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“We have meanwhile set up a process and there are also independent institutions monitoring which objectives of our G7 meetings we actually achieve. When it comes to these goals we have a compliance rate of about 80%, according to the University of Toronto. Germany, with its 87%, comes off pretty well. That means that next year too, under the Japanese G7 presidency, we are going to check where we stand in comparison to what we have discussed with each other now. So a lot of what we have resolved to do here together is something that we are going to have to work very hard at over the next few months. But I think that it has become apparent that we, as the G7, want to assume responsibility far beyond the prosperity in our own countries. That’s why today’s outreach meetings, that is the meetings with our guests, were also of great importance.”

Chancellor Angela Merkel, Schloss Elmau, 8 June 2015
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Preface

Each year since 1996, the G7 and G8 Research Group has produced a compliance report on the progress made by the G7/8 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 G7/8 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 G7/8 more transparent and accessible, and to provide scientific data to enable meaningful analysis of this unique and informal institution. Compliance reports are available at the 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 an global network of scholars, students and professionals. The group oversees the G7 Information Centre, which publishes freely available research on the G7/8 as well as official documents issued by the G7/8.

For the 2015 Final Compliance Report, 21 priority commitments were selected from the 376 commitments made at the Schloss Elmau Summit, hosted by Germany from 7 to 8 June 2015. This report assesses the results of compliance with those commitments as of 6 May 2016.

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 G7 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 Research Group, such as the “briefing book” produced by Newsdesk Media or the pre-summit conferences sponsored by various institutions.

The work of the G7 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 Michael Humeniuk, chair of summit studies, as well as the co-directors of the Compliance Unit: Jerome Newton, Christian Medeiros, and Kaleem Hawa. 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 report.

John Kirton
Director, G7 Research Group
Research Team
Professor John Kirton, Director, G7 Research Group
Michael Humeniuk, Chair, Summit Studies
Jerome Newton, Co-director, Compliance Unit
Christian Medeiros, Co-director, Compliance Unit
Kaleem Hawa, Co-director, Compliance Unit

Analysts

Lead Analysts:
Humayun Ahmed
Sarah Beard
Amelia Cook
Emma De Leeuw
Thomas Feore
Ben Fickling
Sophia Glish
Sarah Harrison
Christine Jacob
Maria Monica Layarda
Hayden Rodenkirchen
Narain Yucel

Analysts:
Neel Aery
Raajan Aery
Christelle Ah Sen
Sabal al Khateeb
Nick Allard
Camille Beaudoin
Justin Bedi
David Browne
Alexander Cadmus
Steven Camit
Asic Chen
Nicholas Chong
Nabha Chowdhury
Tea Cimini
Raheeb Dastagir
Kendra Dempsey
Karim Fawzy
Meng Fei Cathy Li
Leila Martin
Rachel Maeve Mcleod
Riam Kim McLeod
Zachary Medeiros
Yalda Mehran
Mitch Mittelstaedt
Sarah Millman
Barida Monavari
Jody Mou
John Nicholson
Madison Phillips
Anthony Piruzza
Seemi Qaisar
Joseph Ramlochand
Tamsyn Riddle
Aidan Robern
Thomas Robson
Tyler Rogerson
Sarah Sgamelluri
Sanjanah Shah
Raafia Shahid
Kristen Shi
Mathiew Sitaya
Tania Sleman
Val Steckle
Michael Switzer
Sarah Tan
Fatin Tawfig
Yilin Tian
Hunter Vogel
Tina Vulevic
Michael Warchol
Friederike Wilke
Angela Xie
Genevieve Zingg
Executive Summary
The University of Toronto G7 Research Group’s Final Compliance Report on the 2015 Schloss Elmau Summit assesses the compliance of the G7 members with 21 priority commitments of the 376 commitments they made at their summit in Germany on 7-8 June 2015. These selected commitments reflect the breadth of the summit agenda. The analysis covers actions taken by G7 members since the day after the summit until 6 May 2016. The commitments are listed in Table A.

The Final Compliance Score
Compliance is measured on a three-point scale. A score of +1 indicates full compliance with a commitment, a score of 0 indicates partial compliance or a work in progress, and a score of −1 indicates non-compliance as in a failure to comply or action taken that is directly opposite to the commitment.

The average final compliance scores are listed in Table B.

During the assessment period of 9 June 2015 to 6 May 2016, the average compliance score was +0.68 (84%), an increase from the score of +0.60 (80%) from the Interim Compliance Report, which assessed compliance at the midway point between the Schloss Elmau Summit in 2015 and the Ise Shima Summit on 26-27 May 2016. It is also an increase from the final score of +0.63 (82%) for the 2014 Brussels Summit.

Compliance by Member
The European Union is ranked first, with a compliance score of +1.00 (100%), followed by Germany at +0.90 (95%), the United Kingdom at +0.86 (93%) and the United States (+0.81/90%) (see Table C). These four members have maintained their ranking from the 2014 Brussels Summit compliance report. France’s score was equal to the average of +0.67/83%. Japan and Canada (+0.48/74% each) and Italy (+0.24/62%) had below average scores.

Compliance by Commitment
The commitment to tackle the causes of refugee crises ranked first at +1.00 (100%) (see Table D). The commitment with the second highest compliance score at +0.88 (94%) was on macroeconomic policy to foster growth. This was followed by nine commitments (infrastructure investment, fiscal flexibility, the growth agenda, Ukraine, maritime security, migrant protection, health response coordination, national action plans on health, and the advancement of the Copenhagen Accord on climate change) with a score of +0.75 (88%).

The lowest-scoring commitment was on nonproliferation with respect to the Arms Trade Treaty (at +0.25/63%).

The Compliance Gap Between Members
The results from the 2015 Schloss Elmau Summit show a difference of 0.76 between the highest and lowest compliance scores. This gap is significantly larger than in previous years, although lower than the 0.83 of the interim compliance report. The spread was 0.44 in 2014 and 0.45 in 2013.

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 2015–16 period, which spans from 9 June 2015, immediately following the 2015 Schloss Elmau Summit, to 6 May 2016. 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: 2015 Priority Commitments Selected for Assessment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>“To ensure that G7 countries operate at the technological frontier in the years ahead, we will foster growth by promoting education.” (G7 Elmau Schloss Summit Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>“[To ensure that G7 countries operate at the technological frontier in the years ahead, we will foster growth by] promoting quality infrastructure investment to address shortfalls through effective resource mobilization in partnership with the private sector” (G7 Elmau Schloss Summit Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>“We will continue to implement our fiscal strategies flexibly to take into account near-term economic conditions, so as to support growth and job creation, while putting debt as a share of GDP on a sustainable path.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>“The G7 commits to putting [protection of our climate] at the centre of our growth agenda.” (G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>“We will address the specific needs of women entrepreneurs, e.g. by promoting their access to finance, markets, skills, leadership opportunities and networks.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>“We commit to strongly promoting automatic exchange of information on cross-border tax rulings.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>“We reiterate our commitment to work with developing countries on the international tax agenda” (G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>“[Based on our common values and principles we are committed to:] Strengthening the System of Multilateral Treaties/Arms Trade Treaty” (G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>“[Based on our common values and principles we are committed to:] Tackling Causes for Refugee Crises.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>“We reiterate our full support for the efforts to find a diplomatic solution to the conflict in eastern Ukraine, particularly in the framework of the Normandy format and the Trilateral Contact Group” (G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>“We are committed to maintaining a rules-based order in the maritime domain based on the principles of international law, in particular as reflected in the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea” (G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>“[We reaffirm our commitment to] combat the trafficking of migrants” (G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>“We reaffirm our commitment to effectively implement the established international framework for the freezing of terrorists’ assets, and will facilitate cross-border freezing requests among G7 countries.” (G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>“[The G7] will set up or strengthen mechanisms for rapid deployment of multidisciplinary teams of experts coordinated through a common platform.” (G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>“[We will] effectively implement our national action plans.” (G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>“We will stimulate … research focused on faster and targeted development of easily usable and affordable … vaccines.” (G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>“[We] commit to develop long term national low-carbon strategies.” (G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>“We reaffirm our strong commitment to the Copenhagen Accord to mobilizing jointly USD 100 billion a year by 2020 from a wide variety of sources, both public and private in the context of meaningful mitigation actions and transparency on implementation.” (G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>“We will … intensify our support particularly for vulnerable countries’ own efforts to manage climate change related disaster risk” (G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>“We reaffirm our support for Ukraine and other vulnerable countries in their ongoing efforts to reform and liberalize their energy systems.” (G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 339    | “We thus reaffirm our support for the consistent implementation of and strive to alignment of...
our own ODA-supported investments with the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT) and the CFS Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems” (Annex to the Leaders’ Declaration)

* For the full list of commitments, please contact the G7 Research Group at g8@utoronto.ca.
## Table B: 2015 G7 Schloss Elmau Final Compliance Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>European Union</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macroeconomic Policy: Fostering Growth</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macroeconomic Policy: Fiscal Flexibility</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure: Infrastructure Investment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Supporting Women Entrepreneurs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Regulation: AEOI</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Regulation: Tax Agenda</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism: Terrorists’ Assets</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonproliferation: Arms Trade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Security: Ukraine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Security: Maritime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights: Migrants</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development: Refugee Crisis</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health: Coordinated Rapid Deployment</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health: National Action Plans</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health: Vaccines</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change: Growth Agenda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change: Low-Carbon Strategies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change: Copenhagen Accord</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change: Vulnerable Countries</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy: Liberalizing Systems</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Agriculture: Voluntary Guidelines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compliance Average</strong></td>
<td>+0.48</td>
<td>+0.67</td>
<td>+0.90</td>
<td>+0.24</td>
<td>+0.48</td>
<td>+0.86</td>
<td>+0.81</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>+0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015 Interim Compliance Average</strong></td>
<td>+0.18</td>
<td>+0.59</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
<td>+0.18</td>
<td>+0.47</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
<td>+0.65</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>+0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2014 Final 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>+0.75</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>+0.81</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2013 Final Compliance Average</strong></td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>+0.39</td>
<td>+0.33</td>
<td>+0.33</td>
<td>+0.78</td>
<td>+0.72</td>
<td>+0.61</td>
<td>+0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2013 Interim Compliance Average</strong></td>
<td>+0.44</td>
<td>+0.44</td>
<td>+0.28</td>
<td>+0.28</td>
<td>+0.17</td>
<td>+0.56</td>
<td>+0.61</td>
<td>+0.61</td>
<td>+0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2012 Final Compliance Average</strong></td>
<td>+0.71</td>
<td>+0.65</td>
<td>+0.76</td>
<td>+0.29</td>
<td>+0.65</td>
<td>+0.65</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
<td>+0.59</td>
<td>+0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011 Final Compliance Average</strong></td>
<td>+0.67</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>+0.44</td>
<td>+0.33</td>
<td>+0.56</td>
<td>+0.61</td>
<td>+0.61</td>
<td>+0.61</td>
<td>+0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010 Final Compliance Average</strong></td>
<td>+0.61</td>
<td>+0.44</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>+0.17</td>
<td>+0.28</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>+0.56</td>
<td>+0.44</td>
<td>+0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C: 2015 G7 Schloss Elmau Final Compliance Scores by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>+0.39</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>+0.22</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>+0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+0.81</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>+0.61</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>+0.90</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>+0.39</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>+0.86</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>+0.78</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>+0.81</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>+0.65</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>+0.72</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>+0.67</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>+0.59</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>+0.48</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>+0.47</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>+0.44</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>+0.33</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>+0.48</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>+0.18</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>+0.69</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>+0.24</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>+0.18</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>+0.33</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>+0.68</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>+0.60</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>+0.52</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spread</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table D: 2015 G7 Schloss Elmau Final Compliance Scores by Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights: Migrants</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macroeconomic Policy: Fostering Growth</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development: Refugee Crisis</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure: Infrastructure Investment</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macroeconomic Policy: Fiscal Flexibility</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Security: Ukraine</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Security: Maritime</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health: Coordinated Rapid Deployment</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change: Copenhagen Accord</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health: Vaccines</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism: Terrorists' Assets</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health: National Action Plans</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Regulation: Automatic Exchange of Information</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change: Vulnerable Countries</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy: Liberalizing Systems</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Agriculture: Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Regulation: Tax Agenda</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Supporting Women Entrepreneurs</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change: Growth Agenda</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change: Low-Carbon Strategies</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonproliferation: Arms Trade</td>
<td>+0.25</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Average</td>
<td>+0.68</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Macroeconomic Policy: Foster Growth

“To ensure that G7 countries operate at the technological frontier in the years ahead, we will foster growth by promoting education.”

*G7 Elmau Schloss Summit Declaration*

### Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>0</td>
<td></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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Background

Economic growth has been one of the foremost concerns of the G7. According to the 2015 Elmau Leaders’ Declaration, G7 economies continue to face macroeconomic obstacles, such as “unemployment [that is] still too high … prolonged low inflation rates, weak investment and demands, high public and private debt, sustained internal and external imbalances, geopolitical tensions as well as financial market volatility.”

Education is recognized as a key factor in driving economic growth and combating structural economic weakness. As part of its efforts to surmount these problems, the G7 has identified education as a policy domain worthy of particular attention.

### Commitment Features

A member’s compliance with this commitment is determined by two components. The first is the promotion of education. The second is the fostering of future technological and economic growth through that promotion.

Therefore, full compliance requires member states to promote education. They must also incorporate the centrality of education to future technological and economic growth into their plans (or other means of “promotion”), because the advancement of education for its own sake fails to address the second criterion of the commitment.

---

The Leaders’ Declaration also cites “promoting ... innovation, protecting intellectual property rights, supporting private investment with a business friendly climate especially for small and medium-sized enterprises” and other investment-related actions as means to foster growth and keep abreast of new frontiers in technology. However, only measures geared at promoting education specifically are relevant to this commitment.7

The commitment states that compliance resides in the “promotion” of education. Thus, failure to implement specific policies to advance education does not, per se, constitute noncompliance. The “promotion” of education can include, but is not limited to, public statements acknowledging the importance of education to technological and economic growth, or dedication to keeping education-related issues on the list of a country’s priority political issues.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member does NOT progress towards promoting education for purposes of fostering technological and economic growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member makes progress towards promoting education, but does NOT do so explicitly for the purposes of fostering technological and economic growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member promotes education for the explicit purposes of fostering technological and economic growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lead Analyst: Humayun Ab Mend*

**Canada: +1**

Canada has fully complied with its commitment to advance education in order to foster technological and economic growth.

On 31 July 2015, the Honourable Michelle Rempel, Minister of State for Western Economic Diversification, announced two investments. The first, federal funding of CAD291,375, will enable Innovate Calgary, in partnership with the University of Calgary and SAIT Polytechnic, to establish the Kinetica Innovation Centre for high-tech start-up companies. The Center will work to develop technological solutions for the energy sector and actively promote student participation and entrepreneurship. The second investment of CAD297,500 “will support SAIT Polytechnic in the development of 3D virtual training modules for skilled trade workers, which will allow students to access training through a blended classroom and online distance learning experience. This investment will promote economic growth by helping to train workers for in-demand jobs in the skilled trades.”8

On 24 November 2015, Victor Dodig, Chief Executive of Canada’s CIBC bank, recognized Canada’s high overall participation rate in post-secondary education compared to other industrialized countries, while still criticizing it for not producing the types of skills to derive economic growth.9

On 14 January 2016, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau stated that the government needs to a “do a better job” and make sure that “Canada’s education system ... is meeting the challenges of the future.”10 Trudeau’s statement followed media remarks about Canada’s slowness to include coding and other computing skills as part of school curricula.

---


On 2 February 2016, Canada’s Consortium for Aerospace Research and Innovation in Canada (CARIC) and Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) announced the launch of three aerospace research projects in collaboration with the European Commission. Minister for Innovation, Science and Economic Development Navdeep Bains stated that the Canadian government “remains committed to supporting such collaborations as a way of inspiring new, innovative technologies that will help Canada continue its leadership in the aerospace industry.”

Therefore, Canada received a score +1 for promoting education for the explicit purposes of fostering technological and economic growth.

**France: +1**

France has fully complied with its commitment to promote education for the purpose of fostering technological and economic growth.

On 7 May 2015, President François Hollande announced a comprehensive national digital plan for education. The plan aims to provide digital devices and resources to 40 per cent of France’s 800,000 Grade 7 pupils by the 2016 school year, 70 per cent by 2017, and 100 per cent by 2018. This plan includes public investment of EUR1 billion over the next three years for research and development. In September 2015, as part of the plan, students and teachers from over 600 primary, middle, and secondary schools were provided with academic resources and services on individual mobile devices. Results from these large-scale experiments will be utilized to streamline and enhance the introduction of digital technology in schools across the country, effective 2016.

In February 2016, open source solutions firm SMILE and the Ecole privée des sciences informatiques (EPSI) announced the launch of the Open Source School. The School, which will open six campuses across France in September 2016, “is designed to help ease the current skills shortage in high-growth markets such as Big Data, the cloud, and Internet of Things and, more broadly, support the growing interest in Open Source technologies.” The Government of France has made an initial investment of EUR1.4 million as part of its Future Investment Program.

---

France has undertaken tangible measures in the promotion of education through the 2015 educational reform and digital plan for education, thereby demonstrating its dedication to keeping education-related issues on its list of priority political issues. Thus, France has been awarded a score of +1 for complying with its commitment to promote education for the purposes of fostering technological and economic growth.

*Analyst: Angela Xie*

**Germany: +1**

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to promote education, economic growth and technological innovation.

In November 2015, the Bundestag approved the federal budget for the 2016 fiscal year.\(^{18}\) The budget included a EUR1.1 billion increase in funding to the Federal Ministry of Education and Research. The Ministry claimed that this “strengthened education and research as ... fields of priority.”\(^{19}\) Increases to funding include, inter alia, a 16 per cent increase in funding for advanced vocational training, a 9 per cent increase in funding for innovation assistance in the Länder of the former East Germany, and a 9 per cent increase in funding for “electronics systems” under the German government’s “High-Tech Strategy.”\(^{20}\)

Germany has invested in education with explicit regard to technological and economic goals. Therefore, it has been awarded a score of +1.

*Analyst: Tania Sleman*

**Italy: 0**

Italy has partially complied with its commitment to foster technological and economic growth through promoting education. Although substantial educational reform has taken place, these reforms do not explicitly demonstrate a commitment to technological advancement.

The Italian government demonstrated its commitment to promoting education in its “Good Schools” reform, passed in Italian parliament on 9 July 2015.\(^{21}\) Within this reform are four key areas that clearly demonstrate a commitment to educational reform in the interest of economic progress.

First, the reform redefines the process by which teacher salaries are awarded; instead of salaries that increase based off a teacher’s seniority, higher salaries are instead awarded on the basis of merit.\(^ {22}\) This demonstrates a commitment to economic progress by incentivizing teacher efficacy.

Second, the reform introduces an added measure of autonomy for individual schools by empowering school principals with the authority to evaluate, reward, and hire the teachers under them.\(^ {23}\) Through this measure of autonomy, Italy demonstrates its commitment to economic progress by streamlining its education administration network and, once again, creating — through the practice of rewarding effective teachers — an incentive for excellence in teaching.

---


Third, the reform creates approximately 100,000 full-time teaching positions — the exams for 63,712 of which have taken place in January 2016 — in order to strengthen the number and quality of Italian teachers.24 In addition, the reform has facilitated the transition of 90,000 temporary education workers to permanent positions.25 Through bolstering the ranks of its teachers in this way, Italy has demonstrated its commitment to the advancement of its education sector.

Fourth, the Italian government has allocated EUR3.2 billion to the creation and refurbishing of schools.26 Within this allocation are provisions that require students in secondary, professional, and technical education programs to spend a certain amount of time directly participating in the workplace.27 In providing material backing to the improvement of education facilities and by pre-emptively undertaking the transition of students to the workplace, Italy demonstrates sufficient compliance to upholding its commitment to advancing education in the interest of advancing its economy.

Italy has also made several strides where technological innovation is concerned. In January 2016, Cisco Systems announced several strategic commitments that involve investing $100 million and three years of time into training teachers and students through the Cisco Networking Academy, as well as a partnership with Invitalia Ventures — a group owned by the Italian Ministry of Economy28 — that will allow Cisco to invest in Italy's technological innovation.29 Shortly afterwards, Apple announced that it would open its first European application development center in Italy, and would partner with Italian organizations to provide teachers with a specialized curriculum geared at nurturing future developers.30 On 22 January 2016, Italy was selected as the official site for the sixth European Immersive Education Summit, where world-class academic and technical organizations will congregate.31 On 21 April 2016, Italy was the guest country of honour at the 2016 China International Technology Fair, where it will present 12 “smart city” innovation projects. 31 However, none of these projects have been expressly mobilized the Italian education system to boost technological and economic growth.

In sum, while Italy has shown itself to have adequately made strides in the way of its education and its technology, and while such strides have been in the interest of its economic prosperity, no clear commitment to utilizing the education system to further technology and economy has been made. As such, Italy has been awarded a score of 0.

Analyst: Michael Switzer

---

Japan: +1

Japan has fully complied with its commitment to promote education for the purposes of fostering technological and economic growth.

As part of a revitalization process, the Japanese government under Prime Minister Shinzo Abe is introducing several structural reforms and initiatives aimed at improving the education system.32 Foremost among these is a push for instruction of comprehensive English language education as early as the third grade, by 2020.33 An International Baccalaureate program is being introduced to Japanese high schools, and the government has created an international exchange program that it hopes will send 120,000 Japanese university students abroad by 2020.34

New subsidies are being introduced to increase funding to select Japanese universities, in an effort to make them more internationally competitive and raise their global rankings.35 The Abe government is putting a particular focus on scientific research and vocational training, in order to increase academic relevance and graduate students with more labour market viability.36 The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology has urged universities to adapt their curricula to better suit these aims, going so far as to publish a letter encouraging public universities to discontinue their economics, law, and liberal arts programs in favour of more directly labour-applicable ones.37 Conversely, shrinking Japanese demographics are presenting an obstacle for economic development and educational expansion.

Therefore, Japan receives a score of +1.

Analyst: Husain Jasim

United Kingdom: +1

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to promote education for the purposes of fostering technological and economic growth.

On 27 October 2015, the Education Committee of the House of Commons collaborated with the Business, Innovation and Skills Committee to publish the 1st Joint Special Report on Education, Skills and Productivity. In preparation for the report, the committees jointly commissioned research from the National Institute of Economic and Social Research. The report itself compared UK graduates’ contributions to productivity compared to those of the US, France and Germany, and concluded that the principal means of increasing worker contribution to productivity are “innovation” and “improvements to efficiency.”38

The UK has taken steps to prioritize education and support investment in both technology and innovation for the purpose of economic growth. Thus, the UK has received a score of +1 for full compliance.

*Analysts: Ahmed Hasan, Asic Chen, Nikita Gupta and Rachel Glowinsky*

**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to promote education in the direction of fostering technological and economical growth.

President Barack Obama has started “Computer Science for All,” which is a “bold new initiative to empower all American students from kindergarten through high school to learn computer science,” as stated on the White House’s website on 30 January 2016. The hope is to inspire students to be creators in their rapidly growing, technology-driven world. The President of the United States recognizes that our economy is shifting faster than ever, and computer science skills are a basic necessity for economic opportunity and growth.

In 2014, 65 million jobs belonged to the technology sector in America. Technology based jobs will only continue to grow as more technology is released to the public for use. On 29 March 2012, US officials said that jobs in the field of information technology (IT) would grow 22 per cent through 2020. The US Bureau of Labor Statistics projected the IT employment growth rate.

The President’s commitment requires USD4 billion in state funding, and USD100 million for school districts in his forthcoming budget to train teachers, and to provide access to exceptional educational resources. USD135 million in computer science funding is to be available, starting this year, from the National Science Foundation and the Corporation for National and Community Service.

On 30 January 2016, more than 30 school districts have committed to expand computer science opportunities. In addition to this, Microsoft and Code.org is offering to teach computer science to 25,000 teachers. Similarly, the US Department of Education has funded more than USD1 billion to increase awareness of computer science resources for out-of-school programs.

Therefore, the United States has been awarded a +1 for full compliance.

*Analyst: Arani Kulamurugan*

---


European Union: +1
The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to foster both technological and economic growth through the promotion of education.

Through its continued promotion of the Education and Training 2020 (ET2020) initiative — as demonstrated in the December 2015 Joint Report of the Council and the Commission on the implementation of the strategic framework for European cooperation in education and training — the European Union has clearly shown a commitment not only to furthering education, but also to technological progress as both a means to enhance education and as an outcome of effective education. One of the six priority areas proposed in the December 2015 Joint Report is promoting “Open and innovative education and training, including by fully embracing the digital era.” In calling for a style of education that highlights the importance of digital fluency, the European Union has displayed its commitment to advancing education and translating this advancement into the technological and economic playing field.

The European Union has further demonstrated its commitment to advancing its technology and economy through education by the work of its Erasmus+ program. In terms of how education would benefit the economy, the stated objectives within the January 2016 Erasmus+ Program Guide include “[Improving] the level of key competences and skills, with particular regard for their relevance for the labour market.” In terms of the role of education in technological advancement, the Program Guide references joint frameworks that aim to “improve the quality of education in maths and the natural sciences, and to increase the take-up of the subjects in upper secondary and higher education.”

As such, the European Union has demonstrated a commitment to promoting education in and of itself, and promoting education specifically for the sake of economic and technological advancement. Because of this, it has been awarded a score of +1 for full compliance.

 Analyst: Michael Switzer

---

2. Macroeconomic Policy: Fiscal Flexibility

“We will continue to implement our fiscal strategies flexibly to take into account near-term economic conditions, so as to support growth and job creation, while putting debt as a share of GDP on a sustainable path.”

*Elmau 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>+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>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></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>+0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Background

Fiscal flexibility is the notion that fiscal policy should become more flexible to respond better to developments in the economy as they arise.\(^{51}\) This flexibility can be accomplished in several ways. Most commonly, it involves applying the concept of central bank independence widely accepted in monetary policy to fiscal policy by having tax rates be set by a group of unelected officials.

When fiscal policy is left in the hands of politicians, election time horizons can influence tax cutting that, while attractive in the short term, creates problems for the economy later on. Changes to fiscal policy also take significant time when left to elected officials, and thus tax cuts sometimes respond too late to a slowdown and fail to remedy the impact of a recession. Many experts have suggested that fiscal flexibility via independent-agency management of fiscal policy should be pursued. Targeted job creation policies may also help rehabilitate fiscal policies.\(^{52}\) The concept of fiscal flexibility has thus far been explored in several G7 members, including Canada and the European Union.\(^{53,54}\)

### Commitment Features

This commitment largely consists of three parts:

1. Continuing to implement fiscal strategies flexibly for purposes of catering to short-term horizons;
2. Focusing fiscal flexibility on supporting growth and job creation, specifically; and
3. Planning ahead to make debt as a share of GDP sustainable

The commitment first suggests that members “continue to implement” flexible fiscal strategies. This implies that certain G7 members may already be exploring fiscal flexibility. It is thus important to ensure that this year’s compliance is assessed on the basis of measures implemented after the 2015 Elmau G7 Summit Declaration, and not before.
While fiscal flexibility is the primary goal of this commitment, focusing fiscal flexibility on supporting growth and job creation as well as debt as a share of gross domestic product (GDP) sustainability is a secondary goal. Thus, policies that speak specifically to growth, job creation, and debt as a share of GDP sustainability may be more comprehensive and targeted in the long term.

### Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member does not implement fiscal strategies flexibly OR integrate fiscal flexibility, growth, job creation, and debt as a share of GDP into future plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member makes some progress towards implementing fiscal strategies flexibly AND/OR integrating fiscal flexibility, growth, job creation, and debt as a share of GDP into future plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member well on the way to implementing fiscal strategies flexibly AND/OR integrating fiscal flexibility, growth, job creation, and debt as a share of GDP into future plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Canada: +1

Canada has fully complied with the commitment to implement flexible fiscal strategies.

Canada’s fiscal policy makers have focused on increased infrastructure spending in order to promote economic growth and job creation while maintaining a commitment to a declining ratio of gross domestic product (GDP) to debt in the long run.

On 15 September 2015, it was announced that Canada ran a budget surplus of CAD1.9 billion, despite a decline in government revenues stemming from falling oil prices. This was partially achieved by reducing the government’s contingency fund from a projected CAD3 billion to CAD1 billion. Additionally, CAD6.3 billion was raised through the sale of government assets.

In the Update of Economic and Fiscal Projections, Minister of Finance Bill Morneau renewed the Trudeau government’s pledge to balance the budget by 2019-2020 and to maintain a declining debt-to-GDP ratio throughout their mandate. The debt-to-GDP ratio is expected to fall from 30 per cent to 27 per cent by 2020. The renewal of this pledge occurred despite downgraded growth projections, which are estimated to reduce the budgetary balance by CAD6 billion per year.

On 7 December 2015, Morneau pledged “transformative investments in infrastructure and a new plan for a strong middle class.” As part of this promise, Morneau proposed a reduction in the tax rate from 22 per cent to 20.5 per cent for individuals making between CAD45,282 and CAD90,563 in yearly income. This tax cut would be funded by the creation of a 33 per cent tax bracket for individuals making upwards of CAD200,000 a year. Additionally, the cap on tax-free savings accounts will be reduced from CAD10 thousand to CAD5,500.

Moreover, Canada has vowed to increase its infrastructure spending by CAD5 billion over the next two years with the goal of spending an additional CAD60 billion on infrastructure within the next 10 years. This expenditure has been earmarked for projects with long-term benefits, including public transit, affordable

---

housing and childcare facilities. In order to finance this plan, Canada plans to run budgetary deficits of less than CAD10 billion over the next three years before returning to a balanced budget in 2019-2020. Despite downgraded growth projections for the Canadian economy, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau reiterated this pledge on 13 January.

Canada plans to invest CAD200 million in order to “support innovation and clean technologies in the forestry, fisheries, mining, energy, and agricultural sectors.” Moreover, the Canada Green Investment Bond will be established to fund renewable energy projects across the country.

As part of his plan to expand skills training, Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau has announced a CAD750 million increase in federal funding for training programs. Included in this policy pledge is a CAD500 million expansion in the Labour Market Development Agreements made between the federal government and Canada’s provinces and territories.

Canada plans to review departmental spending and close tax loopholes in order to return to a CAD1 billion budget surplus in the 2019-2020 fiscal year. This budget forecasting was projected without assuming that governmental infrastructure investment would have any positive impact on GDP growth, but has been called into question due to rapidly falling GDP growth projections.

Canada has thus been awarded a score of +1 for tailoring its fiscal policy towards the goals of economic growth, job creation and a declining GDP-to-debt ratio.

Anthony Piruzza

France: 0

France has partially complied with its commitment to implement flexible fiscal strategies.

France has not had a budget surplus since the 1970s, and continues to run a budget deficit below the 3 per cent of GDP limit, imposed by the EU.

The unemployment rate in France is over ten per cent—an all-time low for France. On 14 September 2015, French President François Hollande announced labour reforms that seek to abate France’s complex Labor Code. Simplifying the 3000-page Labour Code is aimed to encourage company-level negotiations between employers and unions insofar as to increase hiring flexibility and promote job creation. In this regard, Director General of Labour Jean-Denis Combrexelle proposed increasing the scope of collective bargaining by 2020 in his report “Collective Bargaining, Jobs, and Employment.” Pay rate, working hours, and other work conditions can be negotiated between employers and employees.

---

On 30 September 2015, Secretary of State for the Budget Christian Eckert released the Draft Budgetary Plan for 2016 that outlines France’s fiscal plans to lower taxes and business contributions. Eckert explained the necessity of the expansionary fiscal policy to increase disposable income of consumers and boost the French economy.

On 19 October 2015, President Hollande held a workers-and-bosses conference. Employers and employees reached an agreement, in principle, to extend the retirement age by one year to age 63. An extended retirement age will require employees to pay one more year of contributions before they are eligible to receive pensions. This agreement, if passed, is expected to save EUR6.1 billion by 2020.

Following the Paris attacks, President Hollande announced increased security and national defense expenditures on 16 November, despite the budget deficit that could be facing fines from EU. After the annual EU-wide budget review, the European Commission agreed to loosen guidelines, increase fiscal flexibility, and permit new spending for France in light of the recent terrorist threat.

On 18 January 2016, President Hollande implemented 500,000 more vocational training programs, in addition to the 150,000 that were announced in October 2015. Moreover, President Hollande presented new efforts to boost apprenticeships and government subsidies to small to mid-sized companies. Companies with less than 250 employees will be subsidized EUR2,000 for hiring youths and jobless workers full-time for a minimum of six months. The primary objective of this two billion euro plan is to decrease the youth unemployment rate, which is stagnant at 25.7 per cent and among the highest in Europe.

France does not have independent parties managing its fiscal policies and has not yet made its debt a sustainable share of gross domestic product. However, the French government has implemented some measures to increase fiscal flexibility and promote job creation. Therefore, France is awarded a compliance score of 0.

Meng Fei (Cathy) Li

Germany: +1

Germany has continued to demonstrate fiscal flexibility that reflects short-term events and promotes growth and job creation, particularly in the middle of a worldwide refugee crisis. As the highly unpredictable crisis unfolds, Germany is aggressively pursuing changes in fiscal responsibility to reflect changes in its economy.

In response to the flow of displaced persons, Germany has risen to the challenge of combating its labour shortage in its aging workforce with a series of policies that allowed them to receive 1 million refugees by the end of 2015, four times greater than the 2014 figure.

---

70 Behind the strife, Hollande grinds out French reforms, Reuters (Paris) 19 October 2015. Access Date: 3 February 2016. http://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-france-politics-hollande-idUKKCN0SE0AX20151020
After a larger-than-expected budget surplus of EUR12.1 billion in 2015 of more than twice the expected sum, Germany plans to use much of the money to accommodate and integrate refugees. Under German law, funds unspent at the end of the year should be used to repay debt, but Chancellor Angela Merkel’s ruling coalition agreed last year to funnel all extra money from 2015 into a reserve to pay for refugee-related costs.

In its 2016 national fiscal policy, Germany has pledged EUR670 per refugee per month, as well as an additional EUR8 billion in additional federal spending. Germany’s 16 federal states plan to spend around a combined total of EUR17 billion on refugees this year. In addition, the government has indicated willingness to increase spending later in the year as budgets were based on earlier and lower estimates of 800,000 arrivals in 2015. Independent economists predict a burden of around 1/2 a percentage point of GDP for 2016.

The DIW economic institute predicts that state spending on refugees will increase to 17 billion in 2017, boosting private consumption as well as the construction sector. However, recent forecasts from the Cologne Institute for Economic Research predict a refugee cost of a much costlier EUR50 billion in the 2016-17 federal budget, and say expenses could reach as high as EUR22.6 billion in 2017; with these predictions, Germany will be unable to form a balanced federal budget without new borrowings in 2017.

Independent economists advise that the effect of the refugee influx on state finances depends on how quickly new arrivals are integrated into the labour market. In response, Labour Minister Andrea Nahles announced in late January of 2016 that refugees who do not attempt integrate into German society could see their welfare payments reduced. Such attempts would be “participation in language courses and, in addition, adhering to the basic rules of our coexistence,” Nahles said.

