line with the 3RP standards outlined by the UNHCR and UNDP.

---


### Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>G7 Member does not provide direct support to countries hosting Syrian refugees, in accordance with the 3RP objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>G7 Member pledges to provide direct support to countries hosting Syrian refugees, in accordance with the 3RP objectives but has not yet provided assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>G7 Member provides direct support to countries hosting Syrian refugees, in accordance with the 3RP objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lead Analyst: Anthony Marchese*

### Canada: +1

Canada has fully complied with its commitment, as it continues to directly support neighboring host countries bearing the burden of Syrian refugees as per the standards set forth by the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP). Canada has continued to provide funding via humanitarian efforts and stability initiatives in vulnerable communities.

On 2 May 2015, on his visit to Iraq, Prime Minister Stephen Harper fortified his commitment to protect Syrian refugees by announcing that Canada would provide further, life-saving humanitarian aid to the victims of Syria and Iraq.\(^\text{1061}\) This additional assistance would be geared at meeting the needs of people affected by the conflict in the areas of water, food, shelter, medical care, and sexual- and gender-based violence issues. Moreover, as several sources noted on 7 January 2015, Minister of Immigration Chris Alexander announced that Canada would resettle 10,000 more Syrian refugees in the next three years, an effort that allocates ten per cent of 100,000 Syrian refugees to Canada alone after an appeal by the United Nations Refugee Agency.\(^\text{1062}\)

On 26 March 2014, as part of a project continuing until 31 December 2014, the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development contributed CAD1 million to the Turkish Red Crescent Society to deliver immediate assistance to up to 250,000 Syrian refugees in Turkey.\(^\text{1063}\) The project was expected to deliver “improved living conditions through increased access to essential relief items and increased capacity of the Turkish Red Crescent to respond to humanitarian crises.”\(^\text{15}\) The executing agencies and partners for this humanitarian assistance project were the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Society (IFRC) and the Canadian Red Cross Society (CRCS).

On 15 May 2014, as part of another project continuing until 31 March 2015, the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development contributed CAD2 million to the host communities in Irbid, Mufraq, Zarqa, and Amman in Jordan.\(^\text{1064}\) The goals of this project were “assessing the vulnerability of 8,000 households by helping Syrian refugees meet basic needs, providing extra aid to 4,000 extremely vulnerable households headed by women, people with disabilities, or the elderly, providing


3,250 households with emergency cash to meet urgent needs, and providing training to 400 women with business and life skills through a local partner organization.” This project was expected to assist particularly vulnerable individuals, with its key focus groups being women and children. The executing agency and partner was CARE Canada.

On 26 March 2014, as part of a project continuing until 30 November 2014, the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development contributed CAD910,000 to the host communities in Mufrak and Irbid in Northern Jordan. The goals of this project were “to provide sanitation facilities in 300 shelters benefiting 1,500 people, provide emergency relief items such as hygiene kits, summer underwear, summer sheets and mattress covers to 10,000 conflict-affected people, and conduct hygiene promotion sessions for 10,000 beneficiaries.” As a result, resident individuals would gain increased access to sanitation facilities, and to personal hygiene relief items. The executing agency and partner was CARE Canada.

On 19 March 2014, as part of a project continuing until 31 March 2016, the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development contributed CAD17 million to support 800,000 Jordanians and 300,000 Syrian refugees in nine municipalities of Northern Jordan that have been highly affected by the influx of Syrian refugees. The goal of this project was “to strengthen the ability of Jordanian municipalities to keep up with the delivery of basic services, support local economic development and to improve street lighting for security and waste collection to improve hygiene.” Overall, this project’s outcomes were three-fold: an increase in decision-making power for nine Syrian municipalities, an increase in crisis preparedness overall, and an increase in income generation opportunities for residents. The executing agency and partner for this project was the World Bank.

On 11 February 2015, as part of a project continuing until 28 February 2015, the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development contributed CAD5 million to address the socio-economic challenges of vulnerable Jordanians by increasing support to youth and women living in refugee-hosting communities and reach 10,000 direct beneficiaries (including 6,500 women). This project is part of a larger initiative towards the immediate development needs in Jordan, which as a total constitute approximately CAD20 million, and aims primarily to bring about community-based
development projects, increased educational and vocational training, and increased livelihood opportunities. The executing agency and partner for this project was Save the Children Canada.

On 28 March 2014, as part of a project continuing until 31 March 2015, the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development contributed CAD2.36 million to address the critical water, sanitation and hygiene needs for up to 4,500 refugee households from Syria and 1,350 vulnerable Lebanese households in Lebanon. As a result, refugees could have increased access to sanitation facilities, personal hygiene items, and clean water, all of which contribute to relief from crisis-related health conditions. The executing agency and partner was CARE Canada.