On 16 January 2016, German Finance Minster Wolfgang Schäuble proposed a European Union–wide tax on petrol to help finance refugees and strengthen the bloc’s borders. Although many have criticized the proposal, the suggestion shows the country’s open mindedness and flexibility to new fiscal policies that solve current issues.

In early February 2016, Schäuble has maintained that Germany is in a position to keep a balanced budget for 2016, keeping the country in its past history of budget austerity. One area where Germany has lagged behind in terms of fiscal policy is in the introduction of electric cars. Though it is thriving as an automotive market, industry bosses urged on 3 February for the government to implement incentives to boost demands for electric cars. Merkel’s ruling coalition has considered introducing


a subsidy up to EUR5,000 for electric car buyers, but the country is still largely behind its goal of having 1 million electric cars on the roads by 2020.85

Overall, Germany is awarded +1 for its innovation and flexibility in fiscal policy in responding to the European refugee crisis.

Jody Mou

Italy: 0

Italy has partially complied with the commitment to implement flexible fiscal strategies.

At the end of 2015, the unemployment rate in Italy remained at its lowest in three years at 11.4 per cent, compared to European Union’s 10.4 per cent.86 Youth unemployment is especially high, at 44.2 per cent.87 Employment reforms under Italian Prime Minister Matteo Renzi’s 2015 Jobs Act aims to address unemployment by offering tax incentives for employers to hire new employees and making dismissing employees cheaper and less burdensome for employers.88 The reforms expect to increase the gross domestic product (GDP) by 0.6 per cent after five years and 1.2 per cent after ten years through the creation of 150,000 and 270,000 new jobs, respectively.89 Preliminary monitoring results from mid 2015 indicate a 1.1 per cent increase in employment and a 2.6 per cent decrease in youth unemployment.90

Most notably, Italian banks hold EUR218 billion in bad loans (21 per cent of national GDP) with Italy’s third largest bank losing 43 per cent of its market value earlier this year, twice the national rate.91,92 Italy has the highest debt-to-GDP ratio in Europe, reaching 136 per cent in 2015.93 The European Commission made a deal with Italy under which the non-performing loans will be moved to separate, individual entities who will sell debt backed by these assets close to book values.94 Still, Italy’s budget deficit remains below the 3 per cent GDP limit imposed by the European Union.95 For 2016, Italy’s deficit forecast is 2.2 per cent of GDP. 96 Italy’s 2016 draft budget is at EUR28.7 billion and is accompanied by a request for additional fiscal flexibility

87 Italian Youth Unemployment Rises to its Highest Level Ever, Bloomberg. 31 July 2015. Access date: 9 May 2016.
92 Italy does deal with EU on scheme to shed banks’ bad loans, Reuters UK January 26, 2016. Access Date: 4 February 2016. http://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-eu-italy-banks-idUKKCN0V42NW.
to accommodate structural reform and an investment plan. In November 2015, the European Commission reacted to this draft budget by noting that Italy was in danger of violating compliance standards. Despite this, on 3 February 2016, Italian Economy Minister Pier Carlo Padoan stated that he believes asking for accommodation where Mediterranean refugee crisis costs are concerned is Italy’s basic right. On 23 April 2016, it was reaffirmed that Italy would likely miss fiscal flexibility targets for this year.

Italy’s National Operation Plan 2014-2020 plans on spending EUR1.84 billion on transport systems and the central network infrastructure with a EUR1.38 billion contribution from the European Regional Development Fund. An allocation of 80 per cent of the budget is reserved for the five least developed regions in Italy.

Because Italy is the second largest port for refugees, accounting for a 0.2 per cent projected increase in its deficit, Renzi argued that the country should not be held financially accountable for refugees, invoking the flexibility clause applicable in extenuating circumstances.

Despite the fact that it has instituted several plans and has sought to accelerate its debt reduction, Italy is given a score of 0 for an extended period of poor growth, high unemployment and demands for lenient treatment from the European Commission, which can be explained by its attempts at labour reform and management of refugee crisis.

Seemi Qaiser

Japan: +1

Japan has successfully implemented fiscal flexibility, growth, job creation and debt as a share of gross domestic product (GDP) into their fiscal policy decisions. Japan has tailored their fiscal policy in order to address the issues of deflation and an aging workforce while remaining committed to reducing the country’s debt to GDP ratio.

In 2015, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe issued “Urgent Policies to Realize a Society in Which All Citizens are Dynamically Engaged,” which set out Abe’s three new “arrows” of long-term fiscal policy. These new goals included increasing Japan’s nominal GDP and birthrate as well as improving social services that provide elder care to the country’s aging population.

---

99 Padoan says Italy has flexibility right, Ansa.it 3 February 2016. Access date: 5 May 2016. http://www.ansa.it/english/news/politics/2016/02/03/padoan-says-italy-has-flexibility-right_5e0339b2-6ba5-481e-a5ad-18f654ead701.html.
Akira Amari, Japan’s Minister of State for Economic and Fiscal Policy, has pledged to increase the country’s nominal GDP to JPY600 million by 2020 in order to combat deflation and revitalize the workforce. As a part of this goal, Japan will reduce the effective corporate tax rate by 2.14 per cent in 2016. Additionally, Japan has pledged to reform regulatory barriers to businesses investing in equipment, technology and human resources. As a part of their “Public-Private Dialogue towards Investment for the Future,” Japan will encourage private businesses to make these necessary investments. In order to promote short-term growth, Japan has also committed to an annual 3 per cent increase in the minimum wage until 2020.

The 2016 fiscal budget was approved on 24 December 2015 and increases public expenditure on public works to JPY5.97 trillion. Additionally, the budget of the Japan Tourism Agency was doubled in order to reach the target of attracting 30 million tourists on an annual basis. Much of the increase in government expenditure is expected to be countered by a higher tax revenue due to growing corporate profits.

Moreover, Japan has implemented fiscal policies to increase the nation’s birth rate from 1.42 per cent to 1.8 per cent. These fiscal policies also address concerns that individuals are leaving the workforce in order to provide child care. As a part of this policy goal, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe has promised to expand the number of children accepted into childcare form 400,000 to 500,000.

In response to Japan’s sluggish national economy, the Cabinet approved a JPY3.3 trillion supplementary budget on 18 December 2015.

In order to rein in a national debt that has doubled the country’s GDP, Japan has pledged to report a primary budget surplus in 2020. The 2016 budget reduces the primary budget deficit to JPY10.8 trillion, thanks in part to a restrained bond issuance policy. The budget caps bond issuance at JPY34.4 trillion, reducing the
bond reliance ratio. Japan also showed restraint through their social security expenditure, which only increased by JPY500 billion in 2016.

Thus, Japan has been awarded a score of +1 for successfully incorporating growth, job creation, debt-to-GDP ratio and fiscal flexibility into its short run fiscal plans.

Anthony Piruzza

United Kingdom: +1

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to continue implementing strategies for fiscal flexibility, with a focus on supporting growth and job creation as well as debt as a share of gross domestic product (GDP) sustainability.

In April 2012, the Innovation Fund was launched as a means of addressing youth unemployment. Providing GBP30 million over three years, this government project aimed to help youth over the age of 14 participate in education and training to improve their employability and reduce chances of future dependency. Over a six-month period in 2015, more participants have been enrolled in this program, thus indirectly increasing the potential for a greater number of employed young adults.

In addition, the Welsh government announced to allocate GBP25 million to support the continuation of the Jobs Growth Wales program. The program plans to support the “creation of 8955 new job opportunities for 16-24 year olds over the next three years; 2,900 of which are due to be created by the end of March 2016.” The main objective is to provide jobs for young, unemployed people for at least six months paid at or above the National Minimum Wage with the intention of sustainable employment thereafter.

Furthermore, statistical analysis demonstrated that the UK unemployment rate has decreased to 5.1 per cent in the three months to November 2015 — a 10-year all-time low. Statistical forecast of further decrease to 4.9 per cent by February 2016 is to be expected.

On 8 July 2015, Chancellor George Osborne and HM Treasury presented the “Summer Budget 2015,” which included several proposals to promote economic growth and fiscal flexibility. First, a new National Living Wage of GBP7.20 an hour is to be introduced by April 2016 for people aged 25 and over, with a gradual rise to GBP9+ by the year 2020. Second, the government will reduce the deficit by 1 per cent of GDP on average per year, leading to achievement of a surplus in 2019-20. Third, the Ministry of Defence's budget will be increased by 0.5 per cent above inflation each year up to 2020 in order to protect defense spending. The government will also adhere to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) pledge to spend 2 per cent of national income on defense every year.

Summer Budget 2015 included measures to support London, the South East, and the South Coast. Osborne declared that this budget “puts security first. It delivers economic security so Britain lives within its means.

---

financial security for families, and national security for all.” The Thameslink project — brand new trains and rebuilding of the London Bridge Station — is to be finished, creating 24,000 new jobs and over 18,000 new homes.¹¹³

Moreover, revisions to the economy forecast were made by the Office of Budget Responsibility (OBR) in the “Economic and Fiscal Outlook.” The projected GDP growth was reduced to 2.4 per cent. Tax increases, welfare cuts, and other spending decisions will raise an estimated GBP100 billion over the next few years. However, these in-year cuts will be back-loaded, causing GDP growth in 2016 to remain unchanged. As a result, the slower cuts in 2016-17 are offset, and growth will then rise in 2017.¹¹⁴

In this OBR Budget, the government has outlined two new fiscal targets: “to achieve a surplus on public sector net borrowing in 2019-20 (and then every year in ‘normal times’) and for public sector net debt to fall as a share of GDP every year up to 2019-20.” The report further mentions that their central forecast is consistent with meeting the targets they have now enlisted, as well as previous ones that are still in force.

The United Kingdom has implemented new strategies for fiscal flexibility in addition to continuing previous notions. They have also made a priority to focus on creating new jobs and planning for debt as a share of GDP sustainability. Thus, the UK has been awarded a score of +1 for full compliance.

*Analyst: Yilin Tian*

**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied with the commitment to implement flexible fiscal strategies.

President Barack Obama’s 2016 budget is meant to assist middle-class families by bringing what he calls “middle-class economics in the 21st century.” This policy includes tax cuts for families paying child care up to USD3,000 per child. It amends the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit to increase the amount for families in various circumstances, a move that will benefit 6.7 million children. The tax code is also reformed to support families in which both spouses work by providing a second earner tax credit, and expanding the Earned Income Tax Credit.¹¹⁵ These tax cuts in the new budget demonstrate that the government is willing to carry out tax reforms, which is further a demonstration of the US commitment to fiscal flexibility.

The new budget also promotes job creation and calls for increased availability of training to help people attain these jobs. One way the administration proposes to do this is through the Promise Zones initiative, which will generate partnerships between the federal government and local communities to create jobs. It also promotes expansion of the National Network of Manufacturing institutes by launching seven more institutes in 2016. Supplementing all these job creation initiatives, are proposals for an expansion of employment services, and in-person counselling that will help workers attain these jobs.

America’s ratio of gross domestic product (GDP) to debt increased rapidly following the recession, but has been at a high, and somewhat constant rate, of 74 per cent since the past few years. However, the Congressional Budget Office reported in July 2015 that publicly held debt of the US government when

---


measured as a percentage of GDP is predicted to reach 103 per cent.\textsuperscript{126} So, with regards to the country’s commitment to make debt as a sustainable share of GDP, the US has not made much progress.

In the end, statistical data predicts that unemployment in the US is at its lowest since 2008\textsuperscript{127} and the economy continues to grow at a rate of 2.7 per cent.\textsuperscript{128} Bearing in mind the economic growth of the country, it is to be concluded that the US has succeeded in fulfilling its commitment on fiscal flexibility.

Raafia Shahid

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with the commitment to implement flexible fiscal strategies.

As a part of the Stability and Growth Pact (SGP), the EU continues to establish agreements amongst member states in order to maintain stability of the EMU. Leading to the Elmau Summit, the EU had initiated a Communication on flexibility within the SGP which would be reviewed by the EU Economic and Financial Committee (EFC).\textsuperscript{129} On 29 April 2015, it was established that the EFC-Alternates would prepare a commonly agreed position on flexibility in the SGP.\textsuperscript{130}

On 27 November 2015, the EFC released a draft for a flexibility clause in the SGP that primarily aimed to provide structural flexibility for cyclical conditions, structural reforms, and government investments aiming at, ancillary to, and economically equivalent to major structural reforms.\textsuperscript{131} The draft of the commonly agreed position presents a matrix specifying the annual fiscal adjustments towards the Medium-Term budgetary Objective.\textsuperscript{132}

On 8 December 2015, EU finance ministers discussed the preliminary flexibility clause in the SGP, where member states decided to impose limits to the proposed position. Specifically, temporary cumulative deviation from the targets under the structural reform clause and investment clause could not exceed 0.75 percent of the GDP.\textsuperscript{133} The iteration essentially led to a cap on the flexibility in the SGP.\textsuperscript{134}


On 10 March 2016, the EU released a briefing on the draft 2016 budgetary plans for the implementation of the SGP. The document mentioned the ongoing considerations of the flexibility clause, recognizing the budgetary considerations for the implementation of the SGP additions.

Though components of the flexibility clause in the SGP have been met with some resistance by member states, the EU has demonstrated significant progress in establishing a plan to implement the integration of fiscal flexibility in its financial structure. The EFC has also set a deadline for a review report before 30 June 2018 in order to re-evaluate the effectiveness of the matrix.

The European Union has therefore been awarded a score of +1 for establishing draft considerations towards a commonly agreed position for flexibility in the SGP.

Nicholas Chong

---

3. Infrastructure: Infrastructure Investment

“[To ensure that G7 countries operate at the technological frontier in the years ahead, we will foster growth by] promoting quality infrastructure investment to address shortfalls through effective resource mobilization in partnership with the private sector”

G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

G7 members have consistently committed to promoting infrastructure investment in specific contexts. At the 2014 Brussels Summit for example G7 leaders agreed to boost infrastructure investment throughout Africa, specifically in energy-related projects. The 2013 Lough Erne declaration similarly committed to facilitating institutional investment flows into bankable trade-related infrastructure projects in developing countries.

In 2015, infrastructure became a global banner issue with the inclusion in the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. The G7 has adopted a similar emphasis on the importance of sustainable infrastructure development, acknowledging the role of innovative infrastructure financing and development in the long-term prosperity of developed and developing countries.

While there is no universally accepted definition of what constitutes “infrastructure,” the World Bank defines the term as including physical structures and organizations related to “transport, water, energy and information and communications technology.”

Commitment Features

G7 members have pledged to promote quality infrastructure investment in partnership with the private sector to ensure that G7 members continue to operate on the technological frontier.

Full compliance requires the country to mobilize state resources to renew unfulfilled infrastructure projects or commission new programs and projects, which aim to improve the previous condition of infrastructure (efforts are not merely restoring existing infrastructure, but upgrades or improvements).

These efforts must result in tangible cooperation with the private sector. For example, a compliant country may co-create a national infrastructure investment fund with private sector partners or co-fund a specific but significant infrastructure project with private sector partners.

---

Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member does not take steps to promote significant infrastructure investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member takes steps to promote significant infrastructure investment BUT fails to promote private sector partnerships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member takes steps to promote significant infrastructure investment, including in partnership with the private sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lead Analyst: Hayden Rodenkirkien

Canada: 0

Canada has partially complied with its commitment to promote quality infrastructure investments in partnership with the private sector.

In October 2016, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau pledged an additional $60 billion of infrastructure funding over the next 10 years. The Minister of Finance, Bill Morneau, has suggested that spending timetables may be condensed to account for worsening economic conditions.

In November 2015, the Government of Canada removed a requirement that cities and provinces look at funding infrastructure projects through public-private partnership before sourcing government funding for major infrastructure projects.139

In March 2016, the federal government announced in its budget infrastructure investment of CAD120 billion over a ten year period. The first phase of this will focus on the "public transit, water, waste management and housing infrastructure."140

While the Canadian government continues to make substantial investments in infrastructure and has committed rhetorically to increased spending, it has not strengthened these efforts through means of private sector funding. Canada therefore receives a score of 0.

Analyst: Neel Aery

France: 0

France has partially complied with its commitment to promote infrastructure investment.

On 13 October 2015, France and Saudi Arabia agreed to EUR10 billion in investments focusing heavily on transportation investment.141 So far they have identified 36 potential opportunities that include the manufacturing of buses, trains, and spare parts as well as the establishment infrastructure maintenance and repair.142

On 28 January 2016 France’s minister of ecology and energy announced that the government intends to pave 1000 kilometres of road with photovoltaic panels, which could produce energy for nearly eight per cent of the French population.143

On 28 January 2016 the French government signed EUR15 billion worth of deals with President Rouhani of Iran.\textsuperscript{144} The deal’s agreement covers facets of infrastructure such as railways, but also focuses on increased production as it’s speculated that Iran will buy as many as 127 airbus from France.\textsuperscript{145}

Thus, although France has done little to encourage private investment in infrastructure, it remains the second most prolific private sector, as far as investments, in Europe. France therefore receives a score of 0 for partial compliance.

\textit{Analyst: Richard Vogel}

\textbf{Germany: +1}

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to promote infrastructure investment in partnership with the private sector.

On 29 December 2015, the Government of Germany announced plans to extend a recently concluded bicycle path into 100-kilometre “bicycle superhighway.”\textsuperscript{146} This project would help connect ten cities and is predicted to take 50,000 cars off the road everyday by providing a commuting route for over two million Germans.\textsuperscript{147} Investment in the project is expected to exceed EUR180 million.\textsuperscript{148}

On 14 March 2016, the German government announced plans to establish a fund worth EUR10 billion to invest in high-speed broadband infrastructure in rural areas.\textsuperscript{149} The fund aims to maintain the competitiveness of small and medium-sized businesses operating outside of major cities. The fund will be partly financed by “the proceeds of auctioning UMTS mobile phone frequencies.”\textsuperscript{150}

On 16 March, 2016, German Transport Minister Alexander Dobrindt announced Bundesverkehrswegeplan (Federal Transport Infrastructure Plan) 2030, the Federal government’s plan for upgrading, building and improving Germany’s road, rail and waterways.\textsuperscript{151} Between 2016 and 2030 Germany plans to invest EUR94.7 billion in expansion and construction projects, as well as EUR141.6 billion for the maintenance of existing networks.\textsuperscript{152}

Germany has committed to further infrastructure investment and has in at least one case deployed private investment to achieve this. Therefore, Germany receives a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Richard Vogel}
Italy: +1
Italy has fully complied with its commitment to promote infrastructure investment and addressed shortfalls through effective resource mobilization in partnership with the private sector.

Domestically, Italy has taken steps to address infrastructure shortfalls. Since the Schloss Elmau G7 Summit, an investment agreement from the European Commission for EUR1.84 billion from the European Regional Development Fund has been made official. This infrastructure promotion targets railways, port infrastructure, and intelligent transport systems, and is intended to make transportation in Italy more competitive while maintaining low-carbon environmental standards.

On 10 December 2015, Italy announced a USD8 million contribution to the Sustainable Energy Fund for Africa. The fund aims to support small and medium-sized private renewable energy firms on the continent.

The Italian Ministry of Infrastructure and Transport has been focusing on a bilateral agreement with the Islamic Republic of Iran, signed on 26 January 2016, and while it emphasizes transportation development, this action has not increased private sector participation.

On 28 January 2016, Ital Gas Storage, controlled by Morgan Stanley Infrastructure, received funding from a consortium of international banks to develop a large gas storage plant in Northern Italy, but this was not directly linked to Italian investment promotion.

Italy has taken steps to promote infrastructure investment, including in partnership with the private sector through its contribution to the Juncker Plan. As a result, it has been awarded a score of +1.

Analyst: Sarah Millman

Japan: +1
Japan has fully complied with its commitment to promote infrastructure development.

On 21 November 2015, The Japanese government and the Asian Development Bank (ADB) announced a five-year, USD16 billion partnership. The purpose of this partnership is to promote the investment of private infrastructure projects and to encourage public infrastructure development, both of which are Sustainable Development Goals set out at the United Nations summit in September 2015. ADB President Takehiko Nakao stated that through its “assistance for urban transport, renewable energy, and other infrastructure, the partnership will also contribute to the expansion of climate financing to developing

---

countries, in line with the expected outcome of UN climate conference meeting in December.”

The first step will be the establishment of a trust fund in March 2016 under the partnership between ADB and Japan. This demonstrates financial investment in infrastructure, as well as an attempt to encourage both private- and public-sector interest in infrastructure development.

In December 2015, immediately after Prime Minister Shinzo Abe’s visit to India, the Japan International Cooperation Agency pledged a loan of approximately INR40 billion rupees for two major highway projects in India. The National Highways and Infrastructure Development Corporation will implement both projects. An Indian road transport ministry official stated that the Indian government is also requesting a loan from ADB for the Imphal-Moreh Road, which will significantly improve the region’s transport network.

Japan has promoted contributions to infrastructure investment, both domestically and abroad, in partnership with the private sector. Therefore, it has been awarded a score of +1.

Analyst: Tina Vulevic

United Kingdom: +1
The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to promote infrastructure investment by taking steps to promote quality investment with the public and private sectors.

On 16 July 2015, the Government of the United Kingdom pledged EUR8.5 billion of funding to the European Union’s European Fund for Strategic Investments. The fund aims to “overcome current market failures by addressing market gaps and mobilizing private investment.”

On 23 December 2015, the House of Commons published a report stating that 64 per cent of planned infrastructure investment will be privately funded, 25 per cent will be funded publicly, and 11 per cent will be split between private and public funding.

On 5 October 2015, British Chancellor George Osborne announced the independent National Infrastructure Commission, stating a need for “a Commission, set up in law, free from party arguments, which works out calmly and dispassionately what the country needs to build for its future and holds any Government’s feet to the fire if it fails to deliver.”

Furthermore, the UK has increased nationally significant infrastructure projects in the transport sector including: roads, railway lines, large-scale harbours and airports.167

Thus, the United Kingdom has been awarded +1 for compliance with G7 infrastructure requirements by not only promoting increased infrastructure investment, but also by promoting the investment by both public and private sectors.

_{Analyst: Thomas Robson_}

**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to promote quality infrastructure investment in partnership with the private sector.

On 7 July 2015, the US announced the creation of a National Community Solar Partnership to “unlock access to solar [power] for the nearly 50 percent of households and businesses that do not have adequate roof space to install solar systems.”168 The Partnership will involve collaboration between businesses and government departments as part of a wider initiative to increase access to solar energy in the United States.169

On 14 January 2016, US Transportation Secretary Anthony Foxx announced a plan to earmark USD4 billion in the 2016 budget for investment in self-driving cars.170 This funding would “finance research projects and infrastructure improvements tied to driverless cars.”171 The project would happen simultaneously with a government push to set guidelines and standards for the development of self-driving automobiles. Private sector involvement in the project will involve a test phase in which selected companies would be permitted to deploy their vehicles on US roads.

Thus, through linking the private sector to the public in order to finance infrastructure programs, the US has earned a score of +1.

_{Analyst: Neel Aery_}

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment on infrastructure investment.

The EU has continued to finance infrastructure growth and development through the Innovation and Network Executive Agency.172 This organization ensures investment in European infrastructure through the Connecting Europe Facility, Horizon 2020, TEN-T and Marco Polo.173

---


On 8 October 2015, the European Transport Ministers met at the Transports, Telecommunications and Energy Council where they agreed to liberalize passenger railway service and to strengthen railway infrastructure governance.\footnote{Transport, Telecommunications and Energy Council (TTE) - Ministers for Transport adopt a general approach to railway infrastructure governance and market liberalisation as part of the fourth railway package, The Government of Luxembourg (Luxembourg) 8 October 2015. Access date: 3 February 2015.}


The EU has made significant investments in infrastructure, within its jurisdictions and abroad. It has done so on multiple occasions in partnership with the private sector. Therefore, the EU is awarded a score of +1.

*Analyst: Graydon Kelch*

---

4. Gender: Supporting Women Entrepreneurs

“We will address the specific needs of women entrepreneurs, e.g. by promoting their access to finance, markets, skills, leadership opportunities and networks.”

_G7 Schloss Elmau 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>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</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>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

Women’s economic empowerment was recognized by the G7 at the 1990 Houston Summit. There, G7 members recognized the need to further integrate women into the global economy and began to address women’s issues and gender inequality at each following summit.

At the 2013 Lough Erne Summit, G7 leaders prioritized women’s issues for the first time, by focusing on women’s security rights and on sexual violence in conflict zones.

At the 2015 Schloss Elmau Summit, G7 members reaffirmed their commitment to women’s economic empowerment by stating, “women’s entrepreneurship is a key driver of innovation, growth and jobs.” G7 members also stated that women face more barriers to entrepreneurship than men and expressed support for the United Nations Women’s Empowerment Principles that provides guidance for private sector companies to further empower women in the workplace. Access to finance, markets, skills, leadership opportunities and networks were identified as being imperative in promoting women entrepreneurship.

In the Leader’s Declaration at the Schloss Elmau Summit, G7 members reaffirmed their support for gender equality and welcomed the “World Assembly for Women: WAW!,” which is to be hosted by Japan.

---

Commitment Features

This commitment requires G7 members to actively address women’s access to entrepreneurial needs. Examples of entrepreneurial needs include access to finance, markets, skills, leadership opportunities and networks.

Compliance for this commitment is two-fold. First, members take measures to increase access to any of the aforementioned entrepreneurial needs. For example, a member contributes to increasing women’s participation in technical and vocational education and training (TVET). Second, members increase access for women who face discrimination, such as women with disabilities (in this context, “multiple sources of discrimination” will be taken as other forms of discrimination in addition to sexism).

Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>G7 member does not take measures to promote women’s access to entrepreneurial needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>G7 member takes measures to promote women’s access to entrepreneurial needs, but without focus on women who face multiple sources of discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>G7 member takes measures to promote women’s access to entrepreneurial needs, with focus on women who face multiple sources of discrimination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Michael Humeniuk

Canada: 0

Canada has partially complied with its commitment to take measures to actively promote women’s access to entrepreneurial needs through targeted initiatives but has not had the requisite focus on women who face multiple sources of discrimination to meet the guideline for full compliance.

Following the 2015 Schloss Elmau Summit, a number of new initiatives promoting female entrepreneurship were founded in Canada, including the Startup Canada Women Entrepreneurship Fund. This fund invests in female-led entrepreneurial initiatives in Canada to improve female access to entrepreneurial needs through “education, investment, mentorship and access to growth opportunity.” The fund awarded its first ever investments to community organizations headed by female entrepreneurs in December of 2015.\(^{191}\)

The government also launched the Innovation Agenda on 5 May 2016.\(^{192}\) At the launch for this initiative the Canadian Finance Minister Bill Morneau spoke to the importance of inclusive growth with a focus on demographic groups with lower labor participation rates, such as women and indigenous people. No lasting, impactful policy decisions were reached, nor actions taken at the launch event.\(^8\)

Ongoing, pre-existing government initiatives, such as the Microlending for Women in Ontario Program have continued to improve female involvement in small to intermediate enterprises. This program is projected to provide 800 women with microloans to start their businesses in the coming year, thereby improving women’s entrepreneurial opportunity.\(^{195}\)

Canada has made active efforts to actively improve and promote women’s entrepreneurial opportunity, with new initiatives aiming to support the Canadian female entrepreneur. However, Canada has not launched any initiatives specifically targeting those women facing multiple sources of discrimination, such as women from minority, or indigenous groups. Thus, Canada has been awarded a score of 0.

Analyst: Karim Fawzy

France: +1

France has fully complied with its commitments to gender and women’s economic empowerment by promoting women’s access to entrepreneurial needs as well as focusing on women facing varied forms of discrimination.

In 2014 the Ambassador of Switzerland Michael Gerber, on behalf of France, identified inequality as the primary deterrent to sustainable development, additionally advising the post-2015 agenda to focus on the multiple levels of discrimination women face as a priority. By 2017, targets need to be met in research supported with strong data, stakeholder education and training, increased communication with civil society, and accountability of official development assistance. The French Ministry of Foreign Affairs has implemented this project in order to push for gender integration in all development sectors, with one of its foundational aims to empower women economically.

In September 2015, the post-2015 agenda along with the gender objective were adopted at the UN summit in New York. The dialogue developed at the summit acknowledges the inequalities women face both in terms of employment and economic decision-making both nationally and globally. Investment in education and health care services, reforms to help benefit populations of marginalized peoples, and the tackling of discrimination and root causes of inequality were requirements for state members. France was in full support of the agenda on gender equality.

Supplementing the aforementioned reforms and objectives, since 2013, France’s Gender and Development Strategy implemented by the Interministerial Committee for International Cooperation and Development (CICID) has been focusing on gender inequality in a target-based manner. By 2017, targets need to be met in research supported with strong data, stakeholder education and training, increased communication with civil society, and accountability of official development assistance. The French Ministry of Foreign Affairs has implemented this project in order to push for gender integration in all development sectors, with one of its foundational aims to empower women economically.

In March 2016, France’s commitment to measures for women’s empowerment and sustainable development was reinforced at the 60th session of the Commission on the Status of Women. Conclusions at the session included promotion of women’s independence and economic rights, support of businesses with female leadership, and equal employment opportunities for women. An acknowledgement was also made regarding the intersectional nature of discrimination faced by women, coupled with goals of improving aggregate data and variables for better research and perspectives on gender equality. The session also endorsed all objectives adopted at the 2015 United Nations Summit.

---

202 CSW60 Agreed Conclusions. March 24, 2016. Access date: May 6, 2016. http://www2.unwomen.org/~/media/heads/headquarters/attachments/sections/csw/60/csw60%20agreed%20conclusions%204marc h.pdf?la=en&d=20160415T171708
France’s recent activities target progression of women’s economic opportunities through unified policy and the access to entrepreneurship needs of leadership opportunities and skills. Through the CICID, in accordance with the CSW and UN frameworks, France also continues to address and research the multiple discriminations faced by women.

As a result of its recent actions, France achieves a score of +1 for full compliance.

**Analyst: Narain Yucel**

**Germany: 0**

Germany has partially complied with its commitment to addressing the specific needs of female entrepreneurs, and advancing the status of women at work.

As of 30 September 2015, 3,500 publicly listed or co-determined German companies are legally required to publish the proportion of female membership on their supervisory and managerial boards, under the *Frauenquote* — the “women’s quotas” signed into law in December 2014 (and intended to be fully implemented as of 1 January 2016). Further, these companies were given until 30 September 2015 to declare a strategy to increase female executive and supervisory presence. These companies are permitted to set their own targets for the proportion of female employees filling roles in their supervisory and management boards. However, should the proportion of female presence on these boards regress, the company in question is punishable with fines, or claims for damages up to EUR50,000. Parity co-determined companies are also permitted to set their own targets for female management.

On 1 January 2016, the statutory gender quota came into force for the supervisory boards of publicly listed and parity co-determined companies, affecting approximately 100 German companies. The quota requires an affected company’s supervisory board to be comprised of at least 30% women. Should a company report having an insufficient pool of qualified female candidates to satisfy the quota, the terms of the *Frauenquote* stipulate that the seats must remain vacant until a suitable female employee is found to fill them.

By 3 May 2016, 26 per cent of the supervisory and executive board members of German companies were female. While the proportion of women on the supervisory boards of Germany’s top 200 companies has grown to 20 per cent since the quotas were introduced in 2014, nearly a quarter of the top 200 companies have less than 10 per cent female supervisory board members. With regards to executive board membership, the proportion of women has increased less than one per cent, to an overall proportion of 6 per cent.

On 17 September 2015, Germany hosted a discussion forum in which 50 of the world’s most prominent female scientists, politicians, and businesspeople met to “discuss how to improve the role of women

---


globally.” At the forum, German Chancellor Angela Merkel reiterated Germany’s commitment to advancing women’s entrepreneurship made in the G7 Leader’s Declaration.

Germany has taken tangible measures to improve the representation of women in positions of corporate leadership, and the majority of German companies have taken concrete steps towards implementing these measures. However, Germany, while calling for measures to be put in place, has failed to take concrete steps to equip women with entrepreneurial skills. Germany has also failed to address the concerns of women facing multiple sources of discrimination, such as those with disabilities. In neglecting these considerations, Germany has failed to satisfy the terms of the G7 Leader’s Declaration at Elmau on 8 June 2015. As such, Germany has earned a compliance score of 0.

**Analyst: Thomas G. Feore**

**Italy: +1**

Italy has gullly complied with its commitment to addressing the specific needs of female entrepreneurs and advancing the status of women at work.

From 14 December 2015 to 18 December 2015, Italy hosted a course for policy-makers in women’s entrepreneurship development at the Turin center. The course, intended for senior government officials and other representatives playing a role in development, was intended to equip its pupils with the necessary skills to “assess and improve the enabling environment, build the capacity of women’s entrepreneurs associations and integrate gender equality in value chain development and business training.”

The National Body for Micro Credit (of Italy) continues to offer unique entrepreneurial opportunities to women, particularly those living in “poverty and marginalization,” through its Microcredito Donna, or “women’s microcredit” service. The service is meant to provide women with novel entrepreneurial ideas, especially those who might lack the monetary means or assets for standard loans, the opportunity to realize their goals through small government loans.

Italy has not only taken concrete steps to advance women’s entrepreneurship, but has also taken measures to address the challenges of women facing multiple sources of discrimination, namely women living in poverty. Therefore, Italy is in full compliance with its commitment to promoting women’s entrepreneurship, and has earned a compliance score of +1.

**Analyst: Thomas G. Feore**

**Japan: 0**

Japan has partially complied with its commitment to support women’s entrepreneurial needs. Though the Japanese government has made efforts to increase women’s participation in the workforce, and increase women’s occupation of higher management positions, it has not been as successful as planned. Furthermore, Japan has not made international contributions to increase women’s participation in technical and vocational education and training, let alone contributions with focus on women who face multiple sources of discrimination.

---


On 28 August 2015, Japan’s upper house approved legislation to raise pressure on companies to hire more women and increase their promotion to management. The legislation was part of Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe’s effort to lift his country’s economy.\textsuperscript{216} However, Prime Minister Abe’s ambition has been unsuccessful relative to his original goal. Officials in Abe’s government have conceded that the initial goal of women occupying 30 per cent of management position by 2020 was overambitious; the new target for companies is 27 per cent.\textsuperscript{217}

The latest data from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development in 2014 reported that Japan’s female participation in the workforce was 66 per cent, the highest rate in Japan’s last 15 years.\textsuperscript{218}

Therefore, Japan has been awarded as score of 0.

\textit{Analyst: Michael Humeniuk}

\textbf{United Kingdom: 0}

The United Kingdom has partially complied with its commitment to address the needs of women entrepreneurs. Although it has demonstrated a commitment to empowering women entrepreneurs by developing their access to networks and opportunities to develop their skills, there is little evidence to suggest that the UK has targeted female entrepreneurs that suffer from multiple sources of discrimination.

In a press release published on 17 August 2015, the United Kingdom announced the allotment of GBP50,000 to “create new networking opportunities for women in business from Glasgow to London.”\textsuperscript{219} This initiative consists of the creation of several “Meet a Mentor” sessions that introduce businesswomen to potential mentors and advisers — leading to upwards of 5,000 hours of mentoring in all.\textsuperscript{220} This initiative aims to develop the skills and networking of aspiring businesswomen, and therefore is evidence of UK’s compliance with this particular commitment.