On 9 July 2014, as part of a project continuing until 31 January 2015, the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development contributed CAD2 million to address the critical water, sanitation and hygiene needs for up to 4,500 refugee households from Syria and 1,350 vulnerable Lebanese households in Lebanon. As a result, refugees could have increased access to sanitation facilities, personal hygiene items, and clean water, all of which contribute to relief from crisis-related health conditions. The executing agency and partner was CARE Canada.

On 13 May 2014, as part of a project continuing until 30 November 2014, the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development contributed CAD1.9 million to prevent the outbreak of contagious diseases, manage acute and chronic diseases and promote mother and child health, among 15,000 Syrian refugee and 5,000 Lebanese host and vulnerable families. The goals of this project were both direct and indirect — namely, to both increase primary health care, and to promote increased primary health care training for physicians in Lebanon. The executing agency and partner was Handicap International Canada.

On 28 March 2014, as part of a project continuing until 31 March 2015, the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development contributed CAD5 million to educate and protect 17,300 children, parents and teachers, in Jordan, Iraq, and Egypt. This project was dominantly geared at ameliorating access to education and community resources, and at bettering the lives of children and adolescents. The executing agency and partner for this project was Save the Children Canada.

On 24 March 2014, as part of a project continuing until 31 December 2014, the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development contributed CAD3 million to assist 250,000 Syrian refugees in Egypt and 400,000 Syrian refugees in Iraq. This project increased access to protection services, relief items, and emergency shelter assistance “for up to 650,000 conflict-assisted people.” The executing agency and partner in this project was the UN High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR).
On 27 March 2014, as part of a project continuing until 31 March 2015, the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development contributed CAD35 million to educate and normalize the lives of more than 613,000 conflict-affected children in Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, Iraq, Turkey, and Egypt. The expected immediate returns for this project were improved education, livelihood options, and protection for children and youth. The executing agency and partner for this project was the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF).

Thus, Canada has been awarded a score of +1 for its continued direct support to the neighboring countries bearing Syrian refugee inflow in the form of refugee protection, humanitarian assistance, and safeguarding vulnerable host populations.

**Analyst: Humayun Ahmed**

**France: +1**

France is in full compliance with its commitment to provide direct support to countries hosting Syrian refugees in accordance to the 3RP objectives. France has provided direct aid to Lebanon in order to protect refugees and provide direct humanitarian aid, as well as promote stability within the vulnerable region. It has also held talks with other countries affected by the Syrian crisis in the region, such as Jordan, and demonstrated a commitment to giving direct aid by participating in international donor conferences aimed at providing aid to Syria.

On 12 September 2014, France contributed EUR7 million to Lebanon’s World Bank Trust Fund in a meeting in Beirut. This aid was given with the explicit intention of helping Lebanon receive the refugees that continue to flee the Syrian regime and with a look towards providing stability in Lebanon. The intention to provide the aid had been announced earlier that year in March but the aid was finally signed and put through to the World Bank after the G7 Summit (formerly G8) that was held in Brussels, Belgium.

On 8 January 2015, the Foreign Minister of France, Laurent Fabius, held a meeting with Nasser Judeh, the Foreign Minister form Lebanon. While a host of issues were discussed, the two parties affirmed their commitment to fight against terrorism in the Middle East region and discussing the Syrian crisis in particular.

Annick Girardin, Minister of Development and Francophony, participated in the third international donor conference for Syria on 31 March 2015 in Kuwait. The conference was focused on responding to the human rights crisis, especially with regards to the millions of displaced persons and refugees, and also with regards to the needs of the neighbouring countries surrounding Syria that are receiving refugees.

On 27 September 2014, France adopted a new resolution denouncing the tragic human rights violations in Syria and especially condemned, Daesh, the terrorist group operating within Syria and

---

the Syrian regime. It also tabled resolutions aimed at protecting journalists and people from enforced disappearances.\textsuperscript{1078}

Overall, France receives a score of +1 for giving direct aid to neighbouring countries, particularly Lebanon, in accordance to the 3RP principles and for participating in meetings and conferences aimed at explicitly dealing with the Syria and its refugee and human rights crisis.

\textit{Analyst: Vipasha Shaikh}

\textbf{Germany: +1}

Germany is in full compliance with its commitment to support neighbouring countries bearing the burden of Syrian refugee inflows, as declared at the Brussels G7 Summit.