However, there have been no instances of policy that targets businesswomen subject to sources of discrimination beyond their gender. The UK has thus been awarded a score of 0 for partial compliance.

\textit{Analyst: Michael Switzer}

\textbf{United States: +1}

The United States has fully complied with the commitment to increase access to entrepreneurial needs by promoting their access to finance, markets, skills, leadership opportunities and networks. However, It has not focused on supporting women who face multiple sources of discrimination.

On 18 September 2015, the United States started the Women’s Entrepreneurship in APEC (WE-ACPC) initiative.\textsuperscript{221} The WE-ACPC focuses on strengthening the community that supports women’s


\textsuperscript{218} This might be the ‘silver lining’ for Japan. Business Insider. 9 April 2016. Access date: 5 May 2016. http://www.businessinsider.com/japanese-women-entering-workforce-2016-4


entrepreneurship, an online platform that makes accessing women’s entrepreneurship opportunities more viable, and create a stronger connection between women’s entrepreneurship networks. The United States has implemented a Women’s Startup Lab that can be found in the online platform of the WE-ACPC initiative. The start-up lab gives participant access to activities that would increase their knowledge about entrepreneurship and the confidence needed along with a Pitch Day that allows for the women to introduce themselves to investors. This type of workshop increases access to the markets, skills, leadership opportunities and networks.

On 12 April 2016, the US Small Business Administration announced affiliation with the Western Women's Business Center (WWBC). This affiliation resulted in association offering business services, as well as investment. Although the WWBC specifically caters to North Carolina, this partnership is one example of US government support for women seeking entrepreneurial support.

The United States has increased women’s access to entrepreneurial networks and skills, satisfying the first component of this commitment. Therefore, it has received a score of +1.

Analysts: Rachel Maeve McLeod and Fernando Casanova

European Union: +1

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to address the specific needs of women entrepreneurs. The EU has made contributions to support women entrepreneurs, largely through the European Bank for Development and Reconstruction (EBDR), and has addressed specifically those discriminated against from multiple sources.

On 22 September 2016, the European Commission released the EU’s Gender Action Plan 2016-2020. This program entails continued support and contribution to girls and women’s economic and social empowerment. The document addresses the particular challenges faced by those suffering from multiple sources of discrimination. It states that “the gender gap is even larger when gender inequality intersects with other forms of exclusion such as disability, age, caste, ethnicity, sexual orientation, geographical remoteness or religion.”

On 25 November 2015, the EBDR launched its Women in Business in Kazakhstan. It is expected that approximately 2000 women-led small to medium-sized enterprises will benefit from this program.

In December 2015, the European Union contributed EUR45 million to technical and vocational education and training (TVET) in Pakistan. Gender equality was listed as a significant objective, as a general policy objective.

---

222 Women’s Startup Lab. APEC. Access date: 6 May 2016. http://www.we-apec.com/directory/women-startup-lab
On 11 March 2016, Belarus launched, with the EU’s support, the Women in Business program. The EU contributed EUR5 million, aimed to last until 2022, and will run in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine.228

On 21 March 2016, UNESCO announced that it, in partnership with the EU, had signed an agreement with the Malawi government, granting EUR9 million. The grant will go toward the Skills and Technical Educational Program to increase the participation of young women in TVET.229

Therefore, the EU has fully complied with this commitment and is awarded a score of +1.

Analyst: Michael Humeniuk

---

229 Young women in Malawi to benefit from 9m euro TVET project signed by UNESCO and EU. UNESCO. 21 March 2016. Access date: 5 May 2016. http://www.unesco.org/new/en/member-states/single-view/news/young_women_in_malawi_to_benefit_from_9m_euro_tvet_project_signed_by_unesco_and_eu/#.VyvdB6v_-lI
5. Financial Regulation: Automatic Exchange of Tax Information

“We commit to strongly promoting automatic exchange of information on cross-border tax rulings.”

2015 Elmau Leaders’ Communiqué

### 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>0</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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Background

As early as the 1996 Lyon Summit, taxation issues have received notable attention from the G7/8. At Lyon, the G7 leaders recognized the need for harmonizing tax policies across borders to strengthen international tax co-operation and meet with new tax challenges posed by globalization. Since then, the G7/8 has made significant progress on promoting cross-border tax information exchange. At the 2013 Lough Erne Summit, the G8 leaders proclaimed their “[commitment] to establish the automatic exchange of information (AEOI) between tax authorities as the new global standard.” The leaders also acknowledged the work that the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) had undertaken in developing a multilateral tax information exchange model and pledged to “work with” the OECD to promote this measure. The G8 leaders also called “on all jurisdictions [including developing countries] to adopt and effectively implement this new single global standard at the earliest opportunity.”

The Brussels Summit in 2014 reaffirmed the G7 leaders’ support for the “new single global standard for automatic exchange of tax information” but did not add significant depth to this commitment. At the 2015 Elmau summit, the G7 leaders retained much of the content and phrasing used in the previous summits but made notable progress by setting a deadline for its implementation of “the end of 2017 or 2018” and specifying that the new international standard was to be implemented by “all financial centres” while urging other jurisdictions to adopt the standard.

### Commitment Features

The 2012 OECD report defines automatic exchange of tax information as involving “the systematic and periodic transmission of “bulk” taxpayer information by the source country to the residence country concerning various categories of income (e.g., dividends, interest, royalties, salaries, pensions, etc.).” This new system is designed to assist the tax authority of a taxpayer’s country of residence in verifying the accuracy of taxpayers’ reported foreign source income, thus minimizing the possibility of international tax evasion. Participating jurisdictions that implement the new system send and receive pre-agreed information each year, without having to send a specific request.

The commitment outlined in the 2015 Elmau G7 Leaders’ Communiqué aims to promote and ultimately implement AEOI of cross-border tax information as the new international standard as part of their effort to create “a fair and modern international tax system.” Given that the overarching goal includes the implementation of the new system by “all financial centres,” not restricted to just the G7 countries, full compliance requires member countries to both adopt the new system and take active actions to promote it.
Adoption may include announcing a legal act to regularly disclose tax information to an international body, signing into a legally binding international agreement regulating a new standard, or being engaged in transferring tax information to a foreign country to assist the latter’s tax authority in conducting tax accounting.

Promoting the new exchange system requires member country to take active steps to encourage, persuade, or capacitate another country to adopt the new standard. This may include amending bilateral or multilateral tax treaties, providing assistance in the tax collection and/or tax information management of another country, or holding training events to assist other jurisdictions to implement the new standard.

While related, measures targeted at dealing with tax avoidance and evasion are not part of this commitment. Measures taken by member states must also specify that they are aimed at increasing sharing of cross-border tax information which means that they must be bilateral or multilateral in nature. Announcing a more transparent domestic tax reporting system does not sufficiently meet the requirement of the commitment.

In summary, full compliance requires both adoption and promotion of automatic cross-border tax information exchange. If a member only fulfills either one of the required actions above, it is awarded partial compliance.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member has neither adopted NOR promoted automatic cross-border tax information exchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member has only adopted OR promoted automatic cross-border tax information exchange but not both.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member has adopted AND promoted automatic cross-border tax information exchange.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada: +1**

Canada has fully complied with its commitment to promote a standard of automatic exchange of information on cross-border tax rulings.

In September 2015, Canada participated in the meeting of G20 finance ministers and central bank governors. Canada committed to reaffirming its timeline for implementing the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) Common Reporting Standard of automatic exchange of information (July 2015) and completing the necessary legislative procedures to implement the system. This furthers the Canadian government’s commitment to tax fairness and responsible fiscal management.

Since attending the October 2015 OECD Global Forum on Transparency and Exchange of Tax Information for Tax Purposes, Canada has adopted this standard by committing to the implementation of the Common Reporting Standard by 2017 July in the 2015 Budget. Canada has declared that the first exchange of financial account information in accordance with this standard will take place in September 2018.

After the release of its 2015 budget, Canada attended the 2015 meeting of the Asia Pacific Economic Co-operation (APEC) forum in the Philippines. As an APEC member, Canada reaffirmed its cooperation with the exchange of information, including automatic exchange of financial account information in tax matters.

Canada has also promoted this new exchange system by encouraging and capacitating other countries to adopt the new standard by amending tax treaties with other countries. On 15 June 2015, Canada signed an agreement between Canada and the Cook Islands for the exchange of information on tax matters. By signing this agreement, Canada is continuing its effort with promoting transparency and effective exchange of tax information. This agreement declares mutual exchange of tax information possessed by or accessible to taxation authorities of either jurisdiction. This will allow better administration and enforcement of taxation laws and will help prevent tax evasion. This agreement conforms to the OECD’s standard on tax exchange information.

On 16 January 2016, Canada signed an arrangement between the Canadian Trade Office in Taipei and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office in Canada for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of
Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income. Section 25 of this Arrangement reflects the OECD’s standard for the exchange of tax information.

In the OECD’s Tax Transparency 2015 report, Canada was listed as being compliant in the areas of availability of information, access to information, and exchange of information. Discussion of the framework and guidance moving toward the implementation of the OECD Common Reporting Standard was mentioned in a 12-month lobbying summary from the Office of the Commissioner of Lobbying of Canada.

Because Canada has acted both to adopt and promote the OECD’s standard of automatic exchange of information on cross-border tax rulings, it has been awarded a score of +1.

*Analyst: Mia Naylor*

**France: +1**

France has fully complied with its commitment to promote the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) standard for the automatic exchange of information (AEOI) on cross-border tax rulings.

On 22 September 2015, a special committee on tax rulings met with various finance ministers in the European Union. During this meeting French Finance Minister Michel Sapin expressed support for AEOI on cross-border tax rulings. Sapin also stated that France regarded the new tax regulations as urgent matters and would take active steps to adopt the directive before the end of 2015.

On 28 December 2015, France ratified the OECD Automatic Exchange of Information Agreement.

On 6 October 2015, the Economics and Financial Affairs Council of the European Union reached an agreement on AEOI. The directive will come into effect by 1 January 2017. This directive will require all European Union member states to exchange information automatically on advance cross-border tax rulings. This systemic tax communication among the European Union member states will take place every three months. This new directive will prevent companies from exploiting previously unclear tax rulings. It is also designed to help reduce tax competition among European Union members.

France has also taken active steps to encourage and capacitate other countries to adopt this new standard. It has agreed to meet the OECD standard when exchanging data with Switzerland.

Because of France’s work to adopt and promote the OECD’s AEOI standard on cross-border tax rulings, France has been awarded a score of +1.

*Analyst: Mia Naylor*

**Germany: +1**

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to promote the automatic exchange of information (AEOI) on cross-border tax rulings. It has succeeded in emplacing a legislative framework for the system domestically and taken steps to promote the AEOI among non-signatory jurisdictions.

On 13 July 2015, the Germany launched the Addis Tax Initiative in cooperation with the United Kingdom, the United States, the Netherlands, Ethiopia and Kenya. The initiative assists participating countries to enact reforms that build the fairness, transparency and efficiency of their tax systems. This includes “enabling partner countries take advantage of the progress made on the international tax agenda, such as…tax information exchange including automatic exchange of information (AEOI).”

On 15 July 2015, Germany’s federal cabinet “adopted two draft bills that will enable Germany to exchange financial account information in tax matters automatically with other EU member states and non-EU countries from 2017 onwards.” The bills set out details for AEOI within Germany and align Germany’s EU Mutual Assistance Act with the EU’s adoption of the Common Reporting Standard (CRS) in late 2014.
On 18 December 2015, Germany’s Bundesrat approved the Law on the Automatic Exchange of Information in Financial Accounts in Tax Matters and on the Amendment of other Acts, implementing into German law the OECD Common Reporting Standard. The legislation, which came into effect on 31 December 2015, obliges Germany to conduct the first exchanges of tax information with EU members and third countries by 31 July 2017.

Germany has implemented domestic legislation to enact the AEOI and promoted it abroad. Therefore, it has been awarded a full compliance score of +1.

**Analyst: Jerome Newton**

**Italy: 0**

Italy has partially complied with its commitment to promote the automatic exchange of information (AEOI) on cross-border tax rulings.

On 6 October 2015, the Council of the European Union amended the New Directive irective on administrative cooperation between member states. This directive “requir[es] automatic exchange of information advance tax rulings and advance pricing arrangements between EU Member States.” Italy is part of this directive.

The New Directive must be reflected in the national law of European Union members before the end of 2016. This also means that Italy is committed to adopting the new ruling by the stated deadline.

While Italy has fulfilled its commitment to adopt the international AEOI by 2017, it has not taken active steps to encourage other countries to adopt the new tax information exchange system. Italy is therefore awarded a score of 0 for partial compliance.

**Analyst: Mia Naylor**

**Japan: 0**

Japan has partially complied with its commitment to promote the automatic exchange of financial account information (AEOI). It has acted to advance the implementation of AEOI but has not taken steps to promote it among non-signatories in a substantive manner.

On 28 January 2016, Japan signed a joint statement with Switzerland expressing a common commitment to begin the automatic exchange of account information in 2017. Japan’s Ministry of Finance stated that the statement would contribute to “deepening cooperation in the tax area between Japan and the Swiss Confederation.”

This year, Japan has remained on target with its plan to implement AEOI, but has not promoted the adoption of the system elsewhere. Thus, it has been awarded a score of 0.

**Analyst: Jerome Newton**

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to promote the automatic exchange of tax information as agreed at the 2015 Elmau G7 Summit.

On 13 July 2015, the UK launched the Addis Tax Initiative in cooperation with the United States, Germany, the Netherlands, Ethiopia and Kenya. The initiative assists participating countries to enact reforms that build the fairness, transparency and efficiency of their tax systems. This includes, “enabling partner countries take advantage of the progress made on the international tax agenda, such as ... tax information exchange including automatic exchange of information.” The UK has committed to investing GBP20 million annually to improving tax systems of developing countries.
On 6 August 2015, the UK announced cooperation with Ghana to ensure a better system for tax avoidance and evasion. This would allow automatic sharing of tax information between the two countries and help to detect undeclared taxable assets.

The UK continued its commitment to the recommendations made for the G20/OECD Erosion and Profit Sharing (BEPS) Action plan. It reformed international tax rules to ensure that multinational enterprises could be taxed.

In 2015, the UK also supported the Global Forum’s Africa Initiative, which raises awareness of exchange of information in order to confront tax evasion. This initiative aims to assist 17 African countries in building an effective national tax monitoring system.

The UK has been active in promoting and implementing a systematic exchange of information. Through bilateral or multilateral partnership, the UK also showed commitment to helping other countries develop a program to reduce international tax avoidance and evasion. Therefore, it has been awarded a full compliance score of +1.

 anális: Tatiana Ferrara-Menezes

**United States: 0**

The United States has partially complied with its commitment to promote the automatic exchange of tax information (AEOI). Although it has not acted to implement AEOI, it has participated in an initiative to promote it.

On 13 July 2015, the US launched the Addis Tax Initiative in cooperation with the United Kingdom, Germany, the Netherlands, Ethiopia and Kenya. The initiative assists participating countries to enact reforms that build the fairness, transparency and efficiency of their tax systems. This includes “enabling partner countries take advantage of the progress made on the international tax agenda, such as … tax information exchange including automatic exchange of information.”

The United States is not a signatory to the OECD Common Reporting Standard (CRS). Model 1 intergovernmental agreements for implementing the US Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act (FATCA) provided much of the framework for the CRS. However, FATCA intergovernmental agreements neither require that the US reciprocate the sharing of tax information nor support the establishment of multilateral exchange networks. The United States has also stated its intention not to become a signatory to the CRS.

The United States has thus partially complied with the G7 commitment to promote the automatic sharing of tax information and has been awarded a score of 0.

 anális: Jerome Newton

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to promote and implement the automatic exchange of information (AEOI) on cross-border tax rulings.

On 17 June 2015, the EU published a list of thirty countries it called “non-cooperative jurisdictions” with respect to tax information sharing. It doing so it hoped to “push non-cooperative non-EU jurisdictions to be more cooperative and adopt international standards,” of which the AEOI is part. Although the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development subsequently published an open letter pointing out that some states on the blacklist were, in fact, compliant with AEOI standards, this measure nonetheless constitutes an attempt to promote the AEOI.

On 8 December 2015, the European Council issued Directive 2015/2376 on AEOI, amending the previous Directive 2011/16EU. It introduced, inter alia, new measures and definitions to improve the legal certainty of the terms of the prior directive, more stringent standards for information exchange, and powers for the European Commission to enforce those standards.

Analyst: Tatiana Ferrara-Menezes

Analyst: Jerome Newton
On 15 February 2016, the EU and Andorra entered into an agreement for AEOI.

The EU has both promoted and furthered the enactment of the automatic exchange of financial information in cross-border tax rulings. Therefore, it has been awarded a score of +1 for full compliance.

ِAnalyst: Jerome Newton
6. Financial Regulation: Tax Agenda

“We reiterate our commitment to work with developing countries on the international tax agenda”

*G7 Schloss Elmau 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>-1</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>0</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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background**

Since the 2013 G8 Lough Erne Summit, the G7/8 has been concerned with tax evasion and profit shifting. The phenomenon whereby the policies and tax laws of one country adversely affect another country’s capability to acquire the taxes that are its due, are known as base erosion and profit shifting (BEPS). Since the Lough Erne Summit, the G7/G8 has worked alongside the G20 and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) to support the OECD’s Action Plan on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting as a primary means of tackling such issues. The Action Plan, produced in the same year, had the express aim of constraining offshore corporate tax evasion, specifically in developing countries. Developing countries are often the most neglected on this issue as the problem “manifest[s] differently given the specificities of their legal and administrative frameworks.”

Both developing and developed countries involved consequently lose out on substantial tax revenue. According to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, developing countries lose USD100 billion a year to multinational corporate tax evasion. Taxation is one of the primary methods for developing countries to accumulate resources for economic development. BEPS is therefore a significant issue. It also fosters an imperfect competition, an issue specifically for developed countries, as businesses may move their headquarters from one country to another, in order to benefit from less stringent tax laws and regulations.

---

While tax havens are still a major issue, Oxfam labelled such havens as the “core of a global system that allows large corporations … to avoid paying their fair share.”\(^{236}\) The situation has brightened since 2013. The Financial Secrecy Index has shown that many of these tax havens have considerably improved their regulations and transparency.\(^ {237}\)

**Commitment Features**

The commitment describes the G7 leaders’ willingness to discuss and cooperate with developing countries on the international tax agenda. Although the commitment may seem to be vaguely worded, this commitment to cooperation is addressed in the same communique. Measures that encourage the automatic exchange of information on cross-border tax rulings or that promote improvement to existing international information networks, with regards to developing countries, are considered relevant. However, merely urging countries that may have yet to implement an international standard for the exchange of information related to taxation is not relevant and does not constitute a satisfaction of this commitment.

The Leaders’ Declaration refers specifically to the OECD’s BEPS plan and the need for rapid implementation of the global standard for automatic exchange of information, with regards to all matters pertinent to tax. Therefore measures that promote or address the actions within the BEPS plan or help with the implementation of the global standard for automatic exchange of information, within the context of developing countries are relevant. Some actions within the BEPS plan are as follows: address tax challenges of the digital economy, strengthen controlled foreign company rules, and limit base erosion via interest deductions and other financial payments.\(^ {238}\) Finally, any G7 member’s assistance towards building developing countries’ tax administration capacities is considered relevant.

The leaders’ commitment to a “work with developing countries on the international tax agenda” implies that full compliance constitutes measures that encourage improvements to existing international information networks and that promote and/or implement the BEPS plan. Partial compliance would occur if a member country introduced new measures that improved existing international information networks (including the exchange of information on cross-border tax rulings) but did not promote and/or implement the BEPS plan.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>−1</td>
<td>Members introduce no new measures that encourage the automatic exchange of information on cross-border tax rulings and improve existing international information networks AND does not act to further the promotion or implementation of the OECD BEPS plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Members introduce new measures that encourage the automatic exchange of information on cross-border tax rulings and improve existing international information networks BUT does not act to further the promotion or implementation of the OECD BEPS plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Members that actively engage in the promotion or implementation of the OECD BEPS plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lead Analyst: Ben Fickling*

**Canada:** +1

Canada has fully complied with its commitment on the international tax agenda.

In Canada’s 2016 Budget, the Government of Canada took several steps to implement the OECD Base Erosion and Profit Sharing plan. It proposed new legislation to “strengthen transfer pricing documentation by

---


introducing country-by-country reporting for large multinational enterprises.” Additionally, the Canada Revenue Agency “is applying revised international guidance on transfer pricing by multinationals, which provides an improved interpretation of the arm’s-length principle.” Canada is also participating in “international work to develop a multilateral instrument to streamline the implementation of treaty-related BEPS recommendations, including addressing treaty abuse.”

In November 2015, Canada participated in the G20 summit in Antalya, Turkey, a forum in which BEPS was central topic of discussion. In Lima, Peru, finance ministers finalized a number of measures for reform to tackle tax avoidance.

Therefore, Canada has been awarded the score of +1.

Analyst: Ben Fickling

France: −1

France has not complied with its commitment on the international tax agenda.

There has been little legislation in France to implement the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) Action Plan on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS).

France has made minimal contributions towards tax systems in developing countries. However, the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs has conducted research in evaluating the taxation systems in Benin, Cameroon, Ghana, Mali and Mauritania. Furthermore, France is constantly a part of the dialogue regarding the international tax agenda and has hosted conferences.

France has not provided financial aid to develop taxation systems in developing countries. Nevertheless, France had investigated developing states to identify where there could be improvements on their taxation system. Little to no evidence demonstrates that France took action to enforce measurable change in developing states taxation systems.

France therefore received a score of −1.

Analyst: Sabal Matter Al-Khateeb

Germany: +1

Germany has fully complied with its commitment on the international tax agenda. It has succeeded in emplacing a legislative framework for the automatic exchange of tax information domestically and taken steps to promote it among non-signatory jurisdictions.

---

On 13 July 2015, Germany launched the Addis Tax Initiative in cooperation with the United Kingdom, the United States, the Netherlands, Ethiopia and Kenya. The initiative assists participating countries to enact reforms that build the fairness, transparency and efficiency of their tax systems. This includes “enabling partner countries take advantage of the progress made on the international tax agenda, such as … tax information exchange including automatic exchange of information.”

On 15 July 2015, Germany’s federal cabinet “adopted two draft bills that will enable Germany to exchange financial account information in tax matters automatically with other EU member states and non-EU countries from 2017 onwards.” The bills set out details for the exchange of tax information within Germany and align Germany’s EU Mutual Assistance Act with the EU’s adoption of the Common Reporting Standard (CRS) in late 2014.

On 18 December 2015, Germany’s Bundesrat approved the *Law on the Automatic Exchange of Information in Financial Accounts in Tax Matters and on the Amendment of other Acts*, implementing into German law the OECD Common Reporting Standard. The legislation, which came into effect on 31 December 2015, obliges Germany to conduct the first exchanges of tax information with EU members and third countries by 31 July 2017.

Germany had created an educational program for tax professionals in African countries — “Executive Master’s in Taxation.” The purpose of this program is to educate tax professionals in which they can be agents of change in their respective countries to enact tax reforms. The “Executive Master’s in Taxation” had been created through the relationship between the African Tax Administration Forum and the Berlin School of Economics and Law, the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Therefore, Germany has received a score of +1.

*Analyst: Sabal Matter Al-Khateeb*

**Italy: 0**

Italy has partially complied with its commitment on the international tax agenda.

The peer review of Italy published by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) indicated that Italy promotes transparency in regards to the “OECD Tax and Development Informal group and the Global Forum on Transparency and Exchange of Information for Tax Purposes.”

Italy is undergoing the process of implementing information sharing in terms of taxation. Legislation had been approved for exchange of information as Italy implemented the Directive on Administrative

---


Cooperation and Mutual Assistance and Common Reporting Standard of 1 January 2016. However, the first exchange of information is planned for September 2017.

Italy has acted to implement the OECD BEPS plan, but has not taken substantive steps to promote it in other jurisdictions. Therefore, it has been awarded a score of 0.

**Analyst: Sabal Matter Al-Khateeb**

**Japan: +1**

Japan has fully complied with its commitment to work with developing countries on the international tax agenda.

Japan has taken the role as a regional leader in the dissemination of tax infrastructure assistance to developing countries through leading symposiums and constantly updating their advanced exchange of information (EOI) framework for international taxation. Furthermore, Japan has already begun to incorporate the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) Action Plan on Base Erosion Profit Shifting Action Plan (BEPS) — especially regarding policies focused on developing countries — and is expected to have full legislation implemented within the year.

Japan has set the standard for the EOI for international tax infrastructure in Asia and the Pacific. Japan was one of the first developed Asia-Pacific countries to give access to its tax system and financial reports to developing countries — passing legislation in 2003 allowing its treaty partners to inspect all economic activity between the parties, and in 2006, giving foreign countries access to Japan’s financial records for the purpose of investigating tax crimes. In 2015, Japan held numerous workshops and seminars for developing countries in the Asia-Pacific region, providing instruction on how to better access Japan’s tax information, and also increasing its availability. As a result, the OECD gave Japan an overall compliance score full compliance for 2015 in terms of access, availability, and exchange of tax information.

Japan has also directly contributed to developing countries ability to improve tax infrastructure within their jurisdictions in order to avoid becoming a tax haven. In April 2015, Japan’s Ministry of Finance and the International Monetary Fund hosted a workshop providing resources for the finance ministers of Asian countries on for improving tax infrastructure and corporate finance transparency. This commitment continued after the Elmau Summit, with the Japanese National Tax Agency funding a November 2015 Asian Development Bank workshop on detecting tax evasion for developing countries across Asia and the Pacific.

While not fully legislated yet, Japan’s proactive efforts of incorporating BEPS into its tax system is strong indicator that Japan will be fully compliant with its BEPS commitment on schedule. Japan is expected to formalize BEPS legislation by 2017, yet it has already included a number of BEPS recommendations in its 2015 tax reform package, including measures addressing tax avoidance in digital transactions — a tax area for which many developing countries struggle to maintain. Japan’s efforts to prepare their tax structure in

---

anticipation of BEPS, especially in the realm of international tax avoidance, has led Ernst and Young to give Japan a full compliance score for their 2015 BEPS commitment.\(^{261}\)

Japan's proactive measures to curtail international tax avoidance in developing countries in 2015 has made the country the model for promoting the international tax agenda in the Asia-Pacific region. Furthermore, the country has made clear indication that they will further expand their role in the near future as Finance Minister Taro Aso has called for a more rapid implementation of BEPS.\(^{262}\)

Therefore, Japan has been awarded a score of +1 for this commitment.

**Analyst: Aidan Robern**

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment by actively engaging in the promotion and implementation of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development's (OECD) Action Plan on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS).

The UK has introduced anti-hybrid rules for corporation tax.\(^{263}\) Current corporation tax laws allow large multinational organizations with UK parent or subsidiary companies to have tax mix matches or lower taxes. The aim of the anti-hybrid laws is to create hybrid arrangements by changing the tax treatment of either the payment or the receipt. These new rules will neutralize the tax effect of hybrid mismatch arrangements in accordance with the recommendations of Action 2 of the G20/OECD Base Erosion and Profit Shifting Plan.\(^{264}\) This measure will affect businesses that use artificially contrived tax planning arrangements to exploit mismatches in international tax systems.

Lastly, the UK has actively engaging in the promotion and implementation of the OECD Base Erosion and Profit Shifting Plan through various smaller measures. In developing countries such as Ghana, the United Kingdom helped tackle tax avoidance by working with them to improve their tax rules and infrastructure.\(^{265}\) Moreover, the UK worked closely with the EU to establish a process for tax authorities to exchange information on the tax affairs of large multinational companies.\(^ {266}\) Chancellor of the Exchequer George Osborne stated that: 1) The UK has led campaigns to change the international tax system and consequently, countries across the world are much better equipped to deal with corporate tax avoidance; 2) the UK has consistently demonstrated its commitment to tackling the OECD Base Erosion and Profit Shifting Plan and will continue to introduce new international and domestic tax laws; and 3) the UK government will work closely with the G20 and other international partners to update international tax treaties.\(^{267}\)

The United Kingdom has consistently demonstrated its commitment to tackling the OECD Base Erosion and Profit Shifting Plan. The have introduced several innovative domestic and international tax legislations, helped developing countries with their own infrastructures and addressed the issues of tax avoidance.


\(^{266}\) UK leads international efforts to clampdown on tax avoidance, GOV.UK (United Kingdom) 9 October 2015. Access date: 03 February 2016. https://www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-leads-international-efforts-to-clampdown-on-tax-avoidance.

For these reasons, the United Kingdom has been awarded a score of +1.

**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to work with developing countries on the international tax agenda.

On 13 July 2015, the US launched the Addis Tax Initiative in cooperation with the United Kingdom, Germany, the Netherlands, Ethiopia and Kenya.\(^{268}\) The initiative assists participating countries to enact reforms that build the fairness, transparency and efficiency of their tax systems. This includes “enabling partner countries take advantage of the progress made on the international tax agenda, such as…tax information exchange including automatic exchange of information.”\(^{269}\)

In late 2015, the US agreed to participate in multi-state discussions around the Base Erosion and Profit Sharing Action Plan’s binding arbitration mechanism.\(^{270}\) On 2 October, the US Treasury Department’s deputy assistant secretary for national tax affairs, Robert Stack, stated that US participation in multilateral discussions related to BEPS was to further US interests in binding mandatory arbitration. He made clear that US attendance “by no means foreshadows any decision about whether to eventually join in signing.”\(^{271}\)

However, the United States has made some indirect acts that further the implementation of the standard. On 31 July 2015, the United States Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service released the 2015-2016 Priority Guidance Plan. The plan listed “Regulations under §§6011 and 6038 relating to the country-by-country reporting of income, earnings, taxes paid, and certain economic activity for transfer pricing risk assessment” as areas for priority action.\(^{272}\) Country-by-country reporting “falls under Action 13 of the [Base Erosion and Profit Sharing] Action Plan.”\(^{273}\)

Although the United States has given no indication of intent to support the BEPS Action Plan as a whole, it has to some extent furthered its implementation. Therefore, the United States has been awarded as score of +1

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment on financial and tax regulation.

In October 2015, the EU welcomed the final package of the Action Plan on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the same day the OECD adopted the reforms. Pierre Moscovici, Commissioner for Economic and Financial Affairs, Taxation

---


and Customs, stated in a press release that he will work with EU member states to ensure the final BEPS package is implemented in their single European market.\textsuperscript{274}

In January 2016 the EU announced new measures aimed at curbing tax evasion, primarily within the EU, but also with an eye to developing countries. Indeed, the website dedicated to describing the measures states: “Developing countries should also be included in the international tax good governance network, so that they can benefit from the global fight against tax avoidance too.”\textsuperscript{275} Furthermore, in the communicative materials for the tax evasion measures, the document states, among its proposals: “Assistance to developing countries.”\textsuperscript{276}

Therefore the EU received a score of +1 for complying with the commitment on financial and tax regulation.

\textit{Analyst: Justin Bedi}

7. Terrorism: Terrorists’ Assets

“We reaffirm our commitment to effectively implement the established international framework for the freezing of terrorists’ assets, and will facilitate cross-border freezing requests among G7 countries.”

G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

In the wake of emergent national security threats, G7 has given considerable attention to international terrorism. At the 2002 Kananaskis Summit, the G7 “committed to sustained and comprehensive actions to deny support, or sanctuary to terrorists, to bring [them] to justice, and to reduce the threat of terrorist attacks.” One year later at the Evian Summit, the G7 created the Counter-Terrorism Action Group (CTAG), an institutional commitment to coordinating political will and counter-terrorism activities to help eradicate the root causes of terrorism. At the 2005 Gleneagles Summit, the G7 committed to enhancing the CTAG by working to improve intelligence sharing between member states.

The Financial Action Task Force (FATF) was established in 1989 to “promote effective implementation of legal, regulatory and operational measures for combating money laundering, terrorist financing and other related threats to the integrity of the international financial system.”

The G7 has also institutionally committed to supporting the Government of Afghanistan in its transition to democracy and its attempts to combat terrorism. At the 2009 L’Aquila Summit, member states committed to “provide assistance to the electorally process, to provide comprehensive assistance to the new Afghan Government, and to support capacity building at all levels.” In Muskoka in 2010, the G7 supported the International Security Assistance Force’s (ISAF) transition strategy, as well as ongoing efforts to establish an Afghan-led reconciliation process. A similar push for the advancement of good governance in Afghanistan occurred at the 2011 Deauville Summit, despite the existence of other pressing terrorism priorities.

At the 2012 Camp David Summit, the G7 members continued to support the Government of Afghanistan during the transition process “with a close coordination of our security, political and economic strategies.”

Member states also maintained their support for external conferences, such as those in Bonn and Tokyo, where the world community generates further long-term support for assistance to Afghanistan.

Throughout Afghanistan’s transition process, the G7 has supported the Roma-Lyon Group that seeks to counter threats of terrorism and organized crime. The G7 endorsed the Roma-Lyon Group for its efforts to “enhance cooperation against terrorism; counter improvised explosive devices; combat illicit drug production and trafficking.”

At the 2013 Lough Erne Summit, G7 members stated that they would continue to assist the Government of Afghanistan to “strengthen their institutions of governance, to combat terrorism and the threat of terrorism.”

Most recently at the 2015 Elmau Summit, G7 members reaffirmed their commitment against financing terrorism and to ensuring “an effective implementation of FATF standards, including through a robust follow-up process.”

Commitment Features
This particular commitment focuses on G7 members’ compliance in implementing an established international framework for the freezing of terrorist assets and their compliance in facilitating cross border freezing requests by other G7 members. This can mean investments in counter-terror financing, anti-money laundering, and individualized sanctions or broader multi-lateral innovations.

Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>G7 member does not take any measures to implement an international framework to freeze terrorist assets AND does not facilitate cross-border freezing requests by other G7 members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>G7 member takes measures to implement an international framework to freeze terrorist financing OR facilitates cross-border freezing requests by other G7 members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>G7 member takes measures to implement an international framework to combat terrorist financing AND facilitates cross-border freezing requests by other G7 members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lead Analyst: Christine Jacob

Canada: +1
Canada fully complied with its commitment to effectively implement the established international framework for the freezing of terrorists’ assets and facilitate cross-border freezing requests among G7 members.

The Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorism Financing Act (PCMLTFA) is the main framework in Canadian law dealing with the tracking, prevention, and deterrence of terrorism financing. The Financial Transactions and Reports Analysis Centre of Canada (FINTRAC) and the Ministry of Finance are responsible for enforcing this act. FINTRAC is the body that detects, prevents, and deters financing of terrorist activities.

PCMLTFA allows Canada to heighten its abilities to counter terrorist activity, specifically terrorism financing. This act specifically allows Canada to cooperate with other countries in the international counter-
terrorism effort.288 Thus, Canada has the ability to facilitate freezing requests by G7 members as well as other countries.

Canada already has a framework in place to facilitate asset-freezing requests by other G7 members. The Department of Global Affairs (formerly the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade) helps negotiate and enforce resolutions in international organizations such as the G7, the G20, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.289 The Canadian government continues to use asset-freezing frameworks already in place for its counter-terrorism effort.