In June 2014 the Government of Germany announced that they would extend their original commitment of providing 10,000 refugees safe haven by providing a further 10,000 places for a total of 20,000 places.\textsuperscript{1079} Germany began to admit Syrian refugees in 2013. Upon arrival these refugees have received residence permits, social benefits and access to medical care.\textsuperscript{1080}

On 28 October 2014, Germany’s Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier, Federal Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development Gerd Müller and António Guterres of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) hosted the Berlin Conference on the Syrian Refugee Situation.\textsuperscript{1081} The conference, attended by representatives of approximately 40 countries and international organizations, was charged with determining ways in which the international community can more effectively aid Syrian refugees and countries neighboring Syria.\textsuperscript{1082}

As of December 2014, over 200,000 Syrian refugees had applied for asylum within the European Union (EU). Germany, together with Sweden, has responded to almost half of these requests.\textsuperscript{1083} According to the UNHCR, Germany is the largest recipient of asylum applications in the EU.\textsuperscript{1084}

Furthermore, on 31 March 2015 at the third International Pledging Humanitarian Conference for Syria and Syrian refugees in Kuwait, Germany’s federal government pledged a total funding amount

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1079} UNHCR welcomes Germany’s decision to extend Humanitarian Admission Programme to an additional 10,000 Syrian refugees. 12 June 2014. Accessed 21 May 2015. http://www.unhcr.org/539afe256.html
\end{itemize}
of EUR255 million for humanitarian assistance in Syria and its neighboring countries.\textsuperscript{1085} Foreign Minister Steinmeier reiterated Germany’s leading role in humanitarian assistance to Syria and Syrian refugees as they have pledged more than EUR 1 billion in total since 2012 making the country one of the largest donors to the Syrian refugee cause.\textsuperscript{1086}

Thus, the Government of Germany has been awarded a score of +1 for its direct support to countries hosting Syrian refugees by alleviating the refugee burden by committing to admit a relatively significant number of asylum seekers.

\textit{Analyst: Madeleine Million-Osborne}

**Italy: +1**

Italy has fully complied with its commitment to support countries bearing the burden of Syrian refugee inflows in accordance with the 3RP standards outlined by the UNHCR and UNDP.

Italy and the EU have created a constitutive agreement for the first ever EU Regional Trust, with Italy being the first donor.\textsuperscript{1087} This start-up fund, named \textit{Madad}, combines EUR20 million from the EU and EUR3 million from Italy and aims to support the regional countries of Lebanon, Turkey, Jordan, Iraq and Egypt as well as Syria per the 3RP principles. The Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Italy Paolo Gentiloni stated: "I am convinced that this new instrument will effectively improve the quality of the assistance provided to refugees, host communities and Governments affected by the Syrian crisis.

Italy has also pledged support to the International Labour Organization (ILO) for its programs in Lebanon focusing specifically on Syrian refugees.\textsuperscript{1088} As part of the Lebanon Crisis Response Plan, the country has pledged to donate USD500,000 for the ‘Enabling Job Resilience and Protecting Decent Work Conditions in Rural Communities affected by the Syrian Refugee Crisis in Northern Lebanon’ program.\textsuperscript{1089} This directs funding towards unemployed youth, farmers and agricultural workers within the refugee population and surrounding communities in Lebanon.

Thus, Italy has been awarded a score of +1 for directly supporting countries hosting Syrian refugees, in accordance with the 3RP objectives.

\textit{Analyst: Archana Ravichandradeva}

**Japan: 0**

Japan has partially complied with its commitment to providing direct support to countries hosting Syrian refugees, in accordance with the objectives of the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP).


Japan has demonstrated its willingness to engage in conversation about alleviating the struggle of Syrian refugees in the past few years. It has been in attendance in a number of conferences convened for that purpose, including the Third International Humanitarian Pledging for Syria. In the months prior to the Brussels Conference of June 2014, the Japanese government had already extended short-term assistance in public health, sanitation and food, as well as medium and long-term assistance for empowerment of women and children, and education.\textsuperscript{1090} With regard to the alleviation of the burden placed on Syria’s neighbours, Japan has offered help in the form of emergency aid and loans, and in some cases in the form of food items, particularly to the states of Iraq, Lebanon, Turkey and Jordan.

In July 2014, a month following the Brussels Conference, Japanese lawmakers pledged to work across partisan lines in order to establish a school in a region of Turkey affected by the influx of refugees. The group, led by former Defense Minister Yuriko Koike, raised funds to transform a house in southern Turkey into a school, in cooperation of a Turkish Non-Governmental Organization. Teachers recruited from among the Syrian refugees will teach classes in Arabic at the school.\textsuperscript{1091}

In September of that same year, the Japanese government extended an emergency aid grant of USD22.7 million (the equivalent of JPY2.2 billion) to Iraq and Lebanon. The money went towards providing emergency shelters and relief items for refugees from Syria and Iraq, as well as Internally Displaced Persons. At this time, the total aid given by the government towards the cause of supporting the refugees totaled nearly USD25 million.\textsuperscript{1092}