Canada was awarded a score of +1 due to its ongoing efforts to counter terrorism financing in form of anti-terrorism legislation, amendments to the Criminal Code and Canada’s constant cooperation with the international community’s effort to counter terrorism financing.

**Analyst: Steven Camit**

**France: +1**

France has fully complied with its commitment to implement the established international framework for the freezing of terrorists’ assets and facilitate cross-border freezing requests among G7 members.

On 1 September 2015, the Ministry of Finance and Public Accounts (FICOBA) decreased its cash limit. Cash limits for French residents decreased by two thirds while limits for non-residents decreased by one third.290

France has committed to improving its freezing capabilities. The Ministries of Finance and Interior now have the power to freeze assets of suspected terrorists for six months. This coincides with their anti-terrorist commitment with the European Union and their adoption of law on “transparency of economic life.”291

The French government has promoted cooperation between its ministries to better control cash flow. These measures include better control of physical capital transfers, strict restrictions on prepaid credit cards, more identification requirements when making transactions of EUR1000 or more, and giving FICOBA more control of “nickel” accounts.292

Following the attacks in Paris on 13 November 2015, the French government accelerated its anti-terrorist financing measures to help prevent the financing of terrorism on national, European and international levels.293 In particular, France called on European Union members to take swifter action on toughening rules that would combat money laundering. The deadline for these rules was originally 2017.294

France’s leadership has made effective contributions to the international framework on countering terrorist financing, and has granted G7 members’ requests to freeze assets within its jurisdiction. Thus, France has been awarded a score of +1.

**Analyst: Steven Camit**

---


Germany: +1

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to effectively implement the established international framework for freezing terrorists’ assets and facilitate cross-border freezing requests among G7 members.

Following the 2015 summit, the German government added a new section (89c) on terrorism financing to the Criminal Code. This section replaces the previously existing section (89a, paragraph 2, number 4), and criminalizes all forms of terrorism financing. The changes to the criminal code reflect recommendations by the Financial Action Task Force (FATF).

In addition, the German Banking Act 2014 has already established a domestic framework for the freezing of terrorists’ assets across borders. Under the Act, the Federal Supervisory Authority may freeze assets and stop transactions where related to the financing of terrorism. The German government does not require that freezing be subject to domestic judicial confirmation, and is open to requests made by other states. As of 23 May 2016, no state has yet requested that Germany to freeze terrorist assets in its territory.

According to the November 2015 Terrorist Financing FATF Report to G20 Leaders, Germany is one of 37 jurisdictions out of a total of 194, which has applied targeted financial sanctions equaling a total of EUR5,300 frozen.

Germany has made effective contributions to the international framework on countering terrorist financing. Therefore, it is awarded a score of +1.

Analyst: Courtney Hallink

Italy: +1

Italy has fully complied with its commitment to effectively implement the established international framework for the freezing of terrorists’ assets and facilitate cross-border freezing requests among G7 members.

Italy has made a number of diplomatic initiatives aimed at improving measures to counter terrorist financing.

In December 2015, at a meeting of the finance ministers of the members of the United Nations Security Council, Italy co-sponsored Resolution 2253, drafted by the United States and Russia, regarding ISIS counter financing. The resolution renamed the existing 126/1989 al Qaeda Sanctions Regime and List to incorporate the Caliphate, calling for sanctions on any country, individual or group associated with ISIS, comprising asset freeze, travel ban and ban on transfer of arms. The resolution further called for increased engagement with private sector financial institutions to improve identification of terrorist activity.

---

In September 2015, Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs Paolo Gentiloni, with Nasser Judeh, Jordan’s Minister of Foreign Affairs, presented an initiative entitled Protecting Cultural Heritage — An Imperative for Humanity. The initiative intended to increase protection of cultural heritage targeted by terrorists and traffickers, given the prevalence of artifact trafficking and looting of cultural heritage sites for income generation by ISIS. At the third meeting of the Counter-ISIL Finance Group help in August 2015, four subgroups created to allow coalition members to cooperate on specific aspects of counter terror finance. Italy is chairing the group working to counter the smuggling of archeological artifacts by ISIS militants.

Italy has made effective contributions to the international framework on countering terrorist financing, and has granted G7 members’ requests to freeze assets within its jurisdiction. Thus, Italy has been awarded a score of +1.

*Analyst: Sanjana Shah*

**Japan: −1**

Japan has not complied with its commitment to effectively implement the established international framework for freezing terrorists’ assets and facilitate cross-border freezing requests among G7 members.

Prior to the 2015 Elmau Summit, the Japanese cabinet approved the proposed legislation to freeze terrorist assets after receiving criticism from Financial Action Task Force for its inadequate role in the international effort against terrorist financing. The cabinet also agreed on an amendment to the Prevention of Transfer of Criminal Proceeds Act, which will serve to strengthen the anti-money laundering procedures. The proposed legislation and amendment, however, have not yet been put into force.

In December 2015, Japan created the International Counterterrorism Intelligence Collection Unit. The intelligence unit is be made up of personnel from the Foreign and Defence Ministries, the National Police Agency, and the Cabinet Intelligence and Research Office.

In January 2016, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe proclaimed that Japan would not join the US-led fight against ISIS in the near future. Abe also stated that Japan’s support would be limited to humanitarian aid.

On 2 May 2016, Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe and French President Francois Hollande held a joint news conference in Paris where they confirmed their nations’ renewed commitment to combating terrorism. At the conference Abe denounced terrorism and noted that the two countries will “work together in close coordination and play a leadership role” in tackling terrorism. There was, however no concrete action taken, or decided on at the conference, and so there has been no impact on Japan’s compliance, or their score.

---


Therefore, Japan has not taken any concrete measures to address terrorist financing through an international framework, nor has it granted the request of G7 members to freeze assets in their jurisdiction. Thus, Japan has been awarded a score of -1.

Analyst: Courtney Hallink

United Kingdom: +1

The United Kingdom has fully complied with the commitment to combat terrorism.

Since the 2015 Elmau Summit, the UK has taken measures to implement an international framework to freeze terrorist assets and facilitate cross-border freezing requests by other G7 members.

At the 17 December 2015 meeting of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), George Osborne, Chancellor of the Exchequer, stated that the United Kingdom had submitted a list of British nationals who had travelled to Syria and put their names forward to the United Nations for listing.\(^\text{309}\) Osborne also stated that the United Kingdom would legislate domestically in order to implement United Nations sanctions as soon as possible.\(^\text{310}\)

The November 2015 Terrorist Financial Action Task Force Report to G20 Leaders identified the UK as one of the 37 jurisdictions that has applied targeted financial sanctions on its own motion.\(^\text{311}\) As of 15 August 2015, there were 158 individuals and entities designated in response to impositions by UNSC resolutions on al Qaeda and the Taliban, with asset amounts frozen totalling EUR214,000.\(^\text{312}\)

In response to the fourth report from David Anderson, the Independent Reviewer of Terrorism Legislation in the United Kingdom, the Government of the United Kingdom issued a document in July 2015 outlining the increase in the number of new designations under the Terrorist Asset-Freezing etc. Act 2010. and agreeing that putting one member of the asset-freezing case review group forward to present a “devil’s advocate” case against designation could supplement the level of challenge that takes place during the review group meeting and advance the rigour and effectiveness of these meetings.\(^\text{313}\)

The United Kingdom has taken measures to address terrorist financing through an international framework and has remained committed to granting the requests of G7 members to freeze assets in their jurisdiction. Thus, the United Kingdom has been awarded a score of +1.

Analyst: Elizabeth Gross

---


United States: 0
The United States has partially complied with its commitment to effectively implement the established international framework for the freezing of terrorists’ assets and facilitate cross-border freezing requests among G7 members.

The United States has contributed to the establishment of an effective international framework for countering terrorist financing. In December 2015, US Treasury Secretary Jacob Lew chaired a meeting of finance ministers of the members of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) on the topic of terrorist financing.314 The United States sponsored a UNSC resolution in conjunction with Russia aimed at improving measures to counter terror financing by criminalizing all terror-related financial transactions.315 The resolution encourages financial sanctions against individuals aiding terror recruitment, training or travel even in the absence of direct links to terrorist activity.316

The United States has adopted diplomatic measures in its efforts to counter terrorist financing. In September 2015, the United States announced a State Department Reward for Justice offer of USD5 million for information regarding disruption of the sale of oil or antiquities profiting the ISIS.317 The Treasury Department designated over 30 ISIS officials, facilitators and fighters under Executive Order 13224.318 As a result, these individuals were designated by the UN under UNSC Resolution 1267 and Resolution 1989 for targeted financial sanctions and travel bans.319 The US-led coalition committed to destroying ISIS in both military and financial terms, welcomed new members Malaysia, Nigeria and Tunisia to the existing 60-member coalition.320

The United States has further chosen to target terrorist financing through military measures. On 12 January 2016, President Barack Obama’s State of the Union address discussed the role of US-led air strikes in targeting ISIL finances as he declared a key source of ISIS finance, a bank in Mosul, was bombed the same day.321 The United States launched Operation Tidal Wave II in October 2015 specifically targeting ISIS oil facilities and infrastructure in Deil-ez-Zour, having conducted over 68 airstrikes to date.322 On 21 October 2015, the US-led coalition hit 26 targets in the Omar oil field, one of the two largest oil production sites in

---

Syria, producing approximately 30,000 barrels a day.\textsuperscript{323} Since November 2015, US-led strikes are believed to have reduced ISIS oil revenues by 30 per cent.\textsuperscript{324}

The US has not demonstrated complete international cooperation on the issue of terrorist financing. As per the Terrorist Finance Tracking Program of 2010, signed by the US and the European Union, the EU countries rely on the US for information regarding terrorist financial flows.\textsuperscript{325} Yet, the United States refused to respond to French inquiries regarding terrorist funding sources tied to the ISIS attack in November 2015 in Paris.\textsuperscript{326}

The United States has made effective contributions to the international framework on countering terrorist financing, but has not granted G7 members’ requests to freeze assets within its jurisdiction. Thus, the United States has been awarded a score of 0.

Analyst: Sanjana Shah

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to combat terrorism.

Since the 2015 Elmau Summit, the EU has taken measures to implement an international framework to freeze terrorist assets and facilitate cross-border freezing requests by other G7 members.

A 17 November 2015 European Commission fact sheet detailed progress made in addressing priorities outlined in the European Agenda on Security (adopted on 28 April 2015) including legal and technical improvements to the Schengen Information System database, the establishment of an EU Referral Unit in Europol, the establishment of a Radicalisation Awareness Network Centre of Excellence, and notably, the establishment of a platform bringing together Financial Intelligence Units from the EU members.\textsuperscript{327}

Shortly after the 16 November 2015 G20 summit in Antalya, the European Union Justice and Home Affairs ministers met on 20 November to discuss how to improve the EU’s response to terrorism.\textsuperscript{328} They approved a set of conclusions including an effort to combat the financing of terrorism through: 1) inviting the European Commission to present proposals to strengthen, harmonize and improve the powers of, and the cooperation between Financial Intelligence Units to bolster the fight against money laundering and terrorist financing in line with FATF recommendations; and 2) committing to ensure a swift and effective freezing of terrorist assets throughout the Union, whether through autonomous EU decisions or in compliance with UN Security Council Resolutions.\textsuperscript{329} However, these proposals have yet to pass into legislation.

In December 2015, French Finance Minister Michel Sapin proposed strategies to further cross-border cooperation between financial investigators, freeze terrorist assets throughout the EU, more rigorously assess the use of prepaid cards and virtual currencies, and to access data related to suspicious SWIFT wire transfers

---


in Europe. Sapin’s ministerial counterparts agreed to accelerate action, both on previously agreed strategies and the additional measures introduced by France. Sapin stated that the European Commission will commence work promptly on new proposals, to be settled at a subsequent EU finance minister meeting.

The European Union has taken measures to address terrorist financing through an international framework and has remained committed to granting the requests of G7 members to freeze assets in their jurisdiction. Thus, the European Union has been awarded a score of +1.

*Analyst: Elizabeth Gross*

---

8. Nonproliferation: Arms Trade

“[Based on our common values and principles we are committed to:] Strengthening the System of Multilateral Treaties/Arms Trade Treaty”

G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>+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></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>−1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

The inadequate control of arms transfers has led to the widespread availability of conventional weapons. These can be misused by state and non-state armed forces, and organized criminal groups. The accessibility of these weapons facilitates human rights violations against civilian groups worldwide. Already-marginalized populations and those living in conflict zones are at the greatest risk. Attacks using lethal weapons acquired through uncontrolled transfers also disrupt development projects and challenge humanitarian interventions. The efforts of the G7 members, and other international organizations to promote economic and social development, maintain peace, deliver aid or help displaced persons is impeded by groups with access to weaponry.

On 24 December 2014, the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) was ratified to address the negative impact of the global arms trade. Specifically, the ATT aims to decrease violence against civilians in conflict areas, create safe environments for the United Nations to intervene for peacekeeping missions, prevent human rights violations, promote post-conflict peace building projects, and create safe environments in which other humanitarian organizations can operate.

United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon praised the treaty, stating the ATT “will be a powerful new tool in our efforts to prevent grave human rights abuses or violations of international humanitarian law. And it will provide much-needed momentum for other global disarmament and non-proliferation efforts.” At the 2015 summit, leaders stressed the importance of the ATT and committed to broadening support for the treaty. G7 leaders have acknowledged the ATT as an important tool in creating improving security and combating humanitarian crises.

There are few treaties currently in force that attempt to regulate the sale of conventional weapons. Multilateral agreements include the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects and the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe.338 G7 commitments to the ATT and strengthening the system of multilateral treaties aims to increase regional security and to uphold legitimate arms trades while discouraging illegal trafficking of arms and reducing humanitarian strife.339

Commitment Features

The commitment of G7 leaders to strengthening the ATT and multilateral trade agreements requires the creation of better, coordinated measures to prevent conventional weapons from freely flowing between countries and falling into the hands of those who intend to misuse them. G7 countries will not only need to broaden support for the ATT, but create more effective barriers to illegal trafficking of arms.

As signatories of the ATT, governments are required to assess the risk of transferred weapons or ammunitions increasing conflict or be used to violate international humanitarian law before these transfers take place.340 To be fully compliant, a member state must put in place policies that allow it to better assess the negative outcomes of arms transfers on civilians, in addition to supporting the ATT in general.

Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member does not engage in risk assessments as outlined by the Arms Trade Treaty AND does not participate in activities to strengthen the system of multilateral treaties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member engages in risk assessments before trading or transferring arms as outlined by the Arms Trade Treaty OR participates in activities to strength the system of multilateral treaties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member engages in risk assessments before trading or transferring arms as outlined by the Arms Trade Treaty AND participates in activities to strengthen the system of multilateral treaties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lead Analyst: Amelia Cook

Canada: 0

Canada has partially complied with its commitment to strengthen the system of multilateral treaties and the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT).

Canada remains the only member of NATO not to sign the ATT. However, the victory of the Liberal party in Canada’s general election of 19 October 2015 emplaced a government committed to signing the treaty.341 Newly elected Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau has stated that he will move Canada back towards its traditional role as an active player in multilateral institutions, including the United Nations.342 Ensuring that Canada becomes a party to the ATT was an explicit pledge in the Liberal campaign platform, and a priority in new Foreign Affairs Minister Stéphane Dion’s mandate letter.343,344

However, Prime Minister Trudeau has yet to fulfill these promises. In February 2016, the government refused to cancel or reassess a CAD15 billion arms contract with Saudi Arabia (a stated ranked among the lowest in the world for human rights protection), and declined to make public an internal report into whether or to what extent the deal would violate Canadian export rules.\(^345\)\(^346\) According to *The Globe and Mail*, the Global Affairs Canada says Ottawa is “not ready” to sign the ATT yet.\(^347\)

Canada has made progress in its commitment to strengthening the ATT, but has made no progress toward improving or reassessing risk with respect to the conduct of the arms trade. Canada has thus partially complied with this commitment and is awarded a score of 0.

*Analyst: Jerome Newton*

**France: +1**

France has fully complied with its commitment on strengthening the system of multilateral treaties and the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT). It has actively participated to broaden worldwide support of the ATT and implemented policies to assess risks due to the transfer of arms.

At the First Conference of State Parties for the ATT of 24–27 August 2015, France acted as Facilitator on Secretariat. The conference called for United Nations members to sign and ratify the ATT.\(^348\) In addition, France was appointed as one of five representatives to be a member of the management committee that oversees the international implementation of the ATT.\(^349\)

Thus, France has been rewarded a score of +1.

*Analyst: Peter Fettes*

**Germany: +1**

Germany is awarded a score of +1 for fully complying with the requirements set out by the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) and actively working to strengthen multilateral non-proliferation treaties.

On 16 October 2015, Germany held a meeting in partnership with members of the African Union (AU) to discuss arms limitation as part of the “African Union–Germany Project on Enhanced Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) Control and Physical Security and Stockpile Management (PSSM) in the Greater Sahel.”\(^350\) This meeting furthered a project launched in May 2015 to control the movement and prevent the loss of small arms in the Sahel region of Africa. The project also aims to improve cooperation between developed and developing states on the issue.\(^351\)

Given Germany’s commitment to broadening arms control and risk assessment, in compliance with the ATT, Germany is awarded a score of +1.

*Analyst: Jerome Newton*

**Italy: −1**

Italy has not complied with its commitment to strengthen multilateral trade agreements and implement the terms of the Arms Trade Treaty.

On 13 October 2015, Italy’s Permanent Representative to the UN Conference on Disarmament, Vinicio Mati, reaffirmed Italy’s commitment to all progress made with respect to small arms control, voiced Italy’s support for the expansion of the Nonproliferation Treaty, and welcomed the goals of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention.352

Although Italy has announced support for the multilateral system of treaties controlling the movement of small and other arms, it has made no new substantive efforts to strengthen it. Italy has not engaged openly in the conduct of new risk analyses, consistent with guidelines laid out in the ATT. For these reasons, Italy receives a score of −1.

*Analyst: Amelia Cook*

**Japan: +1**

Japan has fully complied with its commitment to strengthen multilateral trade agreements and implement the terms of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT).

On 26 October 2015, Japan’s ambassador to the Conference on Disarmament at the First Committee of the 70th Session of the General Assembly issued a statement outlining Japan’s support for the ATT, and practical steps to ensure its implementation and execution. First, Japan outlined the importance of creating feasible reporting mechanisms for the ATT Secretariat to promote transparency and keep the execution of the treaty on track.353 Furthermore, Japan committed to universalizing the ATT throughout the Asia-Pacific region through international cooperation and aiding states’ capacity to effectively implement treaty obligations. Finally, Japan called on all member states to “extend their support to the annual resolution on small arms and light weapons drafted by Colombia, Japan, and South Africa, so that it will be adopted again by consensus.”354

Japan has also committed to funding mine programs to clear unexploded bombs, and improving risk assessment programs.355

Due to Japan’s continued commitment to facilitate the effective international implementation of the ATT, Japan receives a score of +1.

*Analyst: Amelia Cook*

---


**United Kingdom: 0**

The United Kingdom has partially complied with its commitment to strengthen the system of multilateral treaties and conduct risk assessments consistent with the ATT.

Following Saudi Arabia’s controversial execution of 47 anti-government protestors in January 2016 and revelations about Saudi attacks on civilian targets in Yemen, numerous civil rights groups and international organizations campaigns for states with arms deals to Saudi Arabia to reassess those agreements. The British government has stated that it will take “extremely seriously” a January 2016 UN report suggesting that Saudi forces committed crimes against humanity in Yemen.

Under the UK’s Consolidated EU and national arms export licensing criteria, the United Kingdom reviews its arms sales agreements on a continual basis, and has therefore conducted risk assessments with respect to deals with Saudi Arabia and other countries this year.

The UK has made no substantive efforts to strengthen the system of multilateral arms treaties this year.

Therefore, the UK is awarded a score of 0.

*Analyst: Amelia Cook*

**United States: –1**

The United States has not complied with its commitment to strengthen the system of multilateral treaties or the ATT.

Following the refusal of the United States Senate to ratify the ATT in March 2013, the US has made no substantive effort to strengthen the treaty, nor to expand or create other treaties addressing the control of small arms.

For this reason, the United States is awarded a score of –1.

*Analyst: Genevieve Zingg*

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to strengthen the system of multilateral treaties and the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT).

An evaluation of the Firearm Directive for the EU was concluded last year and the Commission is submitting proposals for legislative and non-legislative actions to the European Parliament and the Council to improve the current system for controlling and regulating purchase and movement of conventional weapons. On 18 November 2015, at the Press Conference on the Preparation of the 20 November Justice and Home Affairs Council and the Firearms Package, Commissioner Elżbieta Beinkowska stated, “the rules to acquire and trade firearms should be stricter” and announced a new package to better improve regulation. This package consists

---

of implementing stricter and harmonized standards across the EU to create better rules for transferring weapons across borders.\textsuperscript{361}

Finally, the EU has undertaken an “Everything-But-Arms” arrangement with Uganda to aid its development by allowing duty free access to the EU.\textsuperscript{362}

Given the EU’s commitment to implementing the ATT and strengthening multilateral agreements to prevent illegal arms transfers, the European Union receives a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Amelia Cook}


9. Regional Security: Ukraine

“We reiterate our full support for the efforts to find a diplomatic solution to the conflict in eastern Ukraine, particularly in the framework of the Normandy format and the Trilateral Contact Group”

_G7 Schloss Elmau 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></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></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></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

After the failure of the Minsk ceasefire agreements of 5 and 19 September 2014 to curtail fighting in southeastern Ukraine between Ukrainian forces and Pro-Russian Rebels, the leaders of Germany, France, Ukraine and Russia (the meetings of whom are those referred to as occurring in the “Normandy Format”) met again in Minsk on 11 and 12 February 2015 to prescribe an additional set of measures for the implementation of the Minsk agreements.363,364

On 8 September 2015, the Trilateral Contact Group (TCG), which consists of Ukraine, Russia and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), reported that a meeting had taken place between the constituents of the TCG to “[enhance] the implementation of the Minsk agreements of September 2014 and February 2015.” 365 According to the reports of representatives of the affected areas of Ukraine, both Russia and Ukraine had thus far complied with the terms of the ceasefire.366 The TCG called upon the Special Monitoring Mission of the OSCE to confirm that both concerned parties met the conditions of the ceasefire.

With respect to the 12 February 2015 agreement itself, the means for implementing the ceasefire and bringing about, in the words of Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko, a “swift and unconditional ceasefire [in eastern Ukraine]” include measures concerning the withdrawal of artillery, constitutional, governmental and electoral reform in affected areas, unfettered humanitarian aid (as supervised by the international community, namely G7) and pardoning of leaders of the belligerents.367,368

In their 2015 declaration G7 leaders “welcome[d] the [efforts of the] OSCE … in finding a peaceful solution 
[to the conflict in Ukraine],” and reiterated their aims concerning the continued sanctions on Russia until 
such a time as Russia implements the terms of the Minsk agreement and desists from its encroachment upon 
Ukrainian territory. 369 Further, the G7 called upon their ambassadors in Ukraine to form a “Ukraine support 
group … to advance Ukraine’s economic reform process through coordinated advice and assistance.” 370

Commitment Features

As per the Leaders’ Declaration of the 2015 Elmau Summit, the G7 members are committed to upholding 
the regional security of southeastern Ukraine. This includes, firstly, that a compliant member promotes the 
efforts of the OSCE in brokering arrangements for peace between Ukraine and Russia (i.e., in the context of 
the TCG). Any action that contradicts the work or aims of the OSCE constitutes noncompliance.

Furthermore, promotion of the OSCE per se is insufficient for a rating of full compliance. In order to be fully 
compliant, a member must take concrete steps (where concrete steps are understood to be firm, tangible 
actions, which may act by way of new initiatives or the furtherance of old ones) towards bolstering of regional 
security in Ukraine.

With this in mind, it should be noted that the G7 urges its members to uphold economic sanctions on Russia 
until such a time as it fully complies with the terms of the Minsk agreements. Any withdrawal of sanctions 
prior to such a time constitutes noncompliance. In this regard, it is also stated in the Elmau Leaders’ 
Declaration that the G7 calls upon its members to “stand ready to take further restrictive measures in order to 
increase cost on Russia should its actions so require.” 371 While appropriate and timely sanctioning in the 
event of further Russian aggression is a necessary condition for full compliance, failing to fully satisfy this aspect is 
not necessarily grounds for noncompliance (i.e., a 0 may be permissible depending upon other factors).

As stated, the G7 leaders called upon their ambassadors in Kiev to form a support group dedicated to 
expediting the economic reform in Ukraine through “coordinated advice and assistance.” 372 Concrete steps in 
this vein are important factors to look for when considering assigning a rating of full compliance.

Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>G7 member takes concrete steps that contradict the aims of the OSCE OR reneges on Russian sanctions prior to Russia’s compliance with the terms of the Minsk agreements AND/OR takes no concrete steps to the furtherance of the Ukraine support group in Kiev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>G7 member promotes the aims of the OSCE AND upholds Russian sanctions as long as necessary, BUT does not appropriately modify Russian sanctions in response to aggression OR takes no concrete steps to the furtherance of the Ukraine support group in Kiev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>G7 member promotes the aims of the OSCE AND/OR takes concrete measures to facilitate its aims, AND appropriately upholds Russian sanctions where AND to what degree necessary, AND takes concrete steps to develop the Ukraine support group in Kiev.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada: 0

Canada has partially complied with its commitment to pursue a diplomatic solution in Eastern Ukraine.

---


2015 Schloss Elmau G7 Summit Interim Compliance Report
Version of 23 May 2016
77
Since September 2015, Canada has committed 200 troops to Starichki, Ukraine, in an advisory and educational capacity. These troops have been tasked with training the Ukrainian army in the use of small arms and detecting improvised explosive devices (IED). Since January 2014, Canada has also supplied the Ukrainian Military with CAD3.5 million of counter-IED equipment.\(^{373}\)

Although Canada has enacted sanctions against Russia, it has potentially contributed to the fighting in Eastern Ukraine by committing soldiers to train the Ukrainian army. As such, Canada earns a score of 0.

**Analyst: David Browne**

**France: +1**

France has fully complied with its commitment to find a diplomatic solution to the conflict in eastern Ukraine, particularly in the framework of the Normandy format and the Trilateral Contact Group.

In February of 2015, France signed the second Minsk agreement in Minsk, Belarus, along with the leaders of Germany, Ukraine and Russia (the Normandy Format). These agreements called for a ceasefire in the war between pro-Russian separatists and the Ukrainian military, and called for the creation of a buffer zone, a withdrawal of all foreign armed groups, a ceasefire between all forces, and constitutional reform within the Ukrainian government.\(^{374}\)

In late December of 2015, the Normandy Format convened in order to acknowledge that the ceasefire would not be fully carried out by its 31 December deadline. The four leaders joined with Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko in an attempt to ensure that the Minsk Peace agreement in was upheld in full during 2016.\(^{375}\)

France’s participation in the Minsk agreements, and its committed efforts to make sure that the agreements are followed, have earned France a score of +1.

**Analyst: David Browne**

**Germany: +1**

Germany has fully complied with its commitments to promote the aims of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) in order to uphold the regional security of southeast Ukraine and to support sanctions on Russia to curb its encroachment upon Ukrainian soil.

Since the 2015 Elmau Summit, Germany has been consistent in its efforts to reverse Russian adventurism in the region.\(^{376}\) On 15 October 2015, Merkel reminded the international community that the economic sanctions imposed on Russia would only be removed once Russia has fully complied with the peace plan that was created on 11 and 12 February 2015 in Minsk, Belarus.\(^{377}\) In January 2016, the German government reaffirmed that resolving the Russo-Ukrainian conflict was the key to creating a stable and secure environment in Eastern Europe.\(^{378}\)


In addition to maintaining its clear stance on sanctions, Germany has demonstrated its support for the OSCE’s aims there. In a meeting with the OSCE Permanent Council on 2 July 2015, Foreign Minister Walter Steinmeier informed the council “Germany would focus on the fight against common threats such as terrorism, radicalization, drug trafficking and the abuse of cyberspace.” The German foreign minister also drew attention to the fact that “Russia’s annexation of Crimea violated international law and a fundamental principle of Europe’s security order.”

On 16 October 2015, German Chancellor Angela Merkel announced that Germany would invest in Ukraine, provided the Ukrainian government “tackles corruption and pares down the influence of oligarchs.” Merkel aims to stimulate action within the Ukrainian government in an attempt to stabilize the country amid the country’s conflict with pro-Russian rebels. Merkel claimed that “Ukraine still has a lot to do to attract business and need[s] to take steps to improve its legal framework.” However, she stated that there is a “glimmer of hope” for a diplomatic conclusion to the Ukraine crisis. Merkel’s conditional promise to invest in Ukraine demonstrates Germany’s efforts to support the Ukrainian people in parallel with the G7 members’ economic sanctions to disincentivise Russia’s support for rebel movements in Ukraine.

Germany has committed to upholding harsh economic sanctions on Russia, taken leadership of the OSCE, and provided an economic incentive to the Ukrainian government to develop security within Ukrainian society. Germany has thus demonstrated full compliance with the G7 agreement to uphold security within southeast Ukraine. Therefore, Germany earns a score of +1.

**Analyst: Tyler Rogerson**

**Italy: 0**

Italy has partially complied with its commitment to uphold regional security in Ukraine and support efforts to achieve a diplomatic solution to border conflicts with the Russian Federation.

In November 2015, Italian Prime Minister Matteo Renzi was among several European leaders at the G20 Antalya Summit in Turkey who secured an informal agreement to extend economic sanctions against Russia. Despite Renzi’s subsequent call for the expansion of dialog with the Russian Federation and opposition to a rubber-stamping of sanctions extensions, Italy assented to such extensions at a December meeting of EU members.

Italy has made no concrete new steps towards furthering the goals of the Kiev support group. Its willingness to invest in Ukrainian economic stability is stunted by the significance of Italy’s own large trading relationship with the Russian Federation and the salience of foregone trade gains from sanctions. As Europe’s second largest manufacturer, emerging only recently from recession, Italy has been reluctant to anger one of its largest trade partners.

---

384 Italy seeks further EU discussion on extending sanctions against Russia, Reuters (Brussels) 9 December 2015. Access date: 9 February 2016. www.reuters.com/article/us-ukraine-crisis-sanctions-idUSKBNOTS21I20151209
Italy has complied with its commitment to support sanctions as necessary, but has done little to further the goals of internal security in Ukraine. Thus, Italy has been awarded a score of 0.

**Analyst: Jerome Newton**

### Japan: +1

Japan has fully complied with its commitments towards Ukrainian security, with respect both to sanctions and to the pursuit of Ukrainian internal stability.

On 17 January 2016, Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe affirmed Japan’s commitment to new diplomatic avenues for resolving the Ukraine crisis, stating, “I need to seek solutions regarding the stability of the region … I believe appropriate dialogue with Russia, appropriate dialogue with [Russian President Vladimir] Putin is very important.” In addition to seeking new strategies such as renewed dialogue, Japan has maintained the sanctions it imposed against Russia in 2014 and early 2015.  

Japan has also supported the aims of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) in Ukraine. On 30 July 2015, Japan announced the dispatch of personnel to participate in the OSCE Special Monitoring Mission in the country from August 2015 until March 2016.  

Japan has fulfilled both elements of the commitments made at the 2015 G7 Summit, and has therefore been awarded a compliance score of +1.

**Analyst: Jerome Newton**

### United Kingdom: +1

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to uphold the regional security of southeastern Ukraine, as well as its commitment to support the continued peace-brokering efforts of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and economic reform in Kiev.

On 5 September 2015 at a meeting of European Union foreign ministers in Luxembourg, British Minister for Europe David Lidington voiced British support for the work of the OSCE monitoring mission, urging elections in separatist-held areas of Donbas to be “held in line with Ukrainian legislation and in line with OSCE standards and with OSCE/ODIHR [Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights] observation, as set out in the Minsk agreement.” Lидington went on to reiterate the need for actors in the region to follow protocols set out by the OSCE and the Minsk agreement in order to guarantee regional stability, before urging “all sides to engage constructively in the Trilateral Contact Group to ensure progress on the ground.”

The United Kingdom has frequently stressed the need for OSCE monitors in Ukraine to be given secure, unfettered access to the conflict zone in order to properly carry out their function. However, reports from the OSCE dated as recently as 22 January 2016 continue to show mobility impediments to be hindering the

---

386 Japan’s Abe calls for Russia to be brought in from the Cold, Financial Times (London) 17 January 2016. Access date: 8 February 2016. http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/988d04c2-bcd3-11e5-846f-79b0e3d20eaf.html#axzz2z3zdYMCrDO
387 Japan’s Abe calls for Russia to be brought in from the Cold, Financial Times (London) 17 January 2016. Access date: 8 February 2016. http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/988d04c2-bcd3-11e5-846f-79b0e3d20eaf.html#axzz2z3zdYMCrDO
ability of the organization’s Special Monitoring Mission (SMM) to fulfill its mandate.\(^{391}\) As of yet, no concrete plan of action has been put forth in order to improve the mobility situation facing SMM units.

With regards to its commitments to regional security in Ukraine, the United Kingdom has taken several steps to bolster the capability of Ukrainian and peacekeeping forces operating in the disputed regions. In July 2015, the United Kingdom dispatched soldiers to Ukraine in order to participate in the Rapid Trident 2015 training exercises with troops from other partner countries in order to “strengthen Ukraine’s defensive capacity,” and “improve the ability of Ukraine and partner nations to conduct joint operations” among other objectives.\(^{392}\) The United Kingdom has also been instrumental in providing vital support equipment to Ukrainian troops, including First Aid kits, night vision goggles, GPS units, hardened laptops, and Mk6 helmets.\(^{393}\) In total, the United Kingdom has gifted the Ukraine Armed Forces about GBP1.5 million worth of non-lethal equipment.\(^{394}\)

On 17 August 2015, the government of the United Kingdom reiterated its commitment to economic reform in Ukraine with the publication of two-page document outlining the various efforts by which the “UK-UA: Reform Assistance Programme” hopes to aid economic development, and thus political stability in Ukraine.\(^{395}\) Such efforts are in direct compliance with the G7’s recommendation for the establishment of an economic “support group” in Kiev.

The United Kingdom also remains committed to sanctions against Russia. During his visit to Moscow in December 2015, Minister of State for Europe David Lidington expressed Britain’s commitment to maintaining economic sanctions against Russia until Russia fulfills its obligations under the Minsk agreements. He stated that “while the Minsk agreements remain unfulfilled the UK-Russia relationship would not be able to deliver on its full potential.”\(^{396}\)

The United Kingdom has shown active commitment to the aims of the G7 in Ukraine by providing unwavering support to economic reform and regional security in Ukraine, in addition to maintaining sanction against Russia and promoting the efforts of the OSCE. Thus, the United Kingdom earns a score of +1.

*Analyst: Joseph Ramlochand*

**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to uphold the regional security of southeastern Ukraine and support the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and economic reform in Kiev.