In early 2015, following the murder by the Islamic State of Syria and the Levant of a Japanese national, the Japanese Prime Minister reaffirmed the state’s commitment to send humanitarian aid to the region.\textsuperscript{1093} In late January, towards this end, Prime Minister Abe announced the newly established Three-Pillar Foreign Policy in Response to the Terrorist Incident Regarding the Murder of Japanese, promising expanded humanitarian assistance in the areas of food and medical supplies.\textsuperscript{1094}

In late March of the same year, to further the Three-Pillar Foreign Policy announced in January, the government further committed to three important steps. Firstly, the Foreign Minister offered USD116 million to Syrian refugees and Internally Displaced Persons. Secondly, the Japanese government extended USD6 million in emergency aid for Syrian refugees and Internally Displaced Peoples, through the United Nations World Food Program. The goal was to alleviate the shortage of food following the Cold Wave of the 2014-2015 winter, through the winterization of food items.


Finally, there was an offer of USD370 million in loans to improve the infrastructure of local communities in Turkey affected by the surge of refugees.\textsuperscript{1095}

While Japan has complied with its commitment to the alleviation of the burden placed on Syria’s neighbouring states, there is one area in which it has been criticized for its lack of action. Despite the many millions donated by the government, the state has been reluctant to take in refugees into its own borders. In November 2014, the United Nations Commissioner for Human Rights remarked that while over 3000 individuals had applied for refugee status in the past year, only six had been granted it. The Japanese Justice Ministry claims that fleeing a conflict does not render one a refugee, under the international definition of refugee.\textsuperscript{1096} Instead, individuals are given residence permits — this does not allow them the same security as a refugee (they are not able to make use of the educational opportunities the government has in place for refugees, and they cannot bring their family into the country).\textsuperscript{1097} However, with pressure from Non-Governmental Organizations as well as the international community, the Japanese government appears to be taking steps towards reform. The Justice Ministry is currently reviewing the process by which it accepts asylum seekers, with recommendations from the UNHCR.\textsuperscript{1098}

Since the G8 conference of June 2014, the Japanese government has taken many steps (both in rhetoric and in practice) to alleviate the burden placed on Syria’s neighbouring states. This aid has taken the form of emergency aid, foodstuffs, as well as loans for infrastructural reform. However, Japan has failed to contribute to the resettlement of Syrian refugees.

Thus, Japan is awarded a score of 0 for partial compliance to its commitment to provide direct support to countries hosting Syrian refugees.

\textit{Analyst: Priyanka Soundranayagam}

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom is awarded a score of +1 for fully complying with its commitment to support countries bearing the burden of Syrian refugee inflows in accordance with the 3RP standards outlined by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

The United Kingdom has been a strong source of financial support for the current crisis in Syria in past years. In terms of monetary contributions, the government has made available approximately GBP600 million in humanitarian donations. Since the United Kingdom’s involvement, food has been provided for approximately 188,000 people, clean water has been provided for close to 1,000,000 people and medical services in the form of consultants have been provided for almost 250,000 people.\textsuperscript{1099}


Moreover, the United Kingdom has addressed the needs of the most vulnerable persons inside refugee camps. The UK relocated people such as children, torture victims, and persons with disabilities to sanctuary outside of the conflict zone, thus alleviating some of the strain on the resources of nations hosting hundreds of thousands of Syrian refugees.\(^{1100}\)

However, the UK is one of the countries that has been singled out for its slow response to the UN’s call for joining the international programme of resettling Syrian refugees. The government declined to join last year, and instead began its own programme called the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Relocation (VPR) scheme, in which it pledged to admit 500 refugees. Amnesty International commented that the UK “has only settled 143 Syrian refugees … the sheer magnitude of this crisis means that financial aid alone is not enough.”\(^{1101}\)

Despite insufficient efforts to resettle Syrian refugees, the UK remains the second largest donor to the humanitarian crisis in Syria. Thus, it has been awarded a score of +1.

**Analyst: Elliot Borins**

**United States: +1**

The United States of America is in full compliance with its commitment to support countries bearing the burden of Syrian refugee inflows in accordance with the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP) standards outlined by the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

The United States has been committed to lessening the strain felt by nations from an increase of Syrian refugees since the beginning of the conflict. From 2011 to 2015, the United States government has provided over USD 3 billion in funding to the Syrian humanitarian response.\(^{1102}\) In the 2015 fiscal year, the government provided USD777,548,992\(^{1103}\) in assistance to Syria and Neighbouring Countries. USAID and the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) have provided a total of USD40,833,214\(^{1104}\) to assist partner organizations with implementing initiatives on the ground in Syria. USD17,500,000 was provided to UNICEF, a partner organization to USAID, to implement activities for health, humanitarian coordination and information management, and WASH.\(^{1105}\) In addition, USAID/OFDA provided more than USD12 million to NGO partners for logistics support and relief commodities, nutrition, shelter and settlements, health, agriculture and food security, and economic recovery and market systems.