The United States has committed to give approximately USD190 million to Ukraine in support of Ukraine’s reform agenda, targeted at government transparency, promoting economic growth, and foreign direct investment. The funds also support the OSCE Special Monitoring Mission.\(^{397}\)

---


In light of Russia’s failure to implement the terms of the Minsk agreements, the United States has continued to sanction Russian enterprises and Russian individuals since December 2015. The sanctions that have already been imposed remain in place.  

The United has reiterated its commitment to defending Ukraine and strengthening its political and economic position. It has fulfilled each element of its commitment, and has thus been awarded a score of +1.

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with the commitment to uphold the regional security of southeastern Ukraine and support the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and economic reform in Kiev.

In July 2015, the EU gave EUR15 million to Ukraine for humanitarian assistance to boost ongoing aid operations. The EU and its members have sent EUR223 million to those affected since early 2014.

The EU has made numerous efforts to strengthen Ukraine’s economy. In May 2015, the EU and its members agreed on a large loan to Ukraine to help implement economic reforms. Under the Memorandum of Understanding, the EU is providing an assistance package to Ukraine amounting worth EUR1.8 billion.

In July 2015, the EU Commission disbursed the first payment of EUR600 million in assistance to Ukraine to help cover for urgent financial needs and to build a solid economic foundation for further economic interaction with between the EU and Ukraine. Additionally, the EU provided Ukraine with EUR55 million for the program EU Support to Ukraine to Re-launch the Economy (EU SURE).

Since 1 January 2016, the terms outlined in the Association Agreement between the European Union and Ukraine have been fully implemented. The agreement, signed in 2014, includes several new economic rules that will benefit Ukraine. Part of this agreement is the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area, which will create necessary conditions to align key sectors of the Ukrainian economy to EU standards. This free trade agreement abolishes the restricted customs duty and will grant Ukrainian firms preferred access to the European market.

---


In December 2015, the EU extended the economic sanctions imposed on Russia by six months until 31 July 2016 in light of Russia’s failure to implement the terms of the Minsk Agreement.\textsuperscript{406}

The European Union has committed to fostering Ukraine’s political and economic stability. The EU has also upheld the sanctions against Russia. Thus, the European Union has received a compliance score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Friederike Wilke}

10. Regional Security: Maritime

“We are committed to maintaining a rules-based order in the maritime domain based on the principles of international law, in particular as reflected in the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea”

_G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration_

### Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Background

The world’s waterways hold 90 per cent of the resources and “routes … for intercontinental trade.” To avoid the unjust impediment of the economic, resource, and territorial rights of seafaring countries, the G7 Leaders have “committed to maintaining a rules-based order in the maritime domain based on the principles of international law.” The rules and principles in question are, principally, those outlined in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS).

On 15 April 2015 at Lübeck, the G7 Foreign Ministers declared that they “strongly oppose any attempt to assert territorial or maritime claims through the use of intimidation, coercion or force.” In their Declaration on 8 June 2015 at Elmau, the G7 Leaders declared that they “endorse [this] Declaration … issued by G7 Foreign Ministers in Lübeck.”

In this light, of particular concern to the G7 are the recent actions of China in the South China Sea. The waterway is immensely vital economically, seeing USD5 trillion in trade annually, and is reported to be resting on vast oil and gas reserves.

In recent months, Beijing has commenced construction of artificial islands in the Spratly Islands region of the South China Sea, extending its reach into approximately 90 per cent of the waterway, and has been accused of housing military aircraft thereon by Vietnam (the contesting claimant of the Spratly Islands), despite China’s reports that it “has no hostile intent.”

---


Vietnam is not the only party to insist that China’s actions have encroached on its sovereignty. Brunei, Malaysia, Taiwan, and the Philippines have all claimed sovereignty over the region.\textsuperscript{415} The Philippines has explicitly condemned China’s actions as “contrary to the convention [UNCLOS] and without lawful effect to the extent that they exceed … China’s maritime entitlements under UNCLOS.”\textsuperscript{416} When taken to the permanent court of arbitration in The Hague by the Philippines over the matter, China announced it does not recognize the authority of the court and “will neither accept nor participate in the arbitration unilaterally initiated by the Philippines.”\textsuperscript{417}

**Commitment Features**

The G7 leaders endorsed the foreign ministers’ declaration, which states that the dispute in the South China Sea ought to be resolved peacefully and in line with the terms of UNCLOS. The path to a diplomatic resolution is complicated by China’s refusal to participate in negotiations (as currently constructed), but full compliance requires that the G7 member work towards agreeable, diplomatic settlements in the South China Sea. Military steps or coercive incentives of any kind constitute intimidation and coercion, and thus directly contradict the professed commitment of the G7 leaders. As such, any actions of this sort constitute noncompliance.

The G7 Foreign Ministers’ Declaration also calls upon seafaring G7 members to effectively promote initiatives aimed at increasing safety at sea and stifling piracy, smuggling, pollution of waters and marine ecosystems, and other illegal maritime actions. These include the Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, the International Ship and Port Facility Security Code, the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, and the International Maritime Organization’s Guidance to seafarers.\textsuperscript{418} Adherence to these rules is necessary for compliance.

Importantly, the G7 foreign ministers (and G7 leaders) have committed to curbing maritime crime by addressing its possible causes on land, namely “the absence of effective, fair, accountable, and transparent governmental institutions.”\textsuperscript{419} Concrete participation in initiatives aimed at furthering these goals (such as the European Union Strategy and Action Plan in the Gulf of Guinea) is an important factor when considering assigning a rating of full compliance.

The G7 members are also committed to the facilitation of scientific and technological research that aims to further maritime security. Facilitation or stifling of these efforts where they arise should be considered when considering assigning full compliance. Importantly, the G7 condemns any “deliberate obstruction of sea lanes aimed at interrupting trade, traffic and tourism, [and] threats against critical sea-borne infrastructure.”\textsuperscript{420} Any actions of this sort constitute noncompliance.

Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member takes concrete steps that contravene the terms of UNCLOS OR does not promote initiatives aimed at the furtherance of maritime security OR fails to take concrete action against those that contravene the terms of UNCLOS in their domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member adheres to the terms of UNCLOS AND promotes initiatives aimed at the furtherance of maritime security, BUT takes few or no concrete steps to implement and/or further them. Where required, member takes appropriate action against those who contravene the terms of UNCLOS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member adheres to the terms of UNCLOS AND takes concrete steps to implement initiatives aimed at the furtherance of maritime security. Where required, member takes appropriate action against those who contravene the terms of UNCLOS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada: 0

Canada has partially complied with its commitment to upholding maritime security in accordance with the terms and conditions outlined in the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS).

Despite its dedication to maintaining its own Maritime security, Canada has not been active in working to uphold global Maritime security. The Canadian government has remained neutral on the issue of the rising tensions in the South China Sea.421 Fu-Kuo Liu, a professor at Taiwan’s National Chengchi University, claims that Canada could have an important role in brokering a deal between the conflicting countries due to its position as a Pacific middle power.422 Nevertheless, Canada has yet to take any concrete action towards promoting a diplomatic solution to the tensions in the South China Sea.

Canada’s newly elected government under Prime Minister Justin Trudeau has pledged CAD40 million to fund ocean science and monitoring programs.423 In addition, the Trudeau government has promised to formalize “the moratorium on crude oil tanker traffic on British Columbia’s North Coast … and ensure that ecologically sensitive areas and local economies are protected from the devastating impacts of a spill.”424

The Canadian government has taken (and pledges to take further) measures to uphold its maritime security, and has done so in accordance with the terms of UNCLOS. However, Canada’s neutrality regarding the tensions surrounding the East and South China Seas (in spite of its influence in the region) undermines its commitment to uphold order within the global maritime domain. As a result, Canada earns a score of 0.

France: +1

France has fully complied with its commitment to promote order and stability within the maritime domain in accordance with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS).

---


"The naval exercises between the French and Chinese navies were designed to increase the level of mutual trust and establish a greater perception of cooperation between the two navies."\footnote{Amid Washington-Beijing Row, French Frigate Sails to South China Sea, Sputnik News, 28 November 2015. Access date: 21 January 2016. http://sputniknews.com/asia/20151028/1029251601/south-china-sea-france.html}

France has been an active party in leading naval counter-terrorism and anti-piracy efforts, and has also worked to improve its diplomatic relationship with China in order to promote stability and security in the South China Sea. Therefore, France earns score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Tyler Rogerson}

**Germany: +1**

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to further promote and implement the rules and principles outlined in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS).


Germany’s actions constitute full compliance with the G7’s commitment to the upholding of UNCLOS and that of contributing to international maritime security. As such, Germany earns a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: David Browne}

**Italy: +1**

Italy has fully complied with its commitment to adhere to the terms of United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and promote initiatives aimed at the furtherance of maritime security. It is examining pertinent aspects of maritime policy in future legislation and has identified several measures for present and future implementation.

On 24 June 2015, the European Council under Italian presidency approved the European Union Maritime Security Strategy (EUMSS). This strategy aims to serve as a fundamental tool to “combine different laws,
structures, and programmes within the framework of our [EU] common security.”

As well, the EUMSS seeks to strengthen communication between EU countries in order to create more effective responses to emergency situations. Furthermore, the strategy aims to partner with major international organizations such as the United Nations Human Rights Council in order to work in accordance with supranational legal frameworks.

On 8 October 2015, command of the EU Naval Force (EU NAVFOR) Somalia was transferred to the Italian Navy. The naval force is working in coordination with Operation Atlanta, which is tasked with anti-piracy measures in support of the World Food Programme’s mission in Somalia. Furthermore, the mission is tasked with monitoring fishing activity off the coast of Somalia and is in constant communication with EU missions aimed at increasing maritime security.

Italy has identified and implemented specific collaborative measures regarding maritime security. Furthermore, it has promoted an effective agenda regarding maritime policy during its Presidency of the European Council. Thus, the Italy has been awarded a score of +1.

Analyst: Bardia Monavari

Japan: 0

Japan has partially complied with its commitment to maintaining a rules-based order in the maritime domain based on the principles of international law, particularly the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS).

In June 2015, Japan condemned China’s placement of its oilrig in Haiyan-Shiyou-981, near the Vietnamese coast. Japan further called on China to halt construction of oil and gas platforms in the East China Sea near the Japanese coast. The Japanese government issued a defense white paper that stated Chinese construction of approximately 16 oil rigs would be used to exploit the resources of Japan’s waters. Japan also released photographs of Chinese oilrigs in the East China sea, accusing it of breaching the 2008 agreement that called upon joint development between the two countries. It has refrained from military action and adopted diplomatic methods to condemn Chinese actions.

However, Japan has not complied with the G7 Foreign Ministers’ Declaration regarding the protection of marine ecosystems. Japan declared it would be resuming its whaling activities in Antarctica despite the International Court of Justice (ICJ) ruling that found these activities illegal. Japan argued its whaling plan, which reduces catches by two thirds to 333 since the ICJ ruling, is “scientifically reasonable” and thus
justified.\(^{437}\) Japan proposed disputes regarding its whaling activities should be arbitrated under UNCLOS mediation instead of the International Court of Justice.

Japan has made concrete initiatives in keeping with the G7 Foreign Ministers’ Declaration to improve maritime security. In response to the piracy crisis in Somalia, on 24 July 2015, Japan decided to extend the mandate of the current operation under “Act of Punishment and Countermeasures against Piracy” until 23 July 2016.\(^{438}\) At the Shangri-La Dialogue, Japanese Defense Minister Gen Nakatani introduced the Shangri-La Dialogue Initiative, which calls for greater promotion of common law at sea, maritime security through enhancing regional domain awareness, and improvement of disaster response capability.\(^{439}\)

Japan has focused on improving capacity of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations to address the crisis in the South China Sea. As a result of the Indo-Japanese agreement concluded in October 2015, Japan joined US-India Exercise Malabar as a permanent member.\(^{440}\) The agreement emphasized the importance of all parties refraining from unilateral military actions. In October 2015, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe also announced Japan would be providing Vietnam with an aid grant worth USD1.7 billion for Vietnam’s maritime security, in addition to providing patrol vessels to improve Vietnamese security capabilities in face of Chinese actions.\(^{441}\) Prime Minister Abe further agreed to discuss the transfer of defence equipment and technology from the Japan Self-Defence Forces to the Armed Forces of Philippines in November 2015.\(^{442}\)

In April 2016, Japan seized a Taiwanese fishing vessel it claimed was operating within the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) of Japan. The vessel was operating near to the Okinotori reef in the western Pacific Ocean. On 29 April, Taiwanese Foreign Affairs Minister David Y. L. Lin stated that the reef does not qualify as an island under the UNCLOS.\(^{443}\) Under the UNCLOS, a reef is entitled to only “12 miles of territorial waters from its baseline,” whereas an island “while an island enjoys the rights to a contiguous zone, a 200-nautical-mile exclusive economic zone and a continental shelf.”\(^{444}\)

Japan has promoted appropriate initiatives to strengthen maritime security, and taken appropriate action against offenders of the UNCLOS. However, it has recently violated the terms of the UNCLOS by claiming an EEC greater than the treaty permits. Therefore, Japan is awarded a score of 0.

Analyst: Sanjana Shah

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to adhere to the terms of United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and promote initiatives aimed at the furtherance of maritime security.

---


The UN appointed tribunal at the permanent court of arbitration is currently hearing the case of a territorial dispute between the Philippines and China. The Philippines have accused China of establishing illegal bases in its waters.\(^{445}\)

The UK has requested to join the process under a “natural observer” status as its territory is involved in the conflict. It is not clear, however, whether the Foreign Office will monitor the case full time, as it has not taken a position on the legitimacy of rival and overlapping claims in the South China Sea.\(^{446}\)

At the second Japan-UK Foreign and Defence Ministerial Meeting, the United Kingdom discussed many points relating to maritime policy.\(^{447}\)

The British Minister supported the decisions of the arbitration case under UNCLOS between the Philippines and China. They noted that the decision of the tribunal would be legally binding and would be fully supported by the UK.\(^{448}\)

In January 2016, two Filipino pilots were threatened over radio while flying near artificial islands made by China. Other countries have also voiced concerns over attempts to restrict freedom of navigation and over flight in the disputed area. The UK has strongly condemned the incident and has stated that it will not accept China’s unilateral annexation of international space.\(^{449}\)

To combat human trafficking and smuggling, the UK had already promised prior to the Elmau summit to offer a supply of drones and intelligence-gathering equipment and to set up military headquarters to combat smugglers operating in Libya.\(^{450}\)

In June 2015, the UK government also announced that it would send out a task force to tackle human trafficking gangs. The team will work together with Europol and with countries in the Horn of Africa along the smugglers’ route.\(^{51}\)

The UK has contributed to the international community’s fight against smuggling, piracy and other criminal activities relating to maritime policy. In the case of the tribunal regarding the South China Sea dispute, the UK has supported the tribunal and is effectively strengthening the decisions of international organization.

Because the United Kingdom has successfully complied with the commitment, it is awarded a score of +1.

*Analyst: Friederike Wilke*

**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to uphold the terms of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), as well as initiatives aimed at the furtherance of maritime
security. These include the facilitation of naval research and peaceful cooperation with the parties involved in the South China Sea sovereignty dispute.

In light of growing tensions in the South China Sea, the US has consistently advocated for the diplomatic settlement of disputes in line with UNCLOS standards. In a joint statement with Singapore on 22 January 2016, the US emphasized the need for all parties with claims in the South China Sea to “resolve their claims calmly and peacefully in accordance with international law, including the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS),” and further urged all parties to “avoid action that would escalate tensions, including the further militarization of outposts in the [South China Sea].”

This position was echoed by a testimony given by Michael Fuchs, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the US Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, on President Barack Obama’s participation to the November 2015 Asia-Pacific Economic Co-operation leaders’ summit and the East Asia Summit, in which the United States outlined its strategy in the South China Sea as including “building regional consensus behind principles that undergird the rules-based order; standing up for the right of claimants to pursue peaceful dispute settlement mechanisms such as the arbitration process; enhancing maritime capacity of claimants; strengthening coordination with and among partners and allies on maritime issues; increasing our military presence; urging reciprocal steps by all claimants to lower tensions; and, engaging candidly and consistently with Beijing at all levels to underscore our expectation that China will adhere to assurances about not militarizing outposts, upholding freedom of navigation and overflight, and peacefully resolving disputes.”

In terms of concrete action on enhancing maritime security in the South China Sea, the United States has committed to providing over USD250 million in “maritime assistance” to the Philippines, Vietnam, Indonesia, and Malaysia over the next two years in order to “support the maritime capabilities of Southeast Asian countries.” These funds are to be allocated not only to the development of Southeast Asian defense capabilities, but also to the development of law enforcement capabilities in the region in order to combat illegal maritime activities.

The US has also shown commitment to initiatives aimed at increasing safety at sea, and the stifling of illegal maritime actions such as piracy, smuggling, and pollution. At the US-East Asian Summit held in Kuala Lumpur on 22 November 2015, President Barack Obama adopted a statement on Maritime Cooperation sponsored by Indonesia, committing East Asia Summit members to “[cooperation] in tackling regional maritime problems, including preventing incidents at sea, illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing, irregular migration and piracy, and to work together to protect the maritime environment.”

The US has also demonstrated leadership in countering illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (IUU). On 5 October 2015, Secretary of State John Kerry announced the launch of the Sea Scout global initiative, “[uniting] governments and stakeholders worldwide in the fight against [IUU fishing] by focusing global assets and partnerships on identifying, interdicting and prosecuting IUU fishing organizations and networks around the world” in addition to “[strengthening] at-sea fisheries enforcement through integration of existing and emerging technologies, expanded use of internet-based tools, enhanced coordination and information

---

sharing, and capacity building.” The US has also led the development and implementation of new technology for targeting illegal fishing, such as the Visible Infrared Imaging Radiometer Suite.457

As for threats to maritime ecosystems posed by pollution, the US announced the launch of several research initiatives to understand the effects of ocean acidification, maritime debris, and rising carbon dioxide levels on marine life. Such initiatives include the USD582 million US Ocean Observatories Initiative and USD21 million Southern Ocean Carbon and Climate Observations and Modeling project, both announced at the Our Ocean Conference, held in Chile on 5-6 October 2015. These programs debuted alongside announcements of new maritime research partnerships with Chile, Cuba, China and the Caribbean Environment Programme of the United Nations Environment Programme. Kerry also announced the intention of the United States to host the 2016 Our Ocean Conference.458 In building “maritime capacity” in Southeast Asia, the US has also made provisions for the transfer of research vessels in order to facilitate naval research in the interest of the region’s maritime security.459

The US has established itself as a leader in maritime security and the maintenance of UNCLOS as a global standard. Furthermore, it has demonstrated constant engagement with global initiatives aimed at expanding naval research operations for the benefit of both environmental practices and maritime law enforcement. Thus, the United States receives a score of +1.

Analyst: Joseph Ramlochand

European Union: +1

The European Union has fully complied with the commitment on maintaining a rules-based order in the maritime domain. It has proposed strategies to promote transportation safety by Maritime Common Information Sharing Environment (CISE) along with creating the Gulf of Guinea action plan.460,461 The European Union has taken steps to raise awareness of pollution and aquaculture.462

On 13 November 2015, the European Union has taken appropriate action to address Thailand about taking steps to decrease its illegal fishing, as well as child and slave labour. The European Union has maintained contact with Thailand about these issues, and is expected to set a date to review Thailand’s statues.463

To raise awareness of aquaculture the European Union has started providing schools with kits that assist teachers in integrating aquaculture awareness into lesson plans and encourages students to learn about aquaculture in their community.464 This allows children and teenagers to become more aware of aquaculture issues and gets them involved.

---


The European Union has proposed and developed multiple plans to improve maritime security. It has taken appropriate action in confronting other members whose actions contravene the terms of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, as per its commitment at Elmau. It has promoted the sharing of maritime information, improving international cooperation in the maritime domain. Finally, the EU has also taken steps to generate awareness and address the management of maritime resources. Therefore, the European Union earns a score of +1.

*Analyst: Rachel Maeve McLeod*
11. Human Rights: Migrants

“[We reaffirm our commitment to] combat the trafficking of migrants”

G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

The flow of migrants fleeing war torn areas, oppressive regimes and humanitarian conflicts is not a new issue facing the global community. The recent influx of migrants from Syria and growing public attention to human trafficking has again highlighted the need to create a better system for dealing with migrants and displaced people.465

Migration crises, such as that arising from strife in Syria, are prime targets for traffickers. The Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons defines human trafficking as “the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons, by means of the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, of abduction, of fraud, of deception, of the abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability or of the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person, for the purpose of exploitation.”466

In 2014, G7 members committed to support countries bearing the burden of Syrian refugee inflows.467 Since the 2014 Brussels Summit, the outflow of migrants from Syria has reached a critical number, and tragedies in the Mediterranean Sea and Bay of Bengal have created demand to address migrant safety. G7 leaders have expanded their commitment beyond Syria in an attempt to focus on all migrants and prevent the additional human rights violations traffickers perpetrate.468

G7 leaders called upon states not only to respond to migrant crises, but also to take preventative action to address the causes of migrant crises, and continue to support the development needs of middle-income countries supporting refugees.469

---

Commitment Features
G7 members have committed to strengthening the protocols for detecting and preventing human trafficking, addressing the root causes of the migrant crises and supporting middle-income countries that receive an influx of refugees.

The first part of this commitment is inherently transnational, and therefore includes building stronger multilateral responses to trafficking to decrease human suffering. Moreover, countries need to cooperate to be able to create policies that create a safe passage for migrants fleeing, and detect and prevent traffickers who have the intention to harm and exploit refugee’s fragile position.

G7 leaders have acknowledged the need to prevent crises that force millions to flee before they break out. Beyond political turmoil, G7 leaders have also identified other humanitarian conflicts, oppressive regimes, and dire economic and ecological situations as issues that need to be addressed to prevent continual influxes of displaced people. This part of the commitment follows guidelines in the Responsibility to Protect that burdens capable states to intervene on humanitarian grounds to stop the potential suffering of a population. This could include development programs, peacekeeping missions, economic assistance, and other humanitarian projects that focus on improving living conditions, stabilizing regimes, and preventing failed states. Again, this part of the commitment will likely require cooperation by G7 countries to better address the root causes of migrant crises.

Finally, G7 leaders have committed to supporting middle-income countries that have become a safe haven for millions of refugees. The 2015–2016 Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan created in response to the Syria crisis outlines the Syrian crises can have potentially detrimental impacts on host countries, including “exacerbating pre-existing vulnerabilities; overstretching basic social services such as health, water, sanitation and education; aggravating unemployment; and diminishing trade and investment.” Since their commitment to support countries bearing the burden of Syrian migrants at the 2014 Brussels conference, G7 leaders have expanded their commitment to any middle-income country that houses a large number of displaced people. Full commitment could include, but is not limited to, support initiatives that allow these countries to better deal with migrants, such as housing programs or education and language training.

Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>G7 member NEITHER takes action to prevent trafficking NOR takes action to support countries that have a large influx of displaced people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>G7 member takes action to limit human trafficking OR takes action to support countries that receive a large influx of displaced people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>G7 member takes action to prevent trafficking AND to support countries that have a large influx of displaced people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lead Analyst: Amelia Cook

---

Canada: +1

Canada has fully complied with its commitment to strengthen policies aimed at detecting and preventing migrant trafficking. Canada has supported efforts to address the root causes of the migrant crisis, and has offered support to countries receiving a large influx of displaced people.

In response to the ongoing vulnerability of migrant women to human traffickers, Status of Women Canada collaborated with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to deliver training on human trafficking to officials in law enforcement, the justice system, and border and immigration services. Canada ratified two supplementary protocols in addition to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, including the Protocol Against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, and the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children.

On 31 January 2016, Canada’s Minister of Foreign Affairs Stéphane Dion welcomed the launch of Syrian peace negotiations between the Syrian opposition and the Assad regime, convened by the United Nations Special Envoy for Syria. However, Canada is not one of the 17 countries and three organizations known as the International Syria Support Group (ISSG). The ISSG has been involved in international negotiations to resolve the Syrian conflict since October 2015. While not a participant, Canada endorsed the negotiations by supporting UN Security Council Resolution 2254, and has asserted that the Syrian conflict must be resolved through political and diplomatic means.

Canada has committed CAD233.3 million to support development projects in the Middle East region, with the objective of strengthening government services and infrastructure stressed by the influx of displaced people. It has specifically committed to developing health, education, and the delivery of basic service, and has assisted with Jordan’s development challenges in particular.

In November 2015, the Canadian government announced CAD100 million in funding to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), to be distributed at the country level. Canada donated CAD13 million to Syria, CAD22 million to Jordan, CAD30 million to Lebanon, CAD15 million to Turkey, CAD5 million to Iraq, CAD3 million to Egypt, CAD2 million to Europe and another CAD10 million to assist UNHCR’s resettlement process. Canadian Minister of International Development Marie-Claude Bibeau pledged that Canada will continue to support the UNHCR as well as fragile states affected by the crisis.

In addition to supporting other countries that have received a large influx of displaced people, Canada has itself committed to resettling 25,000 Syrian refugees. Canada resettles refugees in part to alleviate the

---

burden for host countries and share the responsibility for displaced persons.\(^{483}\) For these reasons, Canada receives a score of +1.

*Analyst: Jerome Newton*

**France: +1**

France has fully complied with its commitment to strengthen policies for detecting and preventing migrant trafficking, in addressing the root causes of the migrant crises, and in supporting middle-income countries that receive an influx of refugees.

On 25 August 2015, French President François Hollande announced continued support of Operation Barkhane, a collaboration between France and the African Union to reduce terrorism, and address the root causes of displaced persons originating from Africa. Moreover, France proposed creating funds around EUR1 million to enable young people to remain in their countries.\(^{484}\)

On 28 September 2015, President Hollande announced that France was contributing EUR100 million to UN agencies for humanitarian assistance in countries neighbouring Syria, to cover the period from late 2015 through 2016.\(^{485}\)

France has strengthened policies for combating the trafficking of migrants, addressed the root causes of displaced persons at the international level, and provided the necessary support for countries receiving refugees. Thus, France has been awarded a score of +1.

*Analyst: Peter Fettes*

**Germany: +1**

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to support middle-income countries that are receiving an influx of displaced people, and made substantive efforts to prevent human trafficking.

The German government has taken several preventive human trafficking initiatives, including initiating the Alliance Against Human Trafficking for Labour Exploitation, complying with international standards under the Trafficking Protocol for the protection of victims of human trafficking, and being a signatory to the European Trafficking Convention.\(^{486}\) Moreover, in addition to providing victims with the possibility of temporary residency, a network of government funded recovery centers have been implemented with provisions to address the unique needs of trafficking victims during investigations.

In terms of aiding middle-income countries Germany has provided assistance to many countries in the Middle East, and to countries in Europe to aid displaced Ukrainians. On 10 October 2015, Germany announced an additional EUR15 million would be made available to assist Ukrainian refugees. This funding will be predominately allocated to restore water supply and other damaged infrastructure, and provide care for people in great need.\(^{487}\)


\(^{486}\) Human Trafficking and Modern Day Slavery, University of Massachusetts. Access date: 9 February 2016 http://gvnet.com/humantrafficking/Germany.htm

On 5 February 2016, German Development Minister Gerd Müller announced that Germany will double the funding to build schools for displaced refugees abroad. Already Germany has helped 50,000 Syrian children in Iraq, 100,000 Syrian children in Lebanon, and 200,000 Syrian children in Turkey have access to education through funding UNICEF school projects.488

Germany has also committed EUR98 million to help Jordan improve water supply and waste management infrastructure, in an effort to alleviate the pressure of refugees on Jordanian towns.489 Germany will provide EUR30 million to UNICEF to improve the sanitation infrastructure in the Zaatri refugee camp.

In February 2016, the European Commission reached a financing deal in which it agreed to double its initial share of the fund EUR1 billion, while the 28 member states pay the remaining EUR2 billion.490 Germany will contribute the largest sum with EUR427.5 million. The money is intended to directly benefit Syrian refugees in Turkey and to ensure their access to education and healthcare in particular.491

Germany has also been a leader in providing asylum for refugees, welcoming 800,000 asylum seekers this year alone.492 Germany has pledged 35,000 more places for Syrian refugees through its humanitarian admission program and individual sponsorship; about 75 per cent of the EU total.493

Germany’s compliance with international standards to prevent human trafficking, and its continued commitment to aid middle-income demonstrates their full compliance, and therefore receive a score of +1.

Analyst: Genevieve Zingg

Italy: 0

Italy has partially complied with its commitment to prevent human trafficking by assisting middle-income countries that receive a large number of displaced people.

Although eight suspected traffickers were arrested in Italy following the death of 49 migrants off its coast in August 2015, Italy has taken no substantive measures to better address migrant smuggling.494 It continues to be a transit country for many fleeing unstable countries, such as Syria or Libya, but the country has been unable to respond to the migrants and many still fall victim to trafficking.495

On 21 January 2016, the Italian government dropped its objection to an EU migration fund to Turkey and announced contributions to the EUR3 billion fund to help Turkey tackle the growing migrant crisis.496 Although Italy agreed to aid Turkey in its struggle to accommodate the influx of refugees, it has have failed to prevent human trafficking domestically and internationally, and thus it receives a score of 0.

Analyst: Amelia Cook

Japan: 0

Japan has partially complied with its commitment to prevent human trafficking by supporting middle-income countries that have a large influx of displaced people.

Although Japan continues to be a source, transit and destination for human trafficking, it has been slow to update national laws to better address human trafficking, and does not comply with minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking.497 Currently, there are major gaps in the national legislature that criminalize only some forms of human trafficking, and prevent proper prosecution of those conducting illegal trafficking.

Until recently, the government continued to implement the Industrial Trainee and Technical Internship Program, which produced many cases of male and female migrant workers subjected to forced labour. Although a reform bill has been submitted to the Diet that establishes the capacity to punish perpetrators, the government has not enacted national legislation that would aid in the prevention of human trafficking.498 Japan continues to lag the other G7 countries in adequate legislature to prevent human trafficking.

On 23 December 2015, Japan committed USD2 million to support host communities, and Syrian refugees in Lebanon through an emergency fund set up by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).499 The project aims to offset instability in Lebanon due to the influx of refugees, and aid other communities struggling to cope. USD1 million will be allocated to the Lebanon Communities Support Project, and the other USD1 million will support United Nation Human Rights Committee to continue running five community centres in Bakaa.500 Seiichi Otsuka, the Japanese ambassador to Lebanon, said, “This emergency grant to [UN High Commission for Refugees] and UNDP will not only provide the most vulnerable people with necessary protection and support, but also stimulate the local economy by enhancing the capacity of host communities and increasing income generating opportunities. Japan will continue its support towards the countries affected by the humanitarian crisis.”

Although Japan has aided middle income countries who are receiving an influx of refugees, it continues to lag in proper anti-human trafficking legislation and prevention programs, and thus receives a score of 0.

Analyst: Amelia Cook

---

496 Italy drops objection to EU migration fund to Turkey, Reuters. 02 February 2016. Access date: 10 February 2016. http://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-europe-migrants-turkey-italy-idUKKCN0VA30
United Kingdom: +1
The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitments to strengthening the protocols for detecting and preventing human trafficking, addressing the root causes of the migrant crises, and supporting middle-income countries that receive an influx of refugees.

The United Kingdom has fulfilled its commitment to create a safer passage for Syrian refugees. On 29 January 2014, the Home Secretary of the United Kingdom outlined the government’s plan for the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Relocation (VPR) scheme. This scheme aims to provide better protection for Syrian refugees during their journey to other countries. Furthermore, the UK confirmed that Syrian refugees will be granted housing and other costs from the official development assistance budget.

The United Kingdom has accepted nearly 25,000 refugees since the start of the crisis. Syrian refugees entering the country have been granted a status of “Humanitarian Protection.” Under UK law, this status recognizes the serious risk of refugees returning to their country, allowing them to settle in the UK for approximately five years.

In line with financial commitments to supporting middle-income countries, the United Kingdom has committed nearly GBP1 billion to the Syrian relief effort, ranking them as the second highest aid donor. This cost is broken down into food, tents and medical care for people living in neighboring countries.

The United Kingdom’s compliance has earned it a score of +1.

Analyst: Bardia Monavari

United States: +1
The United States has fully complied with its commitment by supporting countries struggling with large influxes of displaced people and taking action to prevent human trafficking.

The US has deployed significant resources against human trafficking networks over cyberspace, including detection and prevention methods for businesses, individuals and law enforcement. Moreover, it has helped several countries enact anti-trafficking legislation and train law enforcement officials, prosecutors and border guards on detecting, investigating and prosecuting traffickers, and it has provided millions of dollars in funding to international organizations targeting human trafficking.

On 2 November 2015, the State Department’s Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons funded USD18 million in grants and agreements to better combat human trafficking. This includes funding 27 non-governmental and international organizations that have projects to address prosecution, protection, and prevention of sex and labour trafficking globally in a wide range of countries.

---

The United States has provided approximately USD75.5 million to Lebanon. The funding is intended to support both refugees and Lebanese host communities, and is meant to provide shelter, education, health care, cash assistance for emergency needs and basic relief items such as blankets, heaters and hygiene kits. It has provided USD44 million to Jordan, USD29 million to Turkey, USD22 million to Iraq, and $4 million to Egypt. The US has also committed to resettle 10,000 Syrian refugees to alleviate the burden on neighboring countries in the Middle East and Europe.

The United States therefore receives a score of +1.

**Analyst: Genevieve Zingg**

### European Union: +1

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to combat trafficking of migrants and aiding middle-income countries that have large influx of displaced people.

On 16 December 2015, the European Commission announced 16 new action programs, and approximately EUR300 million to address the roots causes of forced displacement and human trafficking. These programs are aimed at the countries that compose the horn of Africa, and will receive EUR253 million through the EU Emergency Trust Fund for Africa to create more stability and build their capacity. Those who are fleeing political turmoil and violence are often at the greatest risk of human trafficking, and thus EUR40 million of this fund will be dedicated directly to preventing human trafficking and illegal smuggling of migrants. Other programs include facilitating the safe return of refugees to stable areas of Somalia, and improving integration of South Sudanese refugees in Uganda.

The EU has also expressed its continued commitment to addressing root causes of forced displacement, protection and asylum, prevention of migrant smuggling and human trafficking through implementation of the Khartoum and Rabat processes, which are frameworks for cooperation and political dialogue between the EU and its African partners.

On 29 May 2015 the EU Trust Fund launched its first response to the Syrian refugee crisis by committing EUR40 million to provide aid for 400,000 Syrian refugees in Lebanon, Turkey, Jordan and Iraq. Federica Mogherini, High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and Vice President of the European Commission, stated, “this Trust Fund is another illustration of the EU’s commitment to help the victims of this crisis of unprecedented magnitude in Syria and the neighbouring countries. Our objective is to contribute to a strategic de-escalation of violence in Syria and to help build resilience in the region more generally, in order to alleviate the suffering of the people and create a basis for a sustainable and inclusive political process.” Moreover, Johannes Hahn, Commissioner for European Neighbourhood Policy and Enlargement

---


Negotiations, explained that providing funding for Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey to alleviate pressure of 4 million refugees is “the most affective means to turn despair and illegal trafficking into hope and resilience.”