12 September 2014, Secretary of State John Kerry announced an additional USD500 million in humanitarian aid.\(^{1106}\) The increased funding would allow the United States Government to further

---


strengthen and enhance their programs on the ground. In Iraq, the new additional funding allows for pre-existing infrastructure projects such as the provision of water and sanitation services to continue. In addition, this increase will assist UNICEF in keeping vulnerable refugee youth healthy with access to adequate vaccinations and medical care. In Turkey, increased funding will assist in addressing humanitarian protection needs for Syrian refugees in Turkish camps. In Lebanon, the additional funds will support job placement and expand vocational training to empower women.\footnote{1107}

The United States has remained committed to providing aid in Syria and assisting neighbouring states with high influxes of refugees. On 31 March 2015, US Ambassador to the United Nations Samantha Power announced that the US would provide an additional USD508 million in assistance to those affected by the conflict in Syria.\footnote{1108} In addition to supporting host governments and communities coping with the strain of supporting Syrian refugees, the additional funding would support the initiatives of both international and non-governmental organizations such as UNHCR, WFP, UNICEF, and the Red Cross. The announcement to increase funding comes after the United States Government provided more than USD1.5 billion in aid in fiscal year 2014.\footnote{1109}

Thus, the United States has been awarded a score of +1 for fully complying with its commitment to supporting countries hosting Syrian refugees, in accordance with the 3RP objectives.

\textit{Analyst: Daoun Abouchere}

\section*{European Union: +1}

The European Union is in full compliance with its commitment to support countries bearing the burden of Syrian refugee inflows in accordance with the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP) standards outlined by the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

The EU has been one of the primary supporters of the Syrian humanitarian aid efforts.\footnote{1110} Since the start of the conflict in 2011, the EU has donated more than EUR3.35 billion in development and humanitarian aid.\footnote{1111} The EU’s funding provides medical emergency relief, protection, sanitation and hygiene and health services to those affected by the situation in Syria. In 2015, the EU increased funding for humanitarian assistance by EUR136 million.\footnote{1112} The extra funding will be split amongst assisting those in need inside Syria and the other half to Syrian refugees and host communities in neighbouring countries.\footnote{1113} Furthermore, over the next two years through a new comprehensive

\begin{footnotesize}
\end{footnotesize}
strategy, the European Union plans to include EUR1 billion in funding.\textsuperscript{1114} This new strategy is helping increase the effectiveness of EU initiatives and the EU’s commitment and solidarity to aiding Syrian people.

Through the European Union’s Emergency Response Coordination system, several member states including Denmark, France, Hungary, Italy, Sweden, Slovakia, Norway, Austria, and Luxembourg have provided direct assistance to Syria and neighbouring countries. The assistance has been in the form of providing vital emergency food assistance, safe water, emergency medical supplies, shelter needs, and protection to refugees.

The European Union has partnered with several organizations to ensure effective assistance reaches the people most in need. The European Commission’s Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection department (ECHO) in partnership with the World Food Program is providing food assistance to more than four million people per month inside Syria.\textsuperscript{1115} In addition, ECHO along with the Norwegian Refugee Council are providing shelter support vouchers for over 1000 households within the Erbil community.\textsuperscript{1116} The vouchers can be used to purchase sanitation materials, kerosene heaters, and small household appliances.\textsuperscript{1117} The European Union will continue to provide humanitarian aid to those affected by the crisis and ensure recovery assistance and basic services are available both in Syria and neighbouring countries.\textsuperscript{1118}

Thus, the European Union has been awarded a score of +1 for directly supporting countries hosting Syrian refugees, in accordance with the 3RP objectives.

\textit{Analyst: Daouii Abouchere}


“We reaffirm our support for a free, prosperous and democratic Libya which will play its role in promoting regional stability.”

*Brussels G7 Summit Declaration*

### Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>−1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>−1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>−1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>−0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Background

Since the 2011 and the Arab Spring movement, political struggle has slowed the establishment of stable democratic institutions and peace in Libya. At the 2011 Deauville Summit, during the Libyan Civil War, the G8 Leaders demanded the “immediate cessation of the use of force against civilians” by the regime of Muammar Gaddafi, and committed to “supporting a political transition that reflects the will of the Libyan people.”