The funding will go towards additional education for Syrian children in host countries, continuing education for university level young adults, psychological support, and work opportunities for unemployed and disillusioned youth. The focus of these programs is not only to help transition refugees, but also create opportunities for them to improve their livelihoods through scholarships and providing school supplies.

Werner Hoyer, President of the European Investment Bank, whose shareholders are the 28 governments of the EU, called for an ambitious response to the refugee crisis and committed to a coordinated response that works closely with their partners. The European Investment Bank plans to lend over EUR15 billion over the course of the next five years to ten Mediterranean partner countries and Turkey to alleviate pressure on water supply, schools, health care, and job opportunities in these destination countries.

The EU therefore receives a score of +1.

Analyst: Amelia Cook
### 12. Development: Refugee Crisis

“Based on our common values and principles we are committed to:] Tackling Causes for Refugee Crises.”

*G7 Schloss Elmau 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></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></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><strong>Average Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>+1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Background

In 2015, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) reported that there are approximately 59.5 million people who are either refugees, internationally displaced persons (IDPs), or asylum seekers.\(^{518}\) This is the highest level of forced displacement in recorded history.\(^{519}\) The migration of people towards Europe has had a significant impact on many states within the G7 and the European Union.

Between January and June 2015, approximately 137,000 migrants travelled by sea across the Mediterranean or the Aegean to Europe.\(^{520}\) Of those landing in Italy, the most common countries of origin were Eritrea, and Somalia.\(^{521}\) In contrast, many Syrians and Afghans have taken an alternative migration route through Greece.\(^{522}\) Human Rights Watch blames the recent upsurge in migration on conflict in source countries (for example, in Syria) or repressive regimes (as in the case of Eritrea).\(^{523}\) The increased volume of refugees and asylum seekers, along with the dangerous nature of the journey — there were 1,850 migrant fatalities between January and May 2015\(^{524}\) — contributed to making the topics of refugees and migrant smuggling key issues at the G7’s Elmau Summit.

Yet the Mediterranean was not the only deadly migration route that received international attention in the lead-up to the G7 Summit. Within the first three months of 2015, 25,000 Rohingya and Bangladeshis fled Myanmar and Bangladesh respectively via the Bay of Bengal/Andaman Sea.\(^{525}\) When surrounding states

---


responded to the surge by preventing the boats from landing in May,\textsuperscript{526} smugglers and human traffickers abandoned up to 8000 migrants at sea.\textsuperscript{527} This crisis also contributed to the G7’s focus on migration in 2015.

However, this is not the first time that the G7/G8 have dealt with issues of migration and migrant smuggling. In fact, the subject has a long been an area of focus for the group. In 1995, the G7 established an expert group to study transnational crime in response to growing concern over its capacity to destabilize developing states, spread corruption and pose a threat to financial systems.\textsuperscript{528} The Lyon Group, as it came to be known, reported back to the G7 with a series of forty recommendations at the Lyon Summit the following year.\textsuperscript{529} The G7 endorsed these principles, which included an agreement to develop legislation criminalizing “alien smuggling” and to improve information sharing on fraudulent documents.\textsuperscript{520} Work to implement these objectives took place throughout 1997, and the G7 reaffirmed its commitment to combating migrant smuggling at the Denver Summit.\textsuperscript{531}

During the 1998 Birmingham Summit, the G8 agreed to expand its efforts to fight trafficking by supporting the process to develop a United Nations convention against transnational organized crime.\textsuperscript{532} Following the adoption of United Nations General Assembly Resolution 53/111, members of the G8 worked together during the convention’s negotiations in order to create a successful outcome.\textsuperscript{533}

At the 1999 Ministerial Conference of the G8 Countries on Combating Transnational Organized Crime, the G8 agreed upon a series of guiding principles that they would use to combat trafficking. Within this document, the group widened its focus from the mere containment of migrant smuggling to working towards its prevention. For example, the final communiqué notes, “the primary means to prevent illegal migration and the related activities of smuggling and trafficking organizations is to reduce the root causes of illegal migration and flight in the countries of origin.”\textsuperscript{534} As such, the states and the European Community agreed to “take into consideration the need to address and reduce the root causes of illegal migration” when “negotiating bilateral and multilateral agreements to provide developmental and economic assistance.”\textsuperscript{535} Support for these measures was reaffirmed at the Okinawa Summit in 2000.\textsuperscript{536}

In 2001, G8 Ministers of Justice and the Interior discussed the issue of migrant smuggling and agreed “on the need for further cooperative efforts to combat the organized criminal involvement in the smuggling and


\textsuperscript{530} P8 – Senior Experts Group Recommendations, G7 Research Group (Toronto) 12 April 1996. Access date: 7 January 2016. (http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/crime/40pts.htm).


trafficking of persons, while ensuring that the human rights of migrants are protected."537 During this meeting, the group welcomed the signing of the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, and committed to taking action to bring the document into force as soon as possible.538

Following the events of 9/11, however, steps were taken to streamline the G8’s approach to international crime by combining the Lyon Group and the G8’s expert group on international terrorism.539 At this time, the issue of migrant smuggling appears to have been deprioritized as the summits themselves began to concentrate the fight against terrorism.

Yet, as noted above, recent events in the Bay of Bengal/Andaman Sea and the Mediterranean have again brought this issue into central focus.

**Commitment Features**

This commitment requires G7 members to undertake two separate strategies to address the increasing global flow of refugees, IDPs and migrants.

First, the G7 has agreed to focus on preventing mass migration in future by addressing the root causes of forced displacement. These factors include war, “repressive regimes,” a lack of economic opportunities and “dire … ecological situations.”540 While the G7 has not clearly defined the latter cause, the UNHCR has noted that climate change is expected to increase levels of migration in the future because it will cause a rise in natural disasters, the disappearance of some small island states, resource scarcity and the deterioration of the environment.541 Due to the broad scope of this part of the commitment, there are many actions that a G7 member could take to achieve compliance. However, these efforts must be new, and the state must specifically note that they are an attempt to address the root causes of migration.

While the first strategy is aimed at reducing the volume of migration in the long-term, the second strategy within this commitment requires the G7 to take steps to contain uncontrolled migration levels in the short-term, and takes two forms. First, the G7 reaffirmed its “commitment to prevent and combat the trafficking of migrants.”542 Within this statement, the G7 appears to be referring to two different, yet related, crimes. At previous Summits, the G8 has referred to migrant smuggling as a form of human trafficking,543 and thus its reference to the “trafficking of migrants” can be interpreted as including both migrant smuggling and the human trafficking of migrants. The EU has differentiated between the two by noting that “in the former [migrant smuggling], migrants willingly engage in the irregular migration process by paying for the services of a smuggler in order to cross an international border, while in the latter they are the victims, coerced into severe exploitation which may or may not be linked to the crossing of a border.”544 However, migrants who enter into smuggling agreements are easily exploited and can end up in human trafficking situations. For example, there are many cases where members of the Rohingya minority in Myanmar have entered into

---


agreements with smugglers only to be held for ransom and exploited.545 Given this context, G7 members can comply with this part of the commitment by taking action to combat migrant smuggling and/or human trafficking as it relates to migrants.

The second part of the G7’s short-term strategy to contain uncontrolled migration pledges to “address the unique development needs of middle-income countries hosting refugees and migrants.”546 This statement focuses on the importance of providing support to states neighbouring countries in crisis because they receive large numbers of refugees. For example, there were approximately four million Syrian refugees in Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq, and Egypt in September 2015.547 According to Amnesty International, approximately one in five people in Lebanon are a Syrian refugee.548 Such massive migration can have a destabilizing impact on host communities and poses social, political and economic challenges for the middle-income states involved.

Thus, full compliance with this commitment requires that the member takes action to combat the trafficking of migrants, to provide support for middle-income countries in their efforts to host refugees, and to tackle the causes of refugee crises.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member fails to take steps to tackle the causes of refugee crises AND takes no action to combat the trafficking of migrants AND takes no action to provide support for middle-income countries in their efforts to host refugees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member takes steps to tackle the causes of refugee crises OR takes action to combat the trafficking of migrants OR provides support to middle-income countries in their efforts to host refugees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member takes steps to tackle the causes of refugee crises AND takes action to combat the trafficking of migrants AND provides support to middle-income countries in their efforts to host refugees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada: +1**

Canada has fully complied with its commitment to take steps to tackle the causes of refugee crises, to support the efforts of middle-income countries (MICs) that are hosting refugees, and to take action to combat the trafficking of migrants.

Canada has made efforts to tackle the root causes of the Syrian refugee crisis during the compliance period, though its strategy to combat the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) changed following the November 2015 federal election.

Prior to the beginning of the compliance period, the government under Prime Minister Stephen Harper decided to extend airstrikes against ISIL into Syria for the purpose of denying ISIL a safe haven from which to initiate attacks into Iraq, and to reduce the threat that it poses to Canada.549 Canada had entered into the

---

global coalition to fight ISIL in October 2014, when it committed Canadian CF-18s to the mission in Iraq.\(^{550}\) The government took further action to degrade ISIL’s capabilities during the compliance period by co-chairing a meeting of the anti-ISIL coalition on 30 July 2015, and by committing CAD8.3 million to “fund defence programs in Iraq, as well as supply non-lethal equipment to countries in the region, to help them secure their borders and contain the flow of foreign fighters.”\(^{551}\) In the wake of the drowning of three-year-old Syrian refugee Alan Kurdi in September 2015,\(^{552}\) Harper emphasized the important role that Canada’s military operations play in resolving the refugee crisis. He said that “as long as we have organizations like … the so-called Islamic State, creating literally millions of refugees and threatening to slaughter people all over the world, there is no solution to that through refugee policy … We have to take a firm and military stance against ISIS and that’s what we’re doing.”\(^{553}\)

On 8 February 2016, the new government under Prime Minister Justin Trudeau released an alternative strategy aimed at helping to resolve the situation in Iraq and Syria.\(^{554}\) Trudeau presented the policy as an attempt to “build real solutions that will last.”\(^{555}\) While the government decided to stop participating in airstrikes, new initiatives included a commitment to deploying 830 Canadian troops to “various Global Coalition headquarters to further support Coalition members and Iraqi security forces in the planning and execution of military operations,” and to provide the training needed to teach members of Iraq’s security forces about “casualty management.”\(^{556}\) The government also promised to become more involved in the peace process efforts in Syria, and stated that “An enhanced presence on the ground will allow Canada to increase its engagement with local and international partners and participate more actively in multilateral efforts to resolve the crises and restore stability in the region.”\(^{557}\) Canada also pledged to take part in actions to deal with the refugee crisis in the short-term by continuing to provide humanitarian aid to refugees, and by increasing its aid to MIC host communities.\(^{558}\)

The new strategy followed a meeting of the Small Group of the Global Coalition to Counter ISIL in Rome on 2 February 2016.\(^{559}\) Canada’s Foreign Affairs Minister Stéphane Dion participated in the conference.\(^{560}\)

---


The ministers released a joint statement that emphasized their support for the United Nations (UN)-led peace process in Syria, amongst many other issues.\(^{561}\)

Although Canada is not a member of the International Syria Support Group (ISSG), Global Affairs Canada has closely followed its efforts to bring an end to the conflict in Syria, and has offered statements of support for the peace process in addition to its military involvement.

Following the opening of negotiations between the parties involved in the Syrian civil war, Minister of Foreign Affairs Stéphane Dion noted that the peace process was needed to combat the root causes of the refugee crisis. He said that “After five years of violence … and the displacement of millions, it is imperative that all sides work together to bring an end to the bloodshed. We commend the leadership and support of the United Nations and the International Syria Support Group to this end.”\(^{562}\)

Similarly, on 27 February 2016, Canada responded to the announcement of a “cessation of hostilities” agreement by asking that the involved parties “fully comply with the cessation of hostilities” for the purposes of allowing humanitarian aid into the region, and giving the peace negotiations a chance at success.\(^{563}\)

Canada has also been heavily involved in supporting MICs that are hosting refugees of the Syrian crisis.

Canada announced that it would resettle 25,000 Syrian refugees in the country on 24 November 2016.\(^{564}\) This commitment was framed as a means of aiding MICs by taking the responsibility for hosting some of these refugees from them. Minister of Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship John McCallum noted that “as countries like Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey are hosting ever-increasing numbers of refugees, the government will work … to welcome these refugees and give them an opportunity to build a new life for themselves.”\(^{565}\) This resettlement target was reached on 1 March 2016.\(^{566}\)

On 26 November 2015, the government of Canada pledged CAD100 million to support the activities of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) as it helps both refugees and people who have been internally displaced by the Syrian crisis.\(^{567}\) Some of these funds have been allocated to assist MICs that are hosting Syrian refugees. For example, CAD22 million is being given to the UNHCR in Jordan in order to provide refugees in camps there with basic necessities and healthcare.\(^{568}\) The UNHCR in Lebanon will receive CAD30 million in 2016.\(^{569}\) These funds will not only go towards humanitarian aid and providing refugees with access to an education, but will also “promote peaceful coexistence among local communities by


supporting institutions and communities most affected by refugee influx.”570 Some of this funding will support similar activities in Iraq and Turkey as well.571

On 4 February 2016, Minister of International Development and La Francophonie Marie-Claude Bibeau represented Canada at the Supporting Syria and the Region Conference in London.572 The international conference was convened primarily in order to increase financial support for UN fundraising appeals, which were severely underfunded in 2015.573

In addition, Canada announced that it would be providing CAD100 million to support Syrian refugees and host communities in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, and Iraq.574 CAD31.8 million of this money was contributed by Canadian citizens through a government donation matching campaign that was launched on 12 September 2015.575 Minister Bibeau noted that this effort was vital to help the citizens of MICs because “the communities there are really suffering. Besides helping their own citizens, they’re trying to deal with the basic needs of people who are there to seek refuge, but they don’t have the necessities.”576

Canada also agreed to provide financial support to the New Financing Initiative to Support the Middle East and North Africa Region at a pledging conference on 15 April 2016. The initiative, which is an example of cooperation between the World Bank, the European Investment Bank, and the Islamic Development Bank Group, aims “to provide concessional financing to Lebanon and Jordan, the middle-income countries most severely impacted by the Syrian refugee crisis, expand the funding available to countries struggling with slow growth and high youth unemployment as a result of instability, and to prepare for post-war reconstruction.”577 The first of these objectives is the most relevant to the commitment to aid MICs hosting refugees. The project aims to achieve this by providing grants and concessional loans to countries like Jordan and Lebanon so that they can “continue to effectively host and provide basic public services to the refugee population while at the same time preserving development gains for their own populations.”578

Although Canada has done less than other states to combat migrant smuggling during the compliance period, it has recently taken steps to address this issue.


On 11 February 2016, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) decided to deploy ships “to conduct reconnaissance, monitoring and surveillance of illegal crossings in the Aegean.”\(^{579}\) While their mission is not to conduct migrant rescues, they will relay the location of migrant vessels to the Greek or Turkish coastguards should the ships be in danger, and rescue the migrants themselves if time is of the essence.\(^{580}\) Between 12 February and 31 March 2016, HMCS Fredericton took part in this mission.\(^{581}\)

Representatives from Canada also participated in the Sixth Ministerial Conference of the Bali Process on People Smuggling, Trafficking in Persons and Related Transnational Crime on 23 March 2016.\(^{582}\) This initiative aims to investigate the aforementioned issues in the Asia-Pacific region, and to encourage collaboration to resolve these problems.\(^{583}\) The conference released the Bali Declaration on People Smuggling, Trafficking in Persons, and Related Transnational Crime.\(^{584}\) This non-binding document acknowledges the connection between state weakness and a higher likelihood that migrant smuggling will flourish.\(^{585}\) Thus, it calls for the direct targeting of the smugglers through the criminalization of migrant smuggling and for an increase in aid for general state development to reduce the occurrence of this crime in the long-term.\(^{586}\)

In conclusion, Canada has fully complied with its commitments to combat the root causes of refugee crises, to support MICs that are hosting refugees, and to combat migrant smuggling operations.

*Analysts: Andrew Irwin and Sarah Beard*

**France: +1**

France has fully complied with its commitments to tackle the causes of refugee crises, to support middle-income countries (MICs) in their efforts to help refugees, and to combat the trafficking of migrants.

France re-confirmed its support for all three of these pledges at the “Eastern Mediterranean-Western Balkans Route” conference in Luxembourg. On 8 October 2015, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, Laurent Fabius, and the Minister of Interior, Bernard Cazeneuve, attended this meeting alongside fellow EU ministers and representatives from Turkey, Lebanon, and Jordan.\(^{587}\) Participants not only decided to increase support for countries hosting Syrian refugees, but also to focus on providing aid to Syrian refugees and their host communities in the areas of job access and education.\(^{588}\) They also agreed upon the need to deal with the “root causes” of the crisis by supporting efforts to negotiate a peace settlement in Syria and by stepping up...
efforts to combat the ISIL. Finally, they pledged to increase their “cooperation to fight organised crime responsible for migrant smuggling and trafficking in human beings” and to provide support for the victims of these crimes.

France has taken steps to follow through on its agreement to tackle the root causes of refugee crises.

Between 11 and 12 November 2015, French President François Hollande attended the Valetta Summit on Migration along with other European and African heads of state. The leaders met in order to “strengthen cooperation and address the current challenges but also the opportunities of migration.” Participants adopted a declaration and action plan meant to tackle the issues of illegal migration and forced displacement by weakening their “root causes,” and thus “reducing poverty, promoting peace, good governance, rule of law and respect for human rights, supporting inclusive economic growth … [and] improving the delivery of basic services such as education, health, and security.” They also agreed upon other strategies to reduce illegal migration such as a commitment to “prevent and fight irregular migration, migrant smuggling and trafficking in human beings.”

During the conference, the European Union announced that it had set up an EU Trust Fund for Africa as a means of gathering donations from various organizations and states within the EU so that it could respond quickly and efficiently “to address the root causes of destabilization, displacement and irregular migration, by promoting economic and equal opportunities, security, and development.” France committed EUR3 million in contribution to the fund.

On 10 February 2016, the six states that initially launched the EU met to discuss the impact of current crises like migration and terrorism on the European project. This group, which included the French Minister of Foreign Affairs and Development, released a joint statement after the conference. In it, the ministers called for greater cooperation with the source countries from which illegal migrants have been coming to Europe, as well as with the countries through which they pass on the way. They argued that this was a vital step in “tackling the root causes of migration.”

France has not only tackled the root causes of the Syrian refugee crisis through its development aid, but has also been directly involved in attempts to weaken ISIL and resolve the Syrian conflict during the compliance period. In September 2015, France expanded its military operations to include airstrikes against ISIL targets in Syria. The government likely decided to take this action for several reasons, including concerns about

---

ISIL terrorist attacks in France, and an interest in having a stronger voice in the Syrian peace process. However, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees António Guterres noted in September 2015 that the increasing flow of refugees to Europe had heightened interest in the Syrian crisis and catalyzed governments to take further action to deal with it. French Prime Minister Manuel Valls confirmed this opinion, and noted “in Syria, so long as we haven’t found a political solution; so long as we haven’t destroyed this terrorist group, Islamic State … we will not find a solution [to the refugee crisis].”

France has also taken action to support the creation of a peace settlement to end the Syrian civil war. On 26 February 2016, it voted for United Nations Security Council Resolution 2268, which supported an agreement between the United States and Russia that called fighting between Syrian groups (other than terrorist organizations) to a halt. France is also a member of the International Syria Support Group (ISSG), which was formed in the autumn of 2015 for the purpose of ending the Syrian conflict. It has participated in several meetings of the ISSG during the compliance period.

France has also taken steps to support MICs that are hosting refugees during the Syrian refugee crisis.

On 4 February 2016, Laurent Fabius, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs and Development, attended the Supporting Syria and the Region conference in the United Kingdom. While there, he announced that France had decided to allocate EUR100 billion to combating the Syrian refugee crisis for the years 2016 to 2018. He specified that some of this money would be designated to help MICs that are hosting refugees in the region. In particular, Fabius noted that France would give EUR200 million to Lebanon for initiatives such as youth education, while it would extend EUR950 million in loans to Jordan. These pledges illustrate French compliance with a number of the commitments that participants made in the conference’s final

declaration, which includes an agreement “to reduce the pressure on countries hosting refugees by supporting them in providing access to jobs and education that will benefit both refugees and host communities.”

On 15 April 2016, representatives from France attended the International Conference for the Financing Initiative to Support the Middle East and North Africa Region conference, and pledged to financially support the new project. The primary objective of the initiative is to close the funding gap between the support that MICs hosting Syrian refugees have received, and what they need. For example, part of the project is focused on providing MICs with grants and loans at concessional rates because MICs have not previously had access to lower interest rate loans due to their development status. Thus, the program is meant to provide Jordan and Lebanon with the means to support Syrian refugees in their countries, as well as the communities hosting them.

On 8 September 2015, Laurent Fabius co-chaired the International Conference on the Victims of Ethnic and Religious Violence in the Middle East with Nasser Judeh, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Expatriates of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. They, along with representatives from 54 other countries and 11 international and regional organizations, set out to develop a roadmap for the international community that outlines specific measures meant to “assist and protect persecuted populations in the Middle East.” Based on suggestions made at the meeting, France and Jordan wrote an action plan so that the international community can achieve this objective. One aspect of this document re-commits France to supporting MICs that are hosting refugees. The declaration “reaffirmed their [participants’] commitment to supporting the most affected states in the region — Jordan, Turkey, Lebanon, and Iraq — that are hosting refugees and displaced populations and helping them.”

France has also taken action to combat migrant smuggling during the compliance period.

On 20 August 2015, France and the United Kingdom issued a declaration outlining further steps that they would take to tackle the issue of illegal migration along their borders. This followed a meeting on 28 July 2015, where French Interior Minister Bernard Cazeneuve discussed the problem of illegal migration with British Home Secretary Theresa May. While noting that the issue can only be dealt with in the long-term.

---

through the economic development and stabilization of source countries, the two states agreed that they must prevent illegal migration through strong border control “so as to destroy their [migrant smugglers'] business model and break the link between coming to Europe illegally and achieving long term settlement.” 619 Their statement notes several new actions that they will take in order to increase border security against illegal migration and migrant smuggling. For example, they agreed to set up a new “joint command and control centre in Calais” that “will have a strong focus on developing and deploying intelligence and operation in real-time against criminal activity on both sides of the Channel.” 620 Furthermore, the two states agreed to create the position of a “gold commander” in order “to give unified authority for work to understand, deter, disrupt and interdict criminal activity associated with bringing would-be migrants to the Nord Pas-de-Calais or into the United Kingdom.” 621 France and the UK also decided to increase their cooperation with the EUROPOL JOT Mare, source countries, and other states in the EU to break up migrant smuggling networks. 622

On 22 June 2015, the EU commenced operation EUNAVFOR Med, which uses vessels from states including France to “identify, capture and dispose of vessels as well as enabling assets used or suspected of being used by migrant smugglers of traffickers.” 623

On 3 February 2016, the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, Harlem Désir, met with the Turkish Minister for European Affairs, Volkan Bozkir, in a follow-up meeting to the EU-Turkey Summit of 29 November 2015. Amongst other issues, the two representatives discussed the problems of illegal migration between Turkey and Greece, and ways of dismantling migrant smuggling networks. 624

Between 25 and 26 February 2016, Matthias Fekl, Minister of State for Foreign Trade, the Promotion of Tourism and French Nationals Abroad, participated in a meeting with foreign affairs ministers from Cyprus, Greece, Italy, Malta, Portugal and Spain aimed at discussing the “pertinent aspects of the multitude of interconnected crises affecting the European Union and its citizens, both in our neighbourhood and beyond.” 625 Together, they stressed the importance of strengthening the EU’s policy on asylum seekers, as well as following through on measures like the EU-Turkey Action Plan, which are designed to stem the flow of migration. 626

The above examples illustrate that France has fully complied with its commitment to take action to tackle the root causes of refugee crises, support MICs in their efforts to host refugees, and combat the trafficking of migrants. As a result, it has been awarded a score of +1.

**Analysts: Mathieu Sitaya and Sarah Beard**

**Germany: +1**

Germany has fully complied to tackle the causes of refugee crises, to support middle-income countries (MICs) hosting refugees, and to combat migrant trafficking.

On 9 October 2015, at “Conference on the Eastern Mediterranean/Western Balkans Route,” Germany reaffirmed the pledges made to address the root causes of migration, human trafficking of migrants and to support the countries of Jordan, Turkey and Lebanon and countries along the transit route to Europe. The measures agreed upon included increased financial, educational, legal and administrative support for Turkey, Lebanon and Jordan. Long-term goals to address the “root causes” of the refugee crisis include support for a peace settlement in the Syrian civil war and combat violent extremist groups such as ISIL, complemented by counter-radicalization programs and increased support of Iraq and Afghanistan towards stable and inclusive governments.

In an effort to reduce the influence of violent radical organizations and ultimately increase long-term stability, Germany announced it is sending Tornado jets for reconnaissance and 1,200 supporting personnel to Syria and Iraq to support the fight against ISIL. A pledge of the “Conference on the Eastern Mediterranean/Western Balkans Route” was also to seek broader international engagement for political and solutions and financial aid. Germany has since advocated for inclusive peace talks, not only with international powers, such as Russia and the United States of America, but also with regional powers such as Iran and Saudi Arabia. Germany has lead efforts towards these peace talks, announcing a meeting 4 May 2016 in Berlin between the German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier, French Foreign Minister Jean-Marc Ayrault, UN envoy Steffan de Mistura and Syrian opposition leader Riad Hijab with the initial goal of a ceasefire in Aleppo.

German Chancellor Angela Merkel attended the Valletta Summit on Migration in November with other European and African leaders to reiterate their “firm commitment to respect international obligations.” Their declaration called for further development in the “eradication of poverty” though employment opportunities; increasing cooperation of sub-Saharan, Mediterranean and European countries to “foster

development in regions of origin [of migrants]. Support for “resilience” of vulnerable communities and groups, such as women and children, particularly in areas that host large refugee populations and engagement between those refugees and their origin country are also goals to promote stability. Sub-regional mechanisms and initiatives, to prevent and manage conflict, and state building of governments emphasizing good governance are to be supported to increase the stability of the region and relieve destabilizing influences.

Merkel, in accordance with support of the MICs, pledged EUR2.3 billion of EUR11 billion between 2016 and 2018 during the donor conference in London “Supporting Syria and the Region.” This pledge includes EUR1 billion to humanitarian aid programs and 50 percent of what the World Food Programme needs for the region, EUR570 million. She also expressed gratitude and praise for Turkey, Lebanon and Jordan for accepting so many refugees and that the EU “wherever possible [would] offer [the region] preferential trading conditions” to boost exports and thus increase financial capacity to properly care for refugees.

Germany has pledged to reduce human trafficking of migrants by increasing border security and management by increasing border agency, and the Turkish authorities to meet the demand for increase border capacity. Supporting transit countries with funds and administrative support, increasing legal migration thresholds, and improving socio-economic conditions of origin countries/regions will reduce the number of irregular migrant via human trafficker. Valletta Summit on migration’s resolved to increase training of border personnel and increasing capacity of facilities to capture forged documents. Cooperation between the states for intelligence gatherers in dismantling of organized crime network is necessary to the prevention of irregular migration.

Thus, Germany has been awarded a score of +1 for its actions in addressing the causes of refugee status, helping MICs, and challenging human trafficking.

Analysts: Alexander Cadmus

Italy: +1

Italy has fully complied with its commitment to take steps to tackle the causes of refugee crises, to provide support to middle income countries (MICs) that are hosting refugees, and to take action to combat the trafficking of migrants.

Italy has demonstrated its commitment to tackling the root causes of the refugee crises.

Italian Prime Minister Matteo Renzi attended the Valletta Summit on Migration on 11 and 12 November 2015. Migration was declared a “shared responsibility” at the Summit, which was attended by European and African heads of state in order to “strengthen cooperation and address the current challenges but also the opportunities of migration.” Participants adopted an action plan containing “five priority domains” constructed to tackle the issues of illegal migration and forced displacement through “sixteen priority initiatives” that will be initiated by the end of 2016. The “five priority domains” agreed upon at the Valletta Summit are as follows: “Development benefits of migration and addressing root causes of irregular migration and forced displacement, legal migration and mobility, protection and asylum, prevention of and fight against irregular migration, and migrant smuggling and trafficking in human beings.”

The Valletta Summit Action Plan contained three objectives to achieve the first “priority domain” of “development benefits and addressing root causes of irregular migration.” The three categories are: “investing in development and poverty eradication, development benefits of migration and addressing instability and crises.” Since the Valletta Summit, the Government of Italy has demonstrated a commitment to “investing in development” through the increase of its official development assistance (ODA) by 13.3 per cent (at 2014 prices and exchange rates) from USD4096 million in 2014 to USD4639 million in 2015. 21 per cent of Italy’s ODA is directly related to refugee costs. 5.8 per cent of the total increase in Italy’s ODA is associated with refugee costs, and the other 7.5 per cent increase is aid unrelated to refugee costs, implying that Italy’s increase in ODA is linked both to an increasing cost of hosting refugees and to an increase in humanitarian aid donations.

The Government of Italy has also shown commitment to “addressing instability” in North Africa. Italian Foreign Minister Paolo Gentiloni visited the Libyan Capital, Tripoli, on 12 April 2016 to show support for Libya’s new U.N. backed government led by Fayez Serraj. Following the fall of Libyan dictator Moammar Gadhafi in 2011, terrorist and other extremist groups have occupied Libyan territory creating instability that

---

has transformed Libya into a channel for migrant smuggling into Europe. Italian Interior Minister Angelino Alfano stated that approximately 90 percent of migrants that reach Italy by sea some from Libya expressed his hope that the new government will be able to seal it’s borders to stop the flow of migrants coming from Libya to Italy. By supporting a stable Libyan government the Italian government is addressing a root cause of irregular migration.

In support of the Action Plan created at the Valletta Summit, the European Union (EU) set up the “EU Emergency Trust Fund for stability and addressing root causes of irregular migration and displaced persons in Africa” with EUR1.8 billion in contributions “to address the root causes of destabilization, displacement and irregular migration, by promoting economic and equal opportunities, security, and development.” Italy made the third largest contribution to the trust fund with a donation of EUR10 million.

In addition to addressing the root cause of forced migration through humanitarian aid, Italy has demonstrated its commitment to combating the cause of the Syrian refugee crisis by contributing to the fight against the Islamic State. Italy has contributed approximately 300 personnel to training and advising missions for Iraqi Police as well as approximately 260 personnel for air-to-air refuelling and aerial intelligence and 460 personnel to protect workers performing repairs on the Mosul Dam. Italy also leads the campaign to cut off Islamic State access to financing along with the United States and Saudi Arabia as one of five “lines of effort” in the Global Campaign to Counter the Islamic State.

Italy has taken steps to support Middle Income Countries that are hosting refugees.

Italy’s development assistance associated with the costs of hosting refugees totals USD982 million.

Gentiloni attended the Supporting Syria and the Region Conference in London on 4 February 2016. Italy pledged EUR350 million for Syria, including EUR130 million as a gift, EUR175 million in soft loans, and EUR45 million in debt cancellation towards Jordan and Lebanon, both countries that are hosting millions of Syrian refugees.

In addition, Italy has donated to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNWRA) to support refugees in Palestine and Syria. Italy contributed EUR8.75 million in 2015 and thus far in 2016 Italy has

contributed EUR1 million.665 The UNWRA aims to provide core essential services to refugees in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, West Bank and the Gaza Strip, and thus relieving these regions of some of the financial burden associated with hosting refugees.666

Italy has taken action to combat migrant smuggling.

The 2015 Trafficking in Persons Report states that Italy fully complies with the Trafficking Victims Protect Act’s minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking.667 The report notes a recent increase in the number of victim’s of human trafficking in Italy but attributes it to an increase in migrants seeking refuge from oppressive conditions.668 Specifically, 150,000 migrants arrived in Italy by sea in 2015.669 The report indicated that Italy could better combat human trafficking and migrant smuggling if it improved “efforts to screen irregular migrants and asylum seekers to identify possible trafficking victims.” Italy and European Commission have already initiated plans to improve the screening and registration processes, complete the construction of remaining hotspots, and fingerprint migrants and entering their data into the central Eurodac system.670 Thus, it is clear that Italy is committed to combating human trafficking and migrant smuggling.

In the Council of Europe’s report on Organized Crime and Migrants, Italy is described as having a “disproportionate exposure to irregular migration” and a “hard-won expertise in the fight against organized crime” and as a result it is “leads the way in the combat against migrant smuggling.”671 In August 2015 Italian police arrested fifteen migrant smugglers, demonstrating success in combating migrant smuggling.672

Therefore, Italy has fully complied with its commitment to take action to tackle the root causes of refugee crises, support MICs in their efforts to host refugees, and combat the trafficking of migrants. Thus, it has been awarded a score of +1.

**Analyst: Brianna Guertin**

### Japan: +1

Japan has fully complied with its commitments to counter refugee crises by taking action to tackle the root causes of refugee crises, to provide support for middle-income countries (MICs) in their efforts to host refugees, and to combat the trafficking of migrants.
To begin, Japan has taken action to ameliorate the root causes of refugee crises.

At the United Nations General Assembly on 29 September 2015, Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe spoke about the Syrian refugee crisis, and noted that “our [Japan’s] unchanging principle is at all times to endeavour to return to the root of the problem and improve the situation.”673 He pledged USD750 million “to help build peace and fully ensure this peace across the Middle East and Africa.”674 He noted that Japan had allocated USD810 million for refugees and internally displaced persons in Iraq and Syria in total for 2015.675

On 16 January 2016, Japan’s Minister for Foreign Affairs, Fumio Kishida, delivered a policy speech to the Japan Institute of International Affairs acknowledging the challenges facing the international community.676 In particular, he singled out the Syrian conflict as a major cause of the refugee crisis, and noted the importance of the “stabilization of areas liberated from the rule of terrorism.”677 As such, he pledged USD350 million to support “the stabilization of Syria and Iraq.”678

On 15 January 2016, the Permanent Representative of the Permanent Mission of Japan to the United Nations, Ambassador Motohide Yoshikawa, spoke at the Open Briefing of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) on the Humanitarian Situation in Syria.679 The ambassador cited Resolution 2254 adopted by the UNSC in December, and reminded the council of the need for a political solution to the crisis taking place in Syria.680 In addition, the ambassador suggested that countries should provide assistance that goes beyond emergency aid to Syrians.681

Japan has also worked to support MICs in their efforts to host refugees fleeing conflict zones.