At the 2012 Camp David Summit, following the end of the Gaddafi regime and the establishment of Libya’s National Transitional Council, the G8 leaders made no specific commitments in Libya but stated that “the international community remains committed to actively support the consolidation of the new Libyan institutions.”

The leaders reaffirmed their commitment to support regional efforts towards “economic reform, open government, and trade, investment and integration.” At the Lough Erne summit in 2013, the G8 leaders commended the progress made in the successful elections of August 2012. They focused on ensuring the persistence of new democratic institutions, urging Libyans to “engage with the political process of reconciliation and constitutional reform through peaceful and inclusive means, underpinned by respect for the rule of law.”

The collapse of central government and the return of militia warfare in 2014 has limited the reach of G8 commitments.

---

1120 G8 Camp David Leaders Communiqué, G8 Information Centre (Toronto) 2012, Date of Access: 2 March 2015. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2012campdavid/g8-declaration.html
1121 G8 Camp David Leaders Communiqué, G8 Information Centre (Toronto) 2012, Date of Access: 2 March 2015. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2012campdavid/g8-declaration.html
Commitment Features
Support is understood as the enactment of measures that conduce to the furtherance of a goal. For the four aspects of the commitment: freedom, prosperity, democracy and regional stability, the enactment of any measure that contributes to their achievement or strengthening constitutes support for that goal.

Support for a “free … Libya” should be understood as enacting measures that support the promulgation and enforcement of laws that defend human, civil and political rights. Libya is a signatory to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Therefore, the content of that treaty constitutes a useful benchmark against which to assess support for “freedom.”

The commitment emphasizes support for measures that contribute to bringing about democracy, freedom and prosperity in Libya. Measures that attempt to achieve one of these three goals cannot exclude the development of the others. For example, targeted investments to political parties or other special interest groups could further total prosperity but degrade the quality of democracy in the region. This would constitute non-compliance.

The G8 Leaders’ commitment focuses explicitly on the restoration of regional security. Measures that contribute to democracy, freedom and prosperity can promote domestic and regional stability indirectly. The centrality of the Leaders’ commitment to regional stability as an extension of their commitment to Libya suggests that a fully compliant country makes the achievement of regional stability an explicit part of its support for Libya.

For example, partial compliance would occur if a member dispatched advisers to Libya to help train police and judicial officers in interpreting new national laws, but that member did not explicitly state a connection between that measure’s purported effect and regional stability.

As a result, G7 members must either enact policies that target both domestic stability in Libya and in the region at large, or individual policies that target Libyan domestic stability and regional stability separately.

Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member introduces no measures to support the development of freedoms, prosperity or democracy in Libya OR member introduces measures that exclude the achievement of other parts of the commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member introduces measures that support the development of freedoms, prosperity and democracy in Libya BUT does not introduce measures to further regional security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member introduces measures that support the development of freedoms, prosperity and democracy in Libya AND introduces measures to further regional security.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada: 0

Canada has partially complied with its commitment to reaffirm its support for a free, prosperous and democratic Libya which will play its role in promoting regional stability.

On 13 November 2014, following terrorist attacks in Libya, including attacks in the vicinities of the embassies of Egypt and the United Arab Emirates, Canadian Foreign Minister John Baird stated, “These cowardly attacks only reinforce our determination to continue supporting the Libyan people.

---

We join Libyans in rejecting terrorism and reiterating our full support of the efforts … to fostering an inclusive political dialogue and bringing an end to the current crisis.”

On January 27 2015, Baird stated “Canada is outraged at today’s terrorist attack on the Corinthia Hotel in Tripoli, Libya, which left several people killed and other injured. This cowardly and reprehensible attack illustrated the readiness of extremists to capitalize on the instability in Libya and their firm opposition to a peaceful, secure and prosperous Libya.”

In 2015, the Embassy of Canada to Libya partnered with International Medical Corps to provide relief aid for families in Benghazi displaced by recent clashes. This was partly funded by the Canada Fund for Local Initiatives. On 28 February 2015, aid kits were delivered to more than 1,000 Libyans.

Canada has contributed to the furtherance of its G7 commitments with respect to Libya, but has made no substantive effort to promote regional security. Therefore, Canada has been awarded a score of 0.

**Analyst: Jennifer Commissio**

**France: –1**

France has not complied in taking measures that support a free, prosperous and democratic Libya, which would ultimately play its role in promoting regional stability.

On 21 October 2014, the governments of France, Germany, Italy the United Kingdom and the United States released a joint statement that condemned the ongoing violence in Libya and called for the immediate cessation of hostilities: “We consider that Libya’s security challenges and the fight against terrorist organization can only be sustainably addressed by regular armed forces under the control of a central authority which is accountable to a democratic and inclusive parliament.”

On 17 February 2015, France, alongside Italy, Germany, Spain, the UK and the US, released a joint statement condemning all acts of terrorism in Libya. It stated that “the United Nations-led process to establish a national unity government provides the best hope for Libyans to address the terrorist threat and to confront the violence and instability that impedes Libya’s political transition and development.”

---


Beyond simply condemning actions of terrorism, France has not put forth measures to substantially support the three aforementioned means to promote stability in the region. Therefore France has received a score of −1.

Analyst: Jennifer Commisso

Germany: −1

Germany has not complied with its commitment to support the development of freedom, prosperity, and democracy in Libya or to promote regional security thereby. It has confined its activities to rhetorical support.

On 9 February 2015, at the EU Foreign Affairs Council meeting, Federal Foreign Minister Frank Walter Steinmeier expressed his support for the dialogue process facilitated by the United Nations Special Representative, which aims to include political dialogue within Libya.\(^{1130}\)

On 16 March 2015, Steinmeier travelled to Brussels for the EU Foreign Affairs Council meeting. He emphasized that once Libya reached a government of national unity and security measures had been fulfilled, Germany would provide additional support.\(^{1131}\)

Germany has expressed its support for the UNSMIL and forward political dialogue in order to promote regional stability, but has not introduced any measures specific to the furtherance of the commitment. Therefore, Germany has been awarded a compliance score of −1.

Analyst: Alexander Marshall

Italy: +1

Italy has fully complied with its commitment to promote freedom, prosperity, and democracy in Libya, and has proposed measures to help improve the stability of both political and military bodies in the region immediately surrounding Libya.

Italy is faced with an especially complex situation due to its “geopolitical role and location” in relation to Libya.\(^{1132}\) Human trafficking is a major problem in Libya and Italy is the most common destination for those smuggled. Italy’s primary objective with respect to Libya has been finding solutions to the issue of human trafficking, which is largely the consequence of the turmoil and instability currently afflicting Libya.

As of April 2015, Italy is housing approximately 70,000 migrants from Libya.\(^{1133}\) European authorities are actively seeking ways to address this situation: there has been a proposal to provide funding to countries surrounding Libya to house and care for migrants before they leave for Italy.\(^{1134}\) Italy has also given consideration to setting up U.N.-sponsored refugee camps in Tunisia, Sudan and Niger in order to protect migrants and assess their refugee claims there so as to prevent them from


making the journey to Italy for naught. This has the capacity both to increase regional stability by increasing the diplomatic presence of European countries in unstable areas and to protect Libyans who are fleeing internal violence.

On 22 April 2015, Italian Defense Minister Roberta Pinotti revealed that there are “contingency plans for military intervention against smugglers in Libya,” and added that Italy would be prepared to lead such an operation if it were supported by the United Nations.

By disrupting people smuggling outside Libya, Italy has been contributing to weakening the factions that compromise prosperity, freedom and democracy within Libya. Since the Brussels Summit Italy has led an EU-backed Operation Triton, a “frontier control operation.” Italian Prime Minister Matteo Renzi has “called for EU leaders to approve three key proposals,” which include “doubling the resources and assets of the current EU border patrol mission,” as well as eliminating the vessels of traffickers and improving the coherence within the EU for transferring and protecting migrants who are seeking asylum. Renzi also called on the European Union to substantially increase its funding of “sea and air patrolling of the Mediterranean,” noting that the current annual budget for such an operation is EUR40 million, as compared to the EU’s total annual budget of EUR145 billion.

Italy has made efforts to mitigate the infringement of freedoms in Libya, and has made proposals that will improve upon this. It has also suggested measures to the European Union and the United Nations that can further promote regional stability. Therefore, Italy has been awarded a +1 rating.

Analyst: Matthew Boissonneault

Japan: -1

Japan has not built on the G7’s Brussels Summit commitment to further the prospects of peace and stability in Libya. Unlike many European countries that have closed embassies in Libya, Japan retains an embassy in Tripoli. This suggests a willingness to encourage diplomatic relations and action in Libya. Japan has been a part of meetings about Libya, such as the meetings for the International Contact Group for Libya. However, it has not followed its attendance with substantive efforts.

The only measures Japan has taken have been in the area surrounding Libya. On 22 April 2014, Japan doubled a development loan to Jordan, an effort to provide regional support to “moderate”

---

Middle Eastern countries in order to combat ISIL and promote regional stability.\textsuperscript{1141} These measures were not explicitly connected to Libya.

Though Japan condemns violence in Libya, its noncompliance yields a score of $-1$.

\textit{Analyst: Eliza Coogan}

\textbf{United Kingdom: 0}

The United Kingdom has partially complied with its commitment to support a free and democratic Libya.