On 4 February 2016, Japan’s State Minister for Foreign Affairs Yoji Muto attended the Supporting Syria and the Region Conference in London.682 The objectives of the conference included the attainment of new funding from countries to support Syrian refugees and their host communities in states neighbouring Syria, and to “address the longer term needs of those affected by the crisis by identifying ways to create jobs and provide education.”683 Moto announced at the conference that Japan was pledging a further USD350 million

---

to both provide humanitarian aid to Syrians within Syria, and to support host communities supporting Syrian refugees in the surrounding region.\textsuperscript{684} In particular, he suggested that Japan would help finance educational programs for refugees living in these host communities.\textsuperscript{685}

On 15 April 2016, Japan also committed an unspecified amount of financial support to the New Financing Initiative to Support the Middle East and North Africa Region at a conference.\textsuperscript{686} World Bank President Jim Yong Kim predicted that the impacts of this project, which has been jointly created by the World Bank, the European Investment Bank, and the Islamic Development Bank Group, would be to ameliorate the consequences of the Syrian refugee crisis on Jordan and Lebanon, while also strengthening MENA countries against destabilizing elements in the region.\textsuperscript{687} In particular, the World Bank noted that fund will “provide concessional financing to Lebanon and Jordan, the middle-income countries most severely impacted by the Syrian refugee crisis, expand the funding available to countries struggling with slow growth and high youth unemployment as a result of instability, and … prepare for post-war reconstruction.”\textsuperscript{688}

Japan committed financing to the International Organization for Migration (IOM) in early 2016 for the purpose of support IOM’s efforts to aid Syrian refugees living in Iraq, as well as their host communities.\textsuperscript{689} Japan donated USD500,000 to be used for initiatives such as “school transportation for Syrian refugee children and the provision of vocational skills and business training, income generating activities through involvement in cooperatives, and the rehabilitation of shared community infrastructure, in line with the Syrian Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP) in Iraq.”\textsuperscript{690}

Japan has also taken action to combat migrant smuggling during the compliance period.

On 30 June 2015, Japan pledged USD2.5 million to the International Organization for Migration (IOM) for the purpose of providing aid to the victims of migrant smugglers involved in the Bay of Bengal and Andaman Sea crisis.\textsuperscript{691} During the first quarter of 2015, over 25,000 economic migrants and refugees attempted to reach...

Thailand, Malaysia, or Indonesia via the Bay of Bengal and Andaman Sea. Prior to the boat crisis, many of these people were taken advantage of by their smugglers and held for ransom at camps in Thailand. However, following the discovery of mass graves of migrants, the Thai government took action to shut down these camps. As a result, smugglers began to abandon these migrants at sea and the IOM called for financing so that it could provide the migrants with necessities like food, shelter, and healthcare, as well as help them return home if they wished. Japan’s financing may also have been used to “provide technical assistance to governments on humanitarian border management … and technical expertise aimed at strengthening national and regional migration management.”

On 23 March 2016, representatives from the Japanese government attended the Sixth Ministerial Conference of the Bali Process on People Smuggling, Trafficking in Persons and Related Transnational Crime. Created in 2002, one of the aims of the Bali Process is to enhance international cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region on the issue of combating migrant smuggling. At this year’s summit, participants released a statement outlining their worries about the increased incidence of irregular migration. They called on all participants to adopt legislation declaring migrant smuggling a criminal activity, and to engage in “further law enforcement capacity building to combat people smugglers and human traffickers.” The statement also suggests that states increase the channels by which people can apply to migrate legally, so as to decrease the incidence of migrant smuggling and human trafficking.

On 12 April 2016, the International Organization for Migration (IOM) announced that Japan would be providing it with USD910,000 to support a migration management program in Nigeria. The project has the objective of countering “terrorism and other transnational crimes by enhancing land border controls

---

through the installation of IOM’s Migrant Information and Data Analysis System (MIDAS) at four Nigerian border crossing points. While the project’s goals do not specifically include efforts to lower the incidence of migrant smuggling, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime has noted that migrant smuggling is a growing issue for Nigeria. By strengthening the Nigerian government’s capacity to control its borders, therefore, this initiative indirectly helps to combat migrant smuggling.

Thus, Japan has been awarded a score of +1 for its actions to tackle the causes of refugee crises.

*Analysts: Justin Lee and Sarah Beard*

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitments to tackling the root causes of refugee crises, supporting middle-income countries (MICs) that are hosting refugees, and combating migrant smuggling.

While attending the European Union-Africa Valletta Summit in November 2015, British Prime Minister David Cameron announced that the UK would be allocating GBP200 million to reduce refugee flows by combating the causes of refugee crises in Africa. In a statement providing further detail regarding this new aid, International Development Secretary Justine Greening noted that the funding package aims to “tackle the root causes of problems such as instability and lack of opportunity.” The Department of International Development said that the majority of migrants arriving in Italy in 2015 were of African origin from places including Somalia and Sudan. Greening said that “creating better lives and opportunities, helping the countries that people want to migrate from develop, is the only long term solution to help lessen the drivers of migration.”

The minister stated that there would be funding for projects including: GBP27 million to combat environmental disasters such as El Niño in countries including Somalia and Kenya; GBP13 million to support job creation in Somalia; a GBP2 million contribution to the EU’s Africa Trust Fund. The UK has also committed to combating the root causes of the refugee crisis in Syria. On 17 November 2015, Cameron revealed that the government had decided to redistribute spending within the aid budget by increasing the amount spent on the stabilization of failing states from 20 per cent to 50 per cent. This pledge was realized by the UK’s new aid strategy, which affirmed this new approach, and argued that increased funding for fragile states was needed both in Syria and in the wider region in order to “address current crises, the root causes of migration, and the threats posed to the UK by the ongoing conflict.” However, as Gideon Rabinowitz, a researcher officer for the Centre for Aid and Public Expenditure notes, the

---

practical impact of this re-allocation depends on which definition of “fragility” one uses.\textsuperscript{714} The wider the definition, the lower the need for a reallocation of funds. In fact, the Overseas Development Institute noted that only two of the Department for International Development’s 10 priority states were not counted as fragile after the publication of the new strategy.\textsuperscript{715} Nevertheless, a recent report by the British Parliament’s International Development Committee indicates that the UK government recognizes the problem and is taking steps to correct it.\textsuperscript{716} Thus, this change in strategy does represent an action taken during the compliance period to tackle the root causes of migration.

In addition to its attempts to achieve the stabilization of the region through development, the UK has worked to combat the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), and therefore to stabilize Syria, through military involvement in the state. On 5 September 2015, Chancellor George Osborne argued that Britain should commence airstrikes in Syria in order to stem the refugee crisis.\textsuperscript{717} The British House of Commons voted in favour of this policy on 3 December 2015, and the first sorties against ISIL took place shortly after.\textsuperscript{718}

The UK has also been a supporter of the peace process to halt the Syrian conflict. The International Syria Support Group was created in the fall of 2015 for the purpose of ending the Syrian conflict.\textsuperscript{719} Britain has been represented at several meetings of this group that fall within the compliance period since that time.\textsuperscript{720}

In addition to addressing the root causes of refugee crises, the UK has made an effort to tackle the short-term consequences of mass migration by supporting MICs that have been heavily impacted by refugee movements.

Cameron announced that the UK had decided to earmark an additional GBP100 million to deal with the effects of the Syrian crisis on 4 September 2015.\textsuperscript{721} He noted that 40 per cent of these funds would be given to MICs such as Lebanon and Jordan to help them sustain the refugee camps in these states.\textsuperscript{722}

On 4 February 2016, the UK co-hosted the “Supporting Syria and the Region 2016” Conference.\textsuperscript{723} This gathering of approximately sixty states and other interested parties met both to discuss the international
community’s approach to the crisis in Syria, and to collect financial support for its humanitarian response. Greening, noted that the UK decided to support the initiative after fundraising appeals for Syria and affected MICs in the region were only 54 per cent funded in 2015. The two primary fundraising appeals that form the basis of this year’s response to this crisis by the international community are the 2016 Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) and the 2016 Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP). The HRP focuses on providing aid to people remaining in Syria, with the objectives of “saving lives and alleviating suffering, enhancing protection and building resilience.” In contrast, the 3RP is refugee-oriented and aims to “address the challenges facing refugees, impacted communities and host countries in Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq, and Egypt.” With approximately 4.6 million Syrian refugees registered in 3RP states, the plan requires USD4.55 billion this year to be fully funded. The UK helped to raise over USD11 billion in aid from the international community during this conference. This funding included pledges towards the 3RP, and illustrates Britain’s support for MICs in the Syrian region.

In addition to co-hosting the event, the UK announced that it would double its aid to Syria and the region by allocating an additional GBP1.2 billion to be spent between 2016 and 2020. In addition to this aid, the UK, in a joint declaration by the co-hosts, called for new initiatives in education and job creation to support both Syrian refugees and citizens of host countries. In particular, the statement notes that “Participants agreed to reduce the pressure on countries hosting refugees by supporting them in providing access to jobs and education that will benefit both refugees and host communities. Through linking relief and development efforts, this will provide a lasting benefit for those countries.” In terms of increasing employment, the UK committed to funding job creation programs, as well as helping host countries get “access to external markets, [and] access to concessional financing.” Furthermore, in order to support the “No Lost Generation”

---

initiative, participants pledged to ensure that 1.7 million children from refugee and host community families had access to an education.\textsuperscript{735}

On 15 April 2016, the United Kingdom pledged to financially support a New Financing Initiative to Support the Middle East and North Africa Region.\textsuperscript{736} The initiative, which was co-created by the World Bank, the European Investment Bank, and the Islamic Development Bank, aims to “provide concessional financing to Lebanon and Jordan, the middle-income countries most severely impacted by the Syrian refugee crisis, expand the funding available to countries struggling with slow growth and high youth unemployment as a result of instability, and to prepare for post-war reconstruction.”\textsuperscript{737}

The UK has also taken steps to combat migrant smuggling during the compliance period.

In June 2015, the British government revealed that it would be creating an Organized Immigration Crime (OIC) Taskforce with the mandate of identifying and halting the operations of migrant smugglers in the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{738} Furthermore, on 11 November 2015, Prime Minister Cameron announced plans to increase the number of jobs within the taskforce to approximately 100; extend the mandate of the OIC taskforce until 2020.\textsuperscript{739} In order to realize the latter commitment, the government pledged a further GBP44 million to the initiative.\textsuperscript{740}

On 7 March 2016, Great Britain deployed a navy ship, two UK Border Force cutters, and a Wildcat helicopter on a mission to patrol the Aegean Sea and find vessels that are attempting to smuggle migrants into Greece. The UK’s Defence Secretary, Michael Fallon, noted that the primary objective of the assignment is to “build up a picture of these routes and to start breaking the smugglers’ business model … What’s essential is to work out where this people smuggling is done from and then to get a policy in place of returning people which in the end will stop people [from] making this very, very dangerous crossing.”\textsuperscript{741} At the same time, Fallon stated that Britain would also be following the international Law of the Sea, and rescuing migrants in precarious situations.\textsuperscript{742}


Furthermore, the UK has committed to cooperating with international partners to combat migrant smugglers. In particular, it has had several discussions with France concerning irregular migration during the compliance period. On 20 August 2015, Britain signed an agreement with France outlining steps to deter economic migrants from attempting to enter the UK illegally by using migrant smugglers. While the two states noted that this was a problem that had to be solved by breaking up migrant smuggling networks and supporting the development of source countries in the long-term, they argued that they must strengthen the border in the short-term as a disincentive to potential illegal migrants. This action plan outlines a number of steps that the two governments will take. Most importantly, Britain committed EUR5 million to help fund programs to help refugees claim asylum, identify and protect people who are vulnerable to human traffickers, and dissuade migrants from attempting to enter the UK illegally.

On 3 November 2015, France and Great Britain signed an agreement to increase their work together to dismantle migrant smuggling operations. French Interior Minister Bernard Cazeneuve noted that the agreement “reinforces cooperation between our police services, our intelligence services, and … aims to ultimately increase judicial cooperation between our two countries in the fight against illegal immigration and smuggling networks.”

Moreover, representatives from the UK attended the Sixth Ministerial Conference of the Bali Process on People Smuggling, Trafficking in Persons and Related Transnational Crime as observers on 23 March 2016. One of this initiative’s goals is for members to cooperate to reduce migrant smuggling in the Asia-Pacific region. Although the UK is not a full member, its participation as an observer indicates its interest in combating migrant smuggling in the region.

These efforts illustrate that the UK has fully complied with its commitments to tackle the root causes of the refugee crisis, to help MICs that are hosting refugees, and to combat migrant smuggling.

**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to tackle the causes of refugee crises, to support middle income countries (MICs) within refugee crisis regions, and to combat the trafficking of migrants. Notably, it has addressed the need for a political solution to address the root causes of forced displacement, and proposed plans to stop the trafficking of migrants.

The US has taken action to address the root causes of the Syrian conflict during the compliance period.

As the co-chair of the International Syria Support Group (ISSG), the US has been instrumental in initiating a peace process between the parties to the Syrian civil war (excluding ISIL). On 30 October 2015, the US met...
with 19 other nations and organizations to discuss the Syrian conflict, and to attempt to find a way forward that would satisfy each participants’ interests. Following the conference, they released a joint communiqué calling for a ceasefire in Syria, as well as the opening up a peace process that would result in elections and a new constitution for Syria. The same parties (with the addition of the Arab League) then named themselves the ISSG and met for a second time on 14 November 2015 to continue their discussions. At this time, the US, along with other members of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) “pledged to support a UNSC resolution to empower a UN-endorsed ceasefire monitoring mission in those parts of the country where monitors would not come under threat of attacks from terrorists, and to support a political transition process in accordance with the Geneva Communiqué.” UNSC Resolution 2254 was adopted unanimously on 18 December 2015, and asked the UN to undertake these actions. On 12 February 2016, the US and Russia announced that they had agreed to a “cessation of hostilities” within a week to allow for humanitarian aid to reach Syrian citizens, and to attempt to create a ceasefire through the creation of an ISSG ceasefire task force. A “cessation of hostilities” came into effect on 27 February 2016, and it was unanimously supported by a UNSC vote. The US has also been involved in supporting UN-led peace talks, which began on 14 March 2016 following a failed attempt in January. However, violations of the ceasefire agreement derailed peace talks in April.

A statement by US Secretary of State John Kerry illustrates that these attempts to stabilize Syria are efforts to directly address the root causes of the refugee crisis. For example, on 13 January 2016, Kerry noted that the only way to halt the Syrian refugee crisis was by finding a political solution to the Syrian conflict. He stated, “the reality is there will be no end to this crisis, no end to the pressures on Lebanon, on Jordan, on Turkey … no end to this crisis unless there is an end to the conflict itself … And that is why the third pillar of our strategy is to de-escalate the conflict in Syria.”

US President Barack Obama decided to send approximately 50 Special Operations troops to Syria in order to provide support to local forces on 30 October 2015. Despite this, however, the US does not see its military strategy as a means of resolving the Syrian refugee crisis. Press Secretary Josh Earnest noted that military
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intervention could prevent terrorists from using Syria as a base from which to launch attacks on the West. However, he argued that "we need a political transition inside of Syria in order to address the root causes." Similarly, Obama stressed that Syrian President Bashar Assad was "the primary root cause of this crisis" on 16 November 2015 at the G20 Antalya Summit. While also urging other countries to share the burden of countries such as Turkey, Lebanon, and Jordan that have hosted migrants, Obama reaffirmed the country's military, humanitarian, and diplomatic support.

The US has also funded initiatives with the goal of supporting MICs in the Middle East in their efforts to host Syrian refugees.

Secretary of State John Kerry attended the Supporting Syria and the Region Conference on 4 February 2016. One of the objectives of this meeting was to attain financial pledges from states and multilateral organizations for the purpose of "supporting neighbouring countries who have shown enormous generosity in hosting refugees to cope with the impact of the crisis." While there, Kerry announced that the US would respond to this request by providing USD925 million to provide both refugees and Syrians remaining in the country with basic necessities such as food, water and healthcare and provide refugees living in Jordan and Lebanon with access to an education.

On 15 April 2016, the US declared that it would give USD25 million to the New Financing Initiative to Support the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) Region. This new instrument was created in October 2015 by the United Nations, World Bank, and the Islamic Development Bank Group with the provision of "concessional financing to support refugees and host communities in Jordan and Lebanon" as one of its primary objectives.

These initiatives complement numerous humanitarian aid projects that commenced prior to the compliance period, such as USAID’s support to refugees in Jordan.

Furthermore, the US has taken steps to combat migrant smuggling during the compliance period.

The US announced new steps to deter potential Central American refugees from involvement with migrant smuggling networks on 13 January 2016. US Secretary of State John Kerry noted that "we have plans to

expand the US refugee admissions programme in order to help vulnerable families and individuals from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, and offer them a safe and legal alternative to the dangerous journey that many are tempted to begin, making them at that instant easy prey for human smugglers.\footnote{Address by US Secretary of State John Kerry at the National Defense University on the US Foreign Policy Agenda for 2016, US Department of State (Washington DC) 13 January 2016. Access date: 2 May 2016. http://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2016/01/251177.htm.}

In addition, the International Centre for Migration Policy Development released a report on the consequences of the Syrian conflict for human trafficking in December 2015.\footnote{Address by US Secretary of State John Kerry at the National Defense University on the US Foreign Policy Agenda for 2016, US Department of State (Washington DC) 13 January 2016. Access date: 2 May 2016. http://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2016/01/251177.htm.} Funded by the US Department of State’s Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, the report highlighted the connection between migrant smuggling and human trafficking.\footnote{Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, US Department of State (Washington DC). Access date: 2 May 2016. http://www.state.gov/j/tip/index.htm.} One of its conclusions was that refugees had become increasingly likely to find themselves in human trafficking situations because they: (1) needed to find the money to hire migrant smugglers to get them to Europe; (2) had contact with migrant smugglers who sometimes ended up exploiting them.\footnote{Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, US Department of State (Washington DC). Access date: 2 May 2016. http://www.state.gov/j/tip/index.htm.}


In conclusion, the US has been awarded a score of +1 for its measures to tackle the causes of refugee crises, to support MICs that are hosting refugees, and to combat the trafficking of migrants.

*Analysts: Justin Lee and Sarah Beard*

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to take steps to tackle the root causes of refugee crises, to support middle-income countries (MICs) in their efforts to host refugees, and to take action to combat the trafficking of migrants.

The EU illustrated compliance with its commitment to dealing with the root causes of mass migration through its involvement in, and actions at, the Valletta Summit on Migration. Held between 11 and 12 November 2015, the impetus for the conference was the shipwreck of a migrant smuggling boat in the...
Mediterranean in April 2015, which killed approximately 800 migrants. Participants at the Summit, who included representatives from countries in Europe and Africa, discussed the issue of migration and ways of overcoming some of the problems that it causes. The result was the Valletta Summit Declaration and Action Plan, which is meant to “address the root causes of irregular migration and forced displacement” and “prevent and fight irregular migration, migrant smuggling and trafficking in human beings,” amongst other objectives.

In addition, the EU announced the creation of an “Emergency Trust Fund for Stability and Addressing Root Causes of Irregular Migration and Displaced Persons in Africa” at the conference. The objective of the EUR1.8 billion trust fund is “to address the root causes of destabilisation, displacement and irregular migration, by promoting economic and equal opportunities, security and development.” In order to achieve this goal, the EU noted that the trust fund would be used to support projects that create jobs, work to improve the rule of law, help states control migration, and provide “food and nutrition security, health, education and social protection, as well as environmental sustainability” in countries falling along African migration routes.

The EU has also taken action to support MICs acting as host communities to refugees.

The Council of the European Union agreed to provide the EU Regional Trust Fund in Response to the Syrian Crisis (Madad Trust Fund) with an additional EUR300 million on 8 October 2015. Created in 2014, the Madad Trust Fund’s main goal “is to provide a coherent and reinforced aid response to the Syrian crisis on a regional scale, responding primarily in the first instance to the needs of refugees from Syria in neighbouring countries, as well as of the communities hosting the refugees and their administrations.”

One example of this is the Madad Fund’s decision to finance a series of aid programs targeted at Syrian refugees living in Lebanon, Turkey, Jordan, and Iraq on 1 December 2015. The EUR350 million will be allocated towards “the provision of basic education and child protection, better access to healthcare, improved water and waste-water infrastructure, as well as support to resilience, economic opportunities and social
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inclusion.” Most importantly, EUR130 million of this will help create jobs in MICs for refugees and host communities.\textsuperscript{788}

The EU has also undertaken initiatives that serve the dual purposes of supporting MICs, and also combating migrant smuggling.

On 15 October 2015, the EU announced that it had collaborated with Turkey to create a Joint Action Plan to help Turkey deal with the Syrian refugee crisis.\textsuperscript{789} The EU noted that the objectives of the new approach include attempts to: (1) ameliorate the “root causes” of the mass migration; (2) provide help to Syrian refugees and their host communities; (3) properly manage migration waves so as “to prevent irregular migration flows to the EU.”\textsuperscript{790} Practically, the accord commits the EU to both supporting refugee host communities in the region, and tackling the issue of migrant smuggling. For example, the action plan pledges that the EU will find new funds to support Syrian refugees staying in Turkey, Jordan, Iraq, and Lebanon.\textsuperscript{791} On the issue of migrant smuggling, the action plan states that the EU will “Further support Turkey to strengthen its capacity to combat migrant smuggling, notably by reinforcing the Turkish Coast Guard patrolling and surveillance capacity as well as other relevant Turkish authorities.”\textsuperscript{792} The document also promises increased cooperation and information sharing with Turkey for the purpose of dismantling migrant smuggling networks.\textsuperscript{793}

On 24 November 2015, the EU followed through on one of its commitments to Turkey by announcing that it had decided to fund the creation of a refugee facility “to coordinate and streamline actions financed in order to deliver efficient and complementary support to Syrians under temporary protection and host communities in Turkey.”\textsuperscript{794}

The EU and Turkey announced a second agreement that focuses on regaining control of the EU’s borders and preventing illegal migration on 18 March 2016.\textsuperscript{795} The two parties agreed that the EU would return all migrants arriving illegally on the Greek islands to Turkey, while accepting one Syrian refugee for legal resettlement for each illegal migrant that is sent back to Turkey.\textsuperscript{796} In addition, the EU promised Turkey faster progress through the visa liberalization and EU accession processes, as well as the agreeing to hasten the release of money to Turkey through the Facility for Refugees in Turkey and to provide a maximum of EUR6


billion for the facility for the years 2016 to 2018.\textsuperscript{797} The EU has adopted this plan because it “targets the people smugglers’ business model and removes the incentive to seek irregular routes to the EU.”\textsuperscript{798}

However, the plan includes further funding for the refugee facility, which means that it also represents support for MICs in their efforts to host refugees. For example, the EU announced that it would be funding two new projects under the facility on 19 April 2016.\textsuperscript{799} While EUR60 million has been set aside to cover the costs of refugee returns from Greece to Turkey, EUR50 million in aid will go to providing humanitarian aid to those returnees.\textsuperscript{800}

The EU has also taken other steps that are solely directed at addressing the problem of migrant smuggling. While efforts to improve border management capabilities that precede the compliance period cannot count towards the EU’s score in this area, it should be noted that the EU has implemented several long-term migration programs to improve border management capabilities. The Asylum, Migration, and Integration Fund and the Internal Security Fund have provided EUR7 billion to fund 58 national programs in member states from 2014-2020.\textsuperscript{801}

On 15 July 2015, the EU announced that it would be working with the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) on a four-year project known as the Global Action to Prevent and Address Trafficking in Persons and the Smuggling of Migrants.\textsuperscript{802} The program has a number of goals, which include providing help to developing states as they criminalize the act of migrant smuggling and develop means of stopping migrant smugglers.\textsuperscript{803} In addition, the initiative provides funding for the International Organization for Migration (IOM) to “work with government authorities and civil society organizations to develop assistance and support programmes for victims of trafficking and vulnerable migrants, such as smuggled migrants.”\textsuperscript{804}

One of the ways that it has done so during the compliance period is to increase levels of cooperation between Europol and INTERPOL. Between 15 and 16 October 2015, the two agencies conducted their first joint forum on the question of how to combat migrant smuggling organizations.\textsuperscript{805} The forum led to a number of agreements between the two parties, including agreements to cooperate on the creation of a report on the criminal organizations involved in migrant smuggling, set up an INTERPOL Specialist Operational Network against Migrant Smuggling that will cooperate with Europol and “will aim to increase the real-time exchange of police information worldwide so as to more effectively investigate migrant smugglers and dismantle the


In addition to its efforts to reduce migrant smuggling in the long-term, the EU has stepped up its operations to rescue refugees and directly combat migrant smugglers during the compliance period. On 22 June 2015, the European Naval Force – Mediterranean Operation Sophia was begun. The mandate of this mission is to “contribute to disrupt the business model of human smuggling and trafficking networks in the Mediterranean,” and to “contribute to reducing the further loss of lives at sea.” While the mission was initially approved on 18 May 2015, it does count towards compliance because it has entered into new operational phases during the latter half of 2015. On 7 October 2015, Operation Sophia was authorized to initiate phase two of its operations and begin “to board, search, seize and divert vessels suspected of being used for people smuggling.” During phase one, it rescued over 3 thousand migrants, and focused on gathering information on migrant smuggling routes.

Finally, the European Commission announced plans to strengthen the EU’s border management on 15 December 2015. For example, it agreed to create a new European Border and Coast Guard to “…help to manage migration more effectively.” This new agency will increase cooperation between member states and the EU’s organization for the oversight of external borders.

Thus, the EU has been awarded a score of +1. It has taken targeted the root causes of refugee crises through its work at the Valletta Summit on Migration as well as through the emergency trust fund for Africa. It has also supported MICs hosting refugees through various agreements and monetary donations. Finally, it has tackled the issue of migrant smuggling through strengthened border management, increased cooperation between agencies to disrupt migrant smuggling networks, and a returns program.

*Analysts: Jaspreet Khela and Sarah Beard*
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13. Health: Coordinated Rapid Deployment

“[The G7] will set up or strengthen mechanisms for rapid deployment of multidisciplinary teams of experts coordinated through a common platform.”

*G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</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>0</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></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background**

The 2007 World Health Organization (WHO) International Health Regulations are a framework for collaboration among states to increase public health and reduce the effects of cross-border epidemics.816 The 2011 Ebola outbreak, one of the largest in history, was met with a WHO response of unprecedented scale.817 However, many deemed efforts to contain and eliminate Ebola unsuccessful. In particular, they argued that the slowness, inefficiency and high cost of the response of WHO and the efforts of the United Nations Mission for Ebola Emergency Response mission demonstrated its inability to respond to a future pandemics.818 The lack of coordination among countries and international organizations has played a significant part in this failure.819 Consequently, the G7 has committed to the further expansion of international cooperation to better prepare itself to combat future outbreaks and public health emergencies.

**Commitment Features**

Part of the solution to global health emergencies is increasing active collaboration between countries. Improving rapid response is best done through the combination of efforts by countries and would focus on a global strategy to improve public health. Germany, Ghana and Norway proposed an initiative to the UN Secretary-General for a comprehensive proposal for effective health crisis management. Response mechanisms are also being developed at WHO, World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, including the development of a Pandemic Emergency Facility by the World Bank. Part of compliance would necessitate supporting these proposals as well as internal G7 efforts.

Compliance to this commitment does not mean a general statement announcing efforts to combat disease and other infectious diseases. Compliance to this commitment would require an active statement on strengthening mechanisms for the rapid deployment of teams to combat global health outbreaks. For full compliance this should be coordinated through a common platform.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Guidelines</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member neither strengthens multidisciplinary teams NOR coordinates via the development of a common platform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member strengthens multidisciplinary teams OR coordinates via the development of a common platform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member strengthens multidisciplinary teams AND coordinates via the development of a common platform.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada: +1**

Canada has fully complied with its commitment to strengthen mechanisms for deploying exports to respond future epidemics.

Canada’s response to the Ebola crisis included a number of measures such as domestic preparedness funding, increased border measures, the development of a vaccine and financial as well as technical resources for West African countries. The Canadian government coordinated efforts through the United Nations Missions for Emergency Ebola Response as well as the Red Cross/Red Crescent Societies.\(^{820}\) Canada sent 40 Canadian Forces health staff to Sierra Leone to treat affected health care workers and pledged CAD$20.9 million to ten humanitarian organizations.\(^{821}\) However, Canada did also suspend travel visas for people arriving from those countries, which increased public uncertainty about Ebola threat levels.\(^{822}\)

Canada’s International Health Regulations focus on the “need to report and act on potential public health emergencies of international concern in a timely fashion, and to support public health capacity-building of partners.”\(^{823}\) Canada has established an Ebola virus Rapid Response team that responds to potential outbreaks within Canada.\(^{824}\) Internationally, through collaboration with the World Health Organization (WHO), the US Centers for Disease Control and the Pan American Health Organization, the Canadian Rapid Response team is able to contribute to the mitigation of international public health emergencies.

Canada was also part of a meeting regarding work in outbreaks and emergencies led by WHO and the Global Outbreak Alert and Response Network (GOARN).\(^{825}\) The meeting between the various international organizations was to ensure that Canada’s Rapid Response Team approach was consistent with other regional and international partners to ensure effective deployment in case of an international public health emergency.\(^{826}\)

Canada receives full compliance on its health commitment for rapid deployment through a common platform. A Canadian rapid deployment team has been created to respond to cases of a public health
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\(^{825}\) Meeting between Global Outbreak Alert and Response Network (GOARN) Steering Committee (SCOM) members and the Chair of the Advisory Group on Reform of WHO’s Work in Outbreaks and Emergencies, World Health Organization http://www.who.int/about/who_reform/emergency-capacities/Meeting-report-GOARN-Steering-Committee-17-Sept-2015.pdf

emergency within Canadian provinces or territories. Initiative has also been taken towards cooperation through common platforms. Canada has met with GOARN to discuss way cooperation can be increased among states but also among international organizations.

Therefore, Canada receives a rank of +1 for compliance as a result of Canadian efforts to strengthen and create a rapid deployment team as well as contributing to the future development of a common platform.

**Analyst: Emma de Leeuw**

**France: 0**

France has partially complied with its commitment to strengthen multidisciplinary teams and coordinates via the development of a common platform.

On 25 June 2015, Laurent Fabius, Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Development, held a meeting in Paris with Bill Gates and the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization where the three signed a tripartite agreement for EUR100 million aimed at augmenting immunization levels in several French-speaking countries in the Sahel region: Burkina Faso, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal and Chad.827 The agreement will help provide new vaccines, extend the duration of existing projects and help improve the health systems of the aforementioned countries.828

On 29 October 2015, Annick Girardin, Minister of State for Development and Francophony, held a meeting with Jean-François Delfraissy, Interministerial Coordinator of the fight against Ebola where they discussed progressions in the effort against the West African Ebola epidemic.829 Concurrently, France was preparing to send a team of 20 civil security trainers to Guinea in order to assist with ongoing efforts in the fight against Ebola and to provide fresh supplies to response teams already stationed in Guinea.830

On 29 October 2015, Minister Girardin and her colleague Thierry Mandon, Minister of State for Research, along with Christos Stylianides, European Commissioner and Ebola Coordinator, chaired an international conference, which examined the lessons learned from the management of the crisis in Africa.831 An agreement was reached by setting a common goal for health development and was subsequently followed by a new EUR174 million pledge, which adds to the EUR160 million already assigned to the affected zones.832

From March to July 2015, France has deployed several regional epidemic warning and response teams in Guinea as part of the PREPARE Project and France continues to provide logistical and technical assistance to
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local Regional health directorates. In addition to this assistance, the Agence française du developpement will provide EUR10 million over the next three years to assist with the improvement of health facilities in the Guinean forest region.

On 29 December 2015, Minister Girardin reiterated the need for Guinea to, “recover economically … rebuild its healthcare system, and obtain instruments that help it respond more effectively in the event of a new epidemic.” In addition to its continued logistical and technical and financial support in Guinea, France is actively pursuing the establishment of a health crisis response system with its partners at the United Nations, World Health Organization (WHO) and the European Union.

France has committed considerable support by way of financial, technical and logistical aid to regions directly affected by the Ebola crisis, namely Guinea. These efforts, however, have been conducted unilaterally. In addition to these efforts, France has coordinated with the UN, WHO and the EU in an attempt to establish a health crisis response system.

Therefore, France has been awarded a score of 0 for its partial compliance.

Analyst: Mathieu Sitaya

Germany: +1

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to strengthen mechanisms for deploying exports to respond to future epidemics.

Germany’s global health policy is focused on “containing pandemics, fighting fatal infectious diseases (HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria and polio) and strengthening health care systems.” The German government sustains a number of partnerships related to health, both bilateral and multilateral. Germany continues to participate in the Northern Dimension Partnership in Public Health and Social Well-being with nine other states in the Baltic Sea Region.

In 2013 Germany’s Federal Foreign Office launched the three-year German Partnership Program for Excellence in Biological and Health Security, with a budget of EUR23 million. This program focuses on global partnerships with the aim of mitigating biological security risks and encompasses a number of projects based in various German institutions.
Germany’s Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) hosted the GAVI the Vaccine Alliance pledging conference in January of 2015, in response to the Ebola crisis.839 The conference succeeded in mobilizing an additional USD7.5 billion towards a second replenishment of GAVI for 2016–2020. The German government also increased its contribution to GAVI to EUR600 million for the 2016–2020 period.840

In August 2015 Germany’s Robert Koch Institute produced a “Framework Ebola Virus Disease” document, containing recommendations and regulations with regards to infection control of the Ebola virus within Germany. The document continues to be updated regularly, with updates in March and August 2015.841

The German government provided EUR195 million to support a number of preventive and humanitarian projects related to the Ebola epidemic in West Africa.842 These projects include providing special motorcycles from the Federal Agency for Technical Relief for the transportation of blood samples, and providing lorries for the World Food Programme for food transportation to affected areas. German funding also established treatment centres in both Sierra Leone and Liberia, as well as a mobile laboratory in Mali.

The German Government continues to support a two-year program run by the Robert Koch Institute, which trains medical staff in West Africa to treat patients who are highly infectious. This program, which ends in 2016, enables local medical staff to both recognize and care for those infected with Ebola.843

Germany receives full compliance with regards to its health commitment for rapid deployment through a common platform. Through its consistent support of global partnerships, and impressive domestic efforts at rapid deployment, Germany receives a rank of +1 for compliance.

**Analyst: Jessie Castello**

**Italy: +1**

Italy has fully complied with its commitment to strengthen mechanisms for deploying exports to respond to a future epidemics.

Italy has expressed its support for the rapid deployment of health crisis management resources internationally. It is an active participant in numerous inter-governmental organizations that work to collaborate health emergency responses. Having once been affected by the Ebola virus, Italy has consistently held public health as a priority on its public agenda.

As a member of the Global Health Security Initiative, Italy participated at the 15th ministerial meeting in 2014. The summit issued a communiqué directly responding to the Ebola outbreak, outlining specific actions to recover from this epidemic and prevent future diseases.844 Specifically, the statement included a commitment to “operational, material, and technical support” in the form of evacuation services and medical treatment for healthcare personnel.
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Furthermore, Italy has worked closely with the World Health Organization (WHO). On 20 March 2015, the association released an organizational blueprint in establishing a global health emergency in question, of which Italy was a signatory. This represented one of WHO’s structural reforms to improve its emergency capabilities, including actions such as engaging civil society and United Nations agencies, and improving efficiency of deploying personnel.

On a bilateral level, Italy has been cooperating with the Czech Republic to ensure legislative coordination for disaster risk reduction. The strategic goal of achieving a comprehensive and integrated approach to public health emergencies is one of Italy’s policy priorities.

In addition, Italy is also a supportive delegate at the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction, the European Disease Prevention and Control Center, and the ToPMad research centre and many more. Italy’s active involvement in such international groups demonstrate its emphasis for a multilateral approach to coordinated medical deployment.