Since the 2014 Brussels Summit, the UK has vocalized the importance of promoting stability and prosperity in Libya. With other Western powers, the United Kingdom has publicly denounced violence in Libya and called for a diplomatic solution in response.\textsuperscript{1142}

In 2014, only one development and aid program was initiated for Libya by the UK. It promised to “improve security and justice services by providing the government of Libya with technical assistance.”\textsuperscript{1143} This action was promised before the Brussels Summit and since said Summit, the UK has produced no new development projects targeting Libya.

In fact, only two months after the Summit, the UK closed its embassy in Tripoli, Libya. The UK has said that this, along with its aforementioned lack of development projects, is due to the increased conflict in Libya.\textsuperscript{1144}

However, in late 2014, the United Kingdom launched a training program for Libyan army cadets to improve domestic security. This program, while unsuccessful, represented a substantive attempt to further its G7 goal.\textsuperscript{1145} The UK has more recently declared that the solution to issues in Libya should not be pursued by military means.\textsuperscript{1146}

The United Kingdom has made no explicit effort to bring security to the region as a whole through its Libya policies. Therefore, the United Kingdom has been awarded a score of 0.

\textit{Analyst: Eliza Coogan}

\textbf{United States: +1}

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to developing freedom, prosperity, and democracy in Libya, as well as to fostering increased stability in the region.

\textit{Analyst: Eliza Coogan}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
The United States has “emphasized political reconciliation rather than military force as the solution for Libya’s conflict,”1147 and claims that financial and institutional support “is available for the Libyans as they need it.”1148 It has asserted that any aid given will be ineffective until a political resolution is reached and a new parliament is seated, and is thus reluctant to intervene.1149

USAID, the “lead U.S Government agency that works to end extreme global poverty and enable resilient, democratic societies,” has continued to distribute “emergency relief supplies, including food, water and emergency trauma kits” to the most severely damaged areas of Libya.1150 USAID has also contributed to the World Health Organization’s “emergency health response,” as well as providing the necessary measures to ensure that “critical health care services remain available throughout the conflict.”1151 This includes providing nurses, training Libyan nurses and providing support to field hospitals and trauma centres.1152

For the 2015 Fiscal Year, USAID has requested that USD9.5 million be earmarked for programs in Libya “to help consolidate democratic reforms” through capacity-building and supporting electoral process.1153

The United States has a long-time partnership with Egypt, one of Libya’s bordering states. The US has provided Egypt with substantial economic and military support because Egypt is seen as a key actor for stability in the region.1154 Over the past two years, the United States has also supported counter-terrorism training in Tunisia, another border state.1155 This is indicative of a concerted effort on the part of the United States government to foster stability in the region surrounding Libya.

The United States has made efforts to increase regional stability by maintaining a strong partnership with Egypt, and by sponsoring counter-terrorism training missions in North Africa. Thus, it has been given a rating of +1, which indicates full compliance with their commitment to Libya.

*Analyst: Matthew Boissonneault*

**European Union: 0**

The European Union has partially complied with its commitment to reaffirm its support for a free, prosperous and democratic Libya. It has not made explicit efforts to further regional stability.

On 25 October 2014, the Head of the European Union delegation to Libya, Nataliya Apostolova, reiterated calls for serious and constructive engagement with the Libyan Political Dialog launched in

---
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Ghadames on 29 September. She further called for an immediate and unconditional cessation of hostilities.¹¹⁵⁶

On 27 October 2014, Ambassador Apostolova met with Prime Minister Abdullah Al-Thinni and other members of the Libyan government. She assured the Libyan Government of the EU’s continued support and its transition to a modern and democratic state based on the rule of law, good governance and the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Ambassador Apostolova also reiterated the EU’s recognition of the Libyan House of Representatives as the sole legislative authority in Libya and stated that no parallel entity or authority in Libya, outside of that democratic and legal institutional framework, would be recognized.¹¹⁵⁷

On 14 January 2015, a round of political dialogue was launched under the auspices of the UN Special Representative for Libya, Bernardino Leon. There, the European Union Heads of Mission to Libya reaffirmed their full commitment for a united, inclusive, peaceful and prosperous Libya through the efforts of the SRSG. The EU ambassadors affirmed that there is no military solution and that transparent dialogue is the only way forward.¹¹⁵⁸

On 23 and 24 March 2015, the European Union hosted a meeting of thirty-four Libyan mayors and local leaders in order to encourage political dialogue as part of the UN-led Libyan Political Dialogue.¹¹⁵⁹

The European Union has taken steps to further its support and Libya’s transition to a modern and democratic state, but it has not taken concrete steps to promote regional security. Therefore, the European Union has been awarded a compliance score of 0.

Analyst: Alexander Marshall