Therefore through Italy’s cooperation in both multilateral and bilateral efforts to coordinate rapid response team coordination provides it with a +1 for full compliance.

Analyst: Angela Hou

Japan: 0

Japan has partially complied with its commitment to set up strong mechanisms for the coordinated rapid deployment of multidisciplinary experts to combat global health outbreaks.

On 12 October 2015, the Japan International Cooperation Agency signed a grant agreement with the Government of Mozambique granting aid of up to JPY2.121 billion for the building of a new medical facility to train more health workers in order to improve health services throughout the country.

Japan hosted the international conference titled, “Universal Health Coverage in the New Development Era: Toward Building Resilient and Sustainable Health Systems,” on 16 December 2015. In the opening session of the conference, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe emphasized the importance of making health a priority issue in the upcoming G7 Ise-Shima Summit and emphasized the importance of creating a global framework of collaborations to combat health outbreaks.

However, other than issuing statements urging global cooperation to fight public health emergencies more effectively, the Government of Japan has taken very little measure to creating this framework in cooperation with other developed countries.

Thus, Japan receives a score of 0.

Analyst: Raheeb Dastagir

United Kingdom: +1
The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to create and support innovative research networks and rapid response teams, as encouraged by the G7. It has led the global effort to develop increased research transparency among countries and improve existing global health infrastructure, by committing an estimated GBP200 million over the next five years.850

On 7 June 2015, Prime Minister David Cameron announced an ambitious plan to improve global health infrastructure. He lamented the poor response to the Ebola crisis and announced a three-tiered plan that would include substantive drug and vaccine development, the creation of a UK-funded rapid response team, as well as national commitment to complete transparency in the fields of vaccine research, data and operations, becoming the first country in the world to do so.851,852

Prime Minister Cameron, on the same day, committed GBP20 million over the next five years to create the UK Vaccines Research and Development Network, with a focus on researching Ebola, Lassa, Marburg and Crimean-Congo Fever. This amounts to a GBP4 million commitment per annum.853,854

The UK-based Medical Research Council (MRC) committed an additional GBP5 million to the network as of 8 June 2015. Des Walsh, Head of Infections and Immunity at the MRC, outlined the importance of the network to deliver benefits to global communities, and strongly encouraged leading health organizations of the world to find opportunities to contribute to research more collaboratively.855

In addition, two of the seven nationally funded research councils, the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council and the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council held an open call from 3 July 2015 to 13 January 2016 for innovative vaccinology practices. The primary focus of the research is to develop new vaccinology technology and practices, to create forums for vaccinology discussion among researchers, and to encourage collaboration of veterinary and medical scientists to advance both animal and human vaccinology.856

The second tier of the plan, to increase overall transparency and cooperation in vaccinology amongst the G7 members, was openly called for by Prime Minister Cameron at the Elmau Summit. Prime Minister Cameron announced that the UK would lead the global effort via the G7 to make it mandatory to publish results of all clinical results of vaccine trials for relevant diseases; currently, no such mandate exists. This comment comes after the World Health Organization (WHO) made it clear on 14 April 2015, that there was an ethical responsibility to publish results.857 Finally, Prime Minister Cameron announced that the United Kingdom’s

855 The MRC commits GBP85m towards a new UK R&D Vaccines Network, Medical Research Council (London) 8 June 2015. Access date: 3 February 2016. https://www.mrc.ac.uk/news/browse/the-mrc-commits-5m-towards-a-new-uk-r-d-vaccines-network/
Chief Medical Officer would collaborate closely with WHO to create a data forum for the precise purpose of sharing information and to make global publication more seamless.\textsuperscript{858}

The United Kingdom has committed to create a Rapid Reaction Team (RRT) that would be composed of six to ten expert staff, consisting of epidemiologists, infection control specialists and infection control doctors. Their responsibilities include conducting rapid research on the disease in question, including methods and rate of transmission, and creating immediate global response recommendations. The effort has been spearheaded by Jeremy Farrar, director of the London-based charity Wellcome Trust, and Peter Piot, director of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine and co-discoverer of the Ebola.\textsuperscript{859}

The majority of the GBP20 million committed is to be dedicated to this RRT, with plans to expand the team to 100 epidemiologists and the reserve to 10,000 scientists. Estimates from Reuters have placed the final cost as being between GBP100–200 million.\textsuperscript{860}

Funding for the RRT is currently the joint responsibility of the National Institute for Health Research and Public Health England, with support from the United Kingdom Official Development Assistance Budget. This funding is contingent on the UK only providing financial assistance to recognized countries, which as of 2010 includes approximately 150 countries with a per capita income of USD12,276 or less. The National Institute for Health Research has also identified the army has a public sector partner.\textsuperscript{861}

Following Prime Minister Cameron’s announcement at the Elmau Summit, the two entities launched a public competition aimed at academic institutions to participate in the funding for the RRT. The academic institution that is selected would be required to contribute a minimum of 40 per cent of the annual RRT budget. Applications for institutions closed on 17 December 2015.\textsuperscript{862}

Lastly, the United Kingdom has contributed to the creation of a global Pandemic Emergency Facility, as created by the World Bank Group and WHO. The effort is part of an increased global commitment to faster and more efficient outbreak responses. The Pandemic Emergency Facility is in partnership with the Ebola Recovery and Reconstruction Trust Fund, created by the World Bank Group to address the aftermaths of the Ebola Crisis. As of September 2015 the United Kingdom has committed USD4.5 million to the fund.\textsuperscript{863,864}

The United Kingdom has demonstrated an astounding amount of commitment to furthering the health goals established at the Elmau Summit, with comprehensive funding plans slotted for vaccinology, information technology, and rapid response over the next five years. The United Kingdom has also greatly encouraged the collaboration of the public and private sector by opening calls for funding and cooperation with their research councils and Public Health England. Lastly, the United Kingdom has shown leadership and initiative by being the first country in the world to commit to vaccine research transparency, reaching out to WHO to develop global forums, and committing funds to pre-existing entities to lessen the effects of the Ebola crisis.

The United Kingdom therefore receives a score of +1.

\textsuperscript{858} Prime Minister calls for G7 agreement on clinical trial transparency, AllTrials (London) 8 June 2015. Access date: 3 February 2016. http://www.alltrials.net/news/prime-minister-calls-for-g7-agreement-on-clinical-trial-transparency/
United States: +1

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to strengthen multidisciplinary teams and coordinates via the development of a common platform.

On 29 July 2015, the United States announced its intention to commit USD1 billion to the Global Health Security Agenda (GHSA); an initiative it has been a part of since early 2014 whereby a common platform serves to, “prevent, detect, and respond to future infectious disease outbreaks,” globally.865 In 17 African countries, the US will work with local authorities to develop a plan to “achieve and sustain each of the targets of the GHSA.”866

On 4–6 August 2015, the United States announced its partnership with the African Union Commission in helping to create the African Center for Disease Control and Prevention.867

The United States has maintained its commitment throughout 2015 to facilitate the delivery of treatments of neglected tropical diseases by acquiring drug donations from pharmaceutical companies and delivering them to partner countries.868

On 16 November 2015, at the G20 summit in Antalya, US President Barack Obama, announced that the GHSA had expanded to include 30 new partnerships.869 These countries, along with existing partners, “will strive to achieve a world safe and secure from infectious disease threats by building measurable, sustainable capacity to prevent, detect and rapidly respond to infectious disease threats, whether naturally occurring, accidental or deliberately spread.”870

For its generous contributions and continued efforts in strengthening multidisciplinary teams and coordinating via the development of a common platform such as the GHSA, the United States has been given a score of +1 for its full compliance.

European Union: +1

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment for coordinated rapid deployment in global health emergencies. The European Union has committed to provide 20 per cent of its 2020 budget to improve generic and health emergency preparedness.871

The European Union continues to learn from the most recent global health emergency, namely the Ebola outbreak. Between 12 and 14 October 2015, a conference was held in Luxembourg to improve the European Union’s preparedness and response for future outbreaks of health epidemics. Their focus was to identify the

---

learning points arising from the Ebola epidemic. Lessons that were learned include coordination, risk assessment processes, and intersectional cooperation for good preparedness planning.\textsuperscript{872}

The European Union has implemented new legislation to deal with cross-border threats to health. This has been instrumental in supporting risk management and coordination of the response at the European Union level. Beyond that, it has increased resources for medical evacuation, mobilization of expertise, and transport facilities for lab waste and clinical activities.\textsuperscript{873} New resources available will provide national health authorities rapid access to budgets for communication during a crisis. Contractual procedures are too complex and cumbersome to produce communication material.\textsuperscript{874}

The conference in Luxembourg brought forth conclusions to strengthen health systems towards a resilient system that includes core capacities for implementing the International Health Regulations (IHR) and reinforcing epidemiological surveillance. The European Union has worked to provide mobile laboratories, the fast mobilization of epidemiological expert and a better medical evacuation system.\textsuperscript{875}

European Union activities show interest and compliance to a long term engagement to support medical evaluation and health systems preparedness. Health systems emergency plans taken by the European Union are in line with goals set by the World Health Organization (WHO) to strengthen health systems and implementation of IHR core capacities. The European Union is now in the process of preparing medical staff to be used as medical corps that can be drawn from on short-term notice to be used as teams and equipment for members in health emergencies.\textsuperscript{876} To retain this personnel in zones of need, the European Union has created the PREPARE program as a civil protection mechanisms for regional alert and response teams.\textsuperscript{877}

The European Union is an active member in the Advisory Group on Reform of WHO’s work in outbreaks and emergencies with health and humanitarian consequences. The program will initiate on-site risk assessment at the discretion of the director-general’s within 72 hours for any high threat pathogen.\textsuperscript{878} The program is envisioned to come to its rollout phase in January 2016 and will hope to provide transformative changes to response to health risks and emergencies in activities in the Eastern Mediterranean and African regions.\textsuperscript{879}


In partnership with WHO and Luxembourg, the European Union continues to work in a program for universal health coverage. Their aim is to build country capacities for the development, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of robust and comprehensive national health policies, strategies, plans, and health financing policies to promote universal health coverage.\textsuperscript{880}

In taking steps to increase coordinate rapid deployment in global health emergencies, the European Union has shown full compliance and is awarded a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Fernando Casanova}


“[We will] effectively implement our national action plans.”

G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>+1</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</td>
<td>−0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

Antimicrobial therapies (AMTs) are a vital part of medical research and progress for both humans and animals that involve the use of antimicrobial medicines such as antibiotics to prevent and stop infection. Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) is the resistance of microorganisms to antimicrobials and is a natural process that arose with the usage of AMT's.

Recently there has been a surge in AMR in G7 members due to a variety of factors including overuse of antimicrobial medicines and improper control protocol. This has directly caused significant health issues to animals and humans. AMR patients have a risk of death three times higher than the average infected patient, and are more likely to acquire complications, putting a burden on healthcare systems and their finances.

The European Commission has since made AMR control and reduction a high priority. In 2011 it created the action plan against the rising threats from AMR, identifying 12 important actions including “preventing microbial infections” and “improved monitoring and surveillance in human and animal medicine.”

The G7 members claim they “fully support” the World Health Organization’s (WHO) Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance since the plan’s creation at the World Health Assembly in May 2015. The leaders state that they will “effectively implement our national action plans and support other countries as they develop their own national action plans.” This incorporates the strategies of the Joint Efforts to Combat Antimicrobial Resistance. One Health, an approach that combines environmental, agricultural, human and

---

animal health perspectives and sectors, also guides all the national action plans. These commitments are consistent with the contents of the 2015 Elmau Summit Annex of the Leaders’ Declaration.

**Commitment Features**

The commitment brings forward the WHO Global Action Plan, under the framework and guidelines of One Health, supplemented by the Joint Efforts to Combat Antimicrobial Resistance (JECAR). Although One Health and the JECAR include many subsidiary goals, progress towards these goals does not count as compliance. Rather, the inclusion of measures to combat AMR within a national action plan is the metric used for compliance.

There is specific mention by the leaders in the commitment of the implementation of “our national plans.” The annex to the Leaders’ Declaration also clearly states the support of the G7 members to the WHO Global Action Plan, and the objectives within. This suggests the approach of the G7 members to deal with Antimicrobial Resistance is by creating a national plan that follows the requirements of the WHO Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance in their respective countries. By fulfilling the objectives of the WHO Global Action Plan through national plans, G7 members indicate full compliance.

The five objectives present in the WHO Action Plan to be followed in the national plans are to reduce incidence of infection, improve awareness and understanding, carry out further surveillance and research, use AMTs efficiently, and create sustainable investment on a global scale. Therefore measures falling within the WHO objectives range, such as prevention or surveillance, must relate specifically to antimicrobial resistances. For example, a program that ends up reducing infection incidence through improved sanitation does not constitute compliance unless the program was specifically addressing antimicrobial resistances through program partners and the government.

Partial compliance constitutes a program or policy which is specified to address antimicrobial resistances, however, does not pertain to the WHO Global Action Plan.

Collaboration between various actors and sectors, such as increased professional communication between veterinarians and physicians also satisfies the commitment if the interactions purpose is related to antimicrobial resistances. Connections between different actors, as a part of the One Health approach, should be viewed as an additional objective as it underlies the WHO Global Action Plan, and G7 leaders have “strongly committed” to the approach.

---


http://www.onehealthglobal.net/what-is-one-health/.

http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2015elmau/2015-G7-declaration-en.html
Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member introduces no new measures or programs to address antimicrobial resistance AND does not act to further the support or implementation of the WHO Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member introduces new measures or programs to address antimicrobial resistance BUT does not act to further the support or implementation of the WHO Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member acts to further the support or implementation of the WHO Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistances AND introduces new measures to address antimicrobial resistance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada: +1

Canada has fully complied with its commitment to further the support of the World Health Organization (WHO) Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR).

Minister of Health Jane Philpott announced on 19 November 2015 that “in 2016, Canada will provide additional funding to the Canadian Institutes of Health Research to further study AMR.” She also commended Canada’s progress on surveillance and its dedication to spreading awareness of AMR.

The Public Health Agency of Canada participated in Antibiotic Awareness Week from 18 November 2015 to 22 November 2015 by partnering with Antibiotic Awareness, a website dedicated to informing health care providers and the general public about the dangers of antibiotic resistance.

Although Canada has not introduced new, major measures to address antimicrobial resistances, the government continues to implement its Federal Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance and Use in Canada, which focuses on surveillance, stewardship, and innovation to curtail the threat of antimicrobial resistance. This is a clear demonstration of Canada’s support of the WHO Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance.

Canada receives a compliance score of +1 for announcing additional funding to study AMR and for continuing to spread awareness of AMR.

Analyst: Doris Li

France: +1

France has fully complied with its commitment to further the support of the World Health Organization (WHO) Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR).

On 23 September 2015, Minister of Social Affairs and Health Marisol Touraine stressed the importance of innovation and the coordination of efforts. She therefore announced the launch of a plan for national interdisciplinary research on antimicrobial resistance in 2016, which will be a joint effort between the Alliance...
for Life Sciences and Health (AVIESAN) and the National Alliance Research for the Environment (AllEnvie). 897

Marisol Touraine also plans to rely on “new technologies and social networks” to raise awareness about antimicrobial resistance. On 23 September 2015, she announced her support for le LIEN and AC2BMR’s campaign to promote awareness about AMR to civil society and her intent on bringing it to the attention of the Prime Minister. 898

On 30 October 2015 at a symposium organized by the National Authority of Health, Marisol Touraine urged for the proper use of medicine considering the dangers of AMR. 899

On 17 November 2015, France and the Joint Programming Initiative on Antimicrobial Resistance (JPIAMR) organized an Intergovernmental Workshop to discuss ways to improve programs meant to combat AMR. 900

On 18 November 2015, France continued its support for European Antibiotic Awareness Day through its yearly campaign designed to reduce use of antibiotics and also participated in the first World Antibiotic Awareness Week. 901

Therefore, France receives a compliance score of +1 for its new initiatives to further the support of the WHO Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance.

**Analyst: Doris Li**

**Germany: +1**

Germany has fully complied with the commitment made at the Schloss Elmau Summit in June 2015 to “pool … national efforts in order to share best practices and promote the prudent use of antimicrobials among all relevant stakeholders.” 902

The German government and the German Federal Health Ministry are strongly committed to further support the World Health Organization (WHO) Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR). Germany is also committed to the “One Health” approach, which is emphasized in several reports and initiatives in its fight with AMR plans. 903,904 As proposed by the WHO Action Plan, Germany has put together strategies to...

---

“reduce incidence of infection,” “improve awareness and understanding,” “further surveillance and research,” “efficiently use [antimicrobial therapies],” “create sustainable investment on a global scale.”

The German government and other public and private enterprises have launched several projects that comply with the WHO Action Plan and strengthen Germany’s One Health approach. The GERMAP report, the RESET project, and the MedVet-Steph project are all listed as examples of best practices by Germany in the first edition of the “Combating Antimicrobial Resistance report,” published in September 2015.

In September 2015, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development published a report entitled “Antimicrobial Resistance in G7 Countries and Beyond: Economic Issues, Policies and Option for Action,” in which Germany’s efforts are listed and detailed. According to this report, Germany’s efforts thus far to implement, and strengthen already existing policies concerning antimicrobial resistance fully comply with the Elmau 2015 commitments. Included are several of Germany’s objectives to uphold its commitments such as “improve feedback on antibiotic use data; develop guidelines on use & communication between doctor & patient,” “disrupt infection cycles and avoid infections,” “strengthen one-health initiative at national and international level,” “promote awareness; strengthen [education] capacities,” “establish AMR online platform for HPs; strengthen [sic] tr on hygiene; incorporate AMR into clinical trials.”

Therefore, Germany has been awarded a score of +1 for its full compliance on AMR, its support for the One-Health approach and commitment to the WHO Action Plan.

Analyst: Camille Beaudoin

**Italy: −1**

Italy has not complied with its health commitment to further support to the World Health Organization (WHO) Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance.

Although Italy has supported key objectives of the WHO Action Plan and made efforts to support the One Health approach, it has made no substantive effort to expand this implementation since the 2015 Elmau Summit.

Therefore, Italy receives a compliance score of −1.

Analyst: Camille Beaudoin

**Japan: +1**

Japan has fully complied with the commitment to strengthen the World Health Organization (WHO) Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR). For many years, Japan has provided a constant reassurance on the importance of communicable diseases and AMR.

In a statement published on 12 December 2015, the Office of the Prime Minister of Japan reiterates the significance of adhering to the “One Health Approach” along with other G7 members to fight against AMR.

---

The Prime Minister’s Office states that due to the increase of globalization, notably in the Asia Pacific region, Japan’s geographical locality makes it more responsible for addressing the issue of AMR.910

As of 19 October 2015, the Joint Programming on Antimicrobial Resistance (JPIAMR) voted in Japan as its newest member, which will be represented by AMED.911 This is a crucial step forward as the JPIAMR now includes all residing members of the G7, allowing for closer collaboration and adherence to WHO guidelines. Thus, Japan is awarded a +1 in terms of compliance.

**Analyst: Garrett Hajnal**

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with the commitment to strengthen the World Health Organization (WHO) Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR).

The UK Department of Health released a Five Year Antimicrobial Strategy (2013–2018) to address the growing concern and challenges of AMR.912 In particular, the strategy seeks to address the detailed initiatives by the Annual Chief Medical Officers Report in 2011, in accordance with the One Health approach.913 The plan set forth by the United Kingdom addresses concerns stipulated in the WHO Action Plan. The report indicates that the strategy to slow the development of AMR is by properly managing and conserving the effectiveness of existing treatment, improving the knowledge and understanding of AMR, and to stimulate new treatment methods, antibiotics and diagnostics.914 It employs the WHO Action Plan by identifying seven key areas for future action.

On 23 October 2015, the UK Department of Health released a progress report on its Five Year Strategy. The UK committed to increasing collaboration with the WHO further and to making progress in preparation for a “high-level AMR meeting at the [UN General Assembly] in 2016.”915

As of the end of 2015, the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) has invested of GBP15.8 million in 16 studies, with more to be launched in 2016 and beyond.916

Thus, the United Kingdom has been awarded a +1 for acting to further implement the WHO Global Action Plan on Microbial Resistances by creating and installing a national plan.

**Analyst: Garrett Hajnal**

**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied with the commitment to strengthen the World Health Organization (WHO) Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR). The United States has acted both to further the support of and implement the WHO Global Action Plan.

---


911 Japan joins as newest JPIAMR member, JPIAMR, 19 October 2016. Access date: 19 February 2016.

http://www.mrc.ac.uk/research/initiatives/antimicrobial-resistance/


On 28 July 2015, the White House released a Fact Sheet on the Global Health Security Agenda (GHSA). The fact sheet states that the GHSA “empowers countries, international organizations and civil society to work together to achieve focused goals,” such as “countering antimicrobial resistance … [and] strengthening real-time biosurveillance.” The State Department has integrated AMRs into negotiations regarding binding international Science and Technology Agreements.

In October 2015, the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority (BARDA) released solicitation for “white papers and proposals for funding to develop diagnostics to identify and inform treatment of antimicrobial-resistant bacterial infections.” In November 2015, BARDA was “in contract negotiations to support development of their first AMR diagnostic platform and assay.” The Department of Health and Human Services claims these initiatives will make AMR-detection quicker and more accurate.

In November 2015, the Taskforce for Combating Antibiotic-Resistant Bacteria released the National Action Plan for Combating Antibiotic-Resistant Bacteria: First 180 Days Report. The report is an update to the initial action plan released in March 2015, and provides details of initiatives taken to ensure that the five goals outlined in the report are met.

According to the First 180 Days Report, antibiotic stewardship initiatives “continue to be introduced and evaluated” in both human health and animal health contexts. On 2 June 2015, the White House hosted a one-health antibiotic stewardship forum to connect human health and animal health stakeholders to combat AMR.

The First 180 Days Report also claims that the United States government plans to “expand laboratory capacity to detect and track antibiotic resistance, and to improve surveillance data integration.” The report also mentions other developments in AMR research and surveillance, including 1) the creation of a joint CDC and FDA antibiotic-resistant isolate bank; 2) multiple USG departments’ awarding of projects to...
discover “new antibacterial products and alternatives to antibiotics in animals and humans”; and 3) greater surveillance of AMR through retail meat testing.927

Thus, the United States has fully complied with the commitment on AMR and received the score of +1.

Analyst: Rajan Aery

European Union: +1

The European Union has fully complied with the commitment to strengthen the World Health Organization (WHO) Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR). The European Union has acted both to further support and to implement the WHO Global Action Plan.

In August 2015, the European Commission sent out a questionnaire regarding the “distribution and use of antimicrobial veterinary medicinal products” to all EU members, the Advisory Group on the Food Chain and Animal and Plant Health members, and the Food and Veterinary Office.928 The questionnaire will be followed up by fact-finding missions in 2016 and an overview report scheduled for 2017.929

In September 2015, the Innovative Medicine Initiative, a public-private partnership between the European Commission and the pharmaceutical industry, launched its sixth call for proposals to “re-activate research and development by Industry for new antibiotics and related issues.”930

From 22 to 23 October 2015, the Transatlantic Taskforce for Antimicrobial Resistance (TATFAR), which is made up of members from the United States, EU and Sweden, held a face-to-face meeting to “review progress and discuss follow-up.”931 The talks resulted in a TATFAR Work Plan for 2016-2020 that is expected to be adopted in the first quarter of 2016.932

On 16 November 2015, the European Commission released the Road Map for the Action Plan against the Rising Threats from Antimicrobial Resistance.933 The action plan focuses efforts on the following: 1) appropriate use of antimicrobials; 2) prevent microbial infections and their spread; 3) develop new effective antimicrobials or alternatives for treatment; 4) joining forces with international partners to contain the risks of spreading AMR from international trade and travel and via the environment; 5) monitoring and surveillance; 6) additional research and innovation; and 7) communication, education and training.934

On 18 November 2015, the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control continued to use European Antibiotic Awareness Day to “raise awareness about [AMR],” which has “developed into a platform of global reach.”935

---

The European Commission is working to expand animal health legislation to emphasize preventive health measures. The legislation is expected to be published in the Official Journal in May 2016.

Thus, the EU has received a score of +1.

*Analyst: Jerome Newton*
15. Health: Vaccines

“We will stimulate … research focused on faster and targeted development of easily usable and affordable … vaccines.”

G7 Schloss Elmau 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>-1</td>
<td></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>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></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

At the G7 Schloss Elmau Summit on 8 June 2015, the Leaders’ Declaration recognized “the highest attainable standard of health” as a “fundamental human right.” The development of easily usable and affordable vaccines is considered foundational to improving outcomes for two key aspects of human and veterinary health: antimicrobial resistance and neglected tropical diseases (NTDs).

Antimicrobial resistance has previously been a focus for the World Health Organization (WHO) through its Global Vaccine Action Plan issued in 2012, and the Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance announced in 2015. The former aimed to extend vital immunizations to the world’s population by 2020, while the latter focused on mitigating and responding to antibiotic resistance. International concern for this issue has been widespread: on 17 March 2015, the One Health International Congress highlighted research concerning “medical vs. veterinary drivers” for antibiotic resistance. WHO also pioneered a World Antibiotic Awareness Week, which began on 16 November 2015.

On the issue of neglected tropical diseases, several actions have already been taken. The Global Fund mobilizes nearly USD4 billion each year towards ending AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis, with the development of affordable vaccines serving as a major aspect of these efforts. Additionally, the Global Strategy for Women’s, Children’s and Adolescent’s Health and the “Every Woman, Every Child” initiative aim to collaborate with the GAVI Alliance to achieve the goals of the Global Vaccine Action Plan, with the specific intention of improving maternal and child health outcomes through routine immunization.

---

Commitment Features
The commitment to develop easily usable and affordable vaccines is part of a broader aim to improve health systems. In order to effectively reduce antimicrobial resistance, the Leaders’ Declaration identifies the One Health approach to be optimal. The commitment stresses the importance of creating an integrated national action plan to lower infection rates by devoting resources towards new antibiotic and vaccine development.\(^945\)

In terms of neglected tropical diseases, the commitment emphasizes “coordinating research and development efforts” towards “prevention, control, and treatment”; investing in accessible vaccines is a crucial aspect of disease prevention and control efforts for diseases such as AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria.\(^946\)

Members will be evaluated based upon their work to improve prior commitments and develop new projects targeted towards improving the quality and access to healthcare systems via investment into easily usable and affordable vaccines. These projects should focus on combating antibiotic resistance or the improvement of health outcomes for NTDs. Examples include committing to increase the vaccination rate for an NTD, or investing in research and development for vaccines which could lower the need for antibiotics.

To achieve full compliance, members must show concrete action taken to improve healthcare systems, either nationally or internationally, using vaccines as a mechanism to combat antibiotic resistance or advance health outcomes for NTDs.

Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>−1</td>
<td>Member does not take actions to develop affordable and easily usable vaccines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member takes actions to improve some aspect of vaccine use BUT does not tailor these actions towards antimicrobial resistance or neglected tropical diseases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member takes actions to develop affordable and easily usable vaccines, including those used to lower instances of antibiotic use, and those used for NTDs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lead Analyst: Sarah Harrison*

Canada: −1
Canada has not complied with its commitment to develop easily usable and affordable vaccines, both towards combating antimicrobial resistance and addressing neglected tropical diseases.

Although in November 2014 and March 2015 the Government of Canada laid out a comprehensive federal framework for addressing antimicrobial resistance and vaccine development, it has not made concrete, publicly published progress in building upon this framework with specific programs since the June 2015 Elmau Summit.\(^947\) Therefore, Canada has been awarded a score of −1.

*Analyst: Aceel Hawa*

France: +1
France has fully complied with the commitment to develop affordable and easily usable vaccines, including those used to lower instances of antibiotic use and those used for neglected tropical diseases.

On 23 September 2015, Marisol Touraine, French Minister of Social Affairs, Health and Women’s Rights, announced that action would be undertaken to reduce the deaths of citizens to a spread of antibiotic resistant germ. Specific goals included a “25% reduction in the overall consumption of antibiotics and lowering

mortality related to antibiotic resistance below the 10 000 deaths per year threshold by 2017.\textsuperscript{948} These goals were additional to a structured plan centred on four pillars, which are providing national steering actions against antimicrobial resistance (AMR), encourage research and innovation, allowing civil society to seize the issue by initiating community outreach and communication campaigns, and defending the recognition of a special status for antibiotics, to promote research of these drugs and facilitating access to new drugs market.

In addition, the minister advocated at the European Commission and the October G7 health ministers’ meeting on “the need for international coordination of initiatives taken by each country in this field.”\textsuperscript{949}

On 17 November 2015 in Paris, the Joint Programming Initiative on Antimicrobial Resistance and the French Ministry of Health organized an intergovernmental workshop on AMR. Invited to the workshop were representatives from ministries, agencies, and funding bodies that gathered to understand the remit of ministries and agencies toward AMR and discuss ways to add value to new and existing programs of work through cooperation and coordination within and between countries.\textsuperscript{950}

France has fully complied with its commitment to take action in the development of affordable and easily usable vaccines. Thus, France is awarded a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Michael Warchol}

\textbf{Germany: +1}

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to develop more accessible and easily usable vaccines, with an emphasis on the “prevention, control, and treatment” of neglected tropical diseases and antimicrobial resistance (AMR).\textsuperscript{951}

In November 2015, to ensure the continued progress in prevention and treatment of various neglected tropical diseases, Germany announced a 2016 G7 workshop on neglected tropical diseases and poverty-related diseases. The workshop aimed to implement actions agreed to at the 2015 G7 Science Ministers’ meeting in Berlin. During the workshop, the G7 delegates decided upon a series of actions to present to the G7 Science Ministers during their May 15-17 meeting in Tsukuba.\textsuperscript{952}

On 25 September 2015, German Chancellor Angela Merkel, with Ghana’s President John Dramani and Norway’s Prime Minister Erna Solberg, announced their development of an initiative aimed at preparing countries for and preventing global health crises.\textsuperscript{953} Part of this initiative also involved work with GAVI, the
Vaccine Alliance, to ensure the creation of more accessible and affordable preventive vaccines. The three hosted an event on the importance of strong healthcare systems that are prepared for a crisis, titled Securing a Healthy Future: Resilient Health Systems to Fight Epidemics and Ensure Healthy Lives. This was held during the United Nations Summit on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in New York. Chancellor Merkel announced a new roadmap she is launching called Healthy Systems — Healthy Lives, in order to further explore and discuss possible solutions.\(^5\)

Overall, Germany has complied with its commitment to support research and funding for vaccines, with an emphasis on neglected tropical diseases. In 2015, it has demonstrated this by funding further important research and by forming projects and partnerships to ensure the long-term success of this commitment.

Therefore Germany has received a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Kendra Dempsey}

\textbf{Italy: 0}

Italy has partially complied with the commitment to develop affordable and easily usable vaccines, including those used to lower antimicrobial resistance (AMR), and those used for neglected tropical diseases (NTDs).

On 11 September 2015, the Italian Ministry of Health released a statement on behalf of the Minister of Health Beatrice Lorenzin, reminding citizens to keep vaccinating themselves and their children.\(^5\) On 5 October 2015, the Italian Ministry of Health issued an announcement reminding citizens that vaccinations were available through the National Plan.\(^6\)

On 22 October 2015, the Minister of Health spoke to the house during question period and recommended that a new national plan for vaccination policy be implemented in order to offer expanded services to the public.\(^5\) Institutional communication highlighting the risks of preventable diseases along with integrated information in educational content in school curricula was also recommended.\(^5\)

On 17 November 2015, the Italian Ministry of Health issued a statement that 18 November is European Antibiotic Awareness Day, now a part of the newly formed World Health Organization initiative of World Antibiotic Awareness Week.\(^5\)

These developments suggest an awareness of the importance of vaccination and a commitment to institutional knowledge dissemination in the space, but do not outright meet the commitment requirements that nations engage in financing or direct development of affordable vaccines, including those used to lower AMR or fight NTDs.


\(^6\) Minister Lorenzin: I vaccinated my children, it is important, should not be afraid, Ministero della Salute, 11 September 2015. Access date: 3 February 2016.

http://www.salute.gov.it/portale/news/p3_2_1_1_1.jsp?lingua=italiano&menu=notizie&p=dalministero&id=2235

\(^6\) Coperture vaccinali in età pediatriaca, Ministero della Salute 5 October 2015. Access date: 3 February 2016.

http://www.salute.gov.it/portale/news/p3_2_1_1_1.jsp?lingua=italiano&menu=notizie&p=dalministero&id=2267

\(^6\) Lorenzin the House question time on vaccinations: “Approve early in the new plan, the resources you have and you can find”, Ministero della Salute, 22 October 2015. Access date: 3 February 2016.

http://www.salute.gov.it/portale/news/p3_2_1_1_1.jsp?lingua=italiano&menu=notizie&p=dalministero&id=2293

\(^6\) Lorenzin the House question time on vaccinations: “Approve early in the new plan, the resources you have and you can find”, Ministero della Salute, 22 October 2015. Access date: 3 February 2016.

http://www.salute.gov.it/portale/news/p3_2_1_1_1.jsp?lingua=italiano&menu=notizie&p=dalministero&id=2325

\(^6\) Antibiotic resistance the world’s week a one-health approach, Ministero della Salute, 17 November 2015.

http://www.salute.gov.it/portale/news/p3_2_1_1_1.jsp?lingua=italiano&menu=notizie&p=dalministero&id=2325
Italy has thus partially complied with its commitment on developing affordable and easily usable vaccines, and has been awarded a score of 0

*Analyst: Michael Warchol*

**Japan: +1**

Japan has fully complied with the commitment to develop affordable and easily usable vaccines, including those used to lower antimicrobial resistance (AMR) and those used for neglected tropical diseases (NTDs).

On 16 December 2015, Japan hosted the Global Fund’s Fifth Replenishment Meeting on, where private sector organizations and non-profits met in Tokyo to make record-breaking commitments to support the fund through more than US$37 million in pledges.\(^{960}\)

Japan has also made significant contributions and pledges to the GAVI the Vaccine Alliance. Japan contributed USD17.6 million to GAVI for 2015 in support of health system recovery in Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone. The amount was doubled from the annual average in previous years and constitutes USD53.7 million in direct funding.\(^{961}\)

The Joint Programming Initiative on Antimicrobial Resistance (JPIAMR) provides a collaborative platform to take the AMR combat from awareness to action by supporting research and facilitating its translation to industry and policy. On 19 October 2015, the JPIAMR voted in Japan, represented by the Japan Agency for Medical Research and Development as its newest partner member.\(^{962}\) The voting in of Japan is critical as it marks Japanese ambition to not only fulfill its G7 commitment but to excel while doing so.

In a declaration of “Japan’s Vision for a Peaceful and Healthier World,” Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe, said “We reiterate the importance of the One Health approach in the fight against antimicrobial resistance, and of supporting countries to comply with the [World Health Organization] Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance, as confirmed at the G7 Elmau Summit.”\(^{963}\) The Prime Minister’s reiteration of a policy that Japan has been key in structuring reaffirms Japanese efforts towards completing its commitment.

Japan has fully complied with its commitment to take action in the development of affordable and easily usable vaccines. During 2015, Japan made multiple financial contributions to recognized health organizations focused on providing effective vaccines to eradicate NTDs. Japan has also made a large effort to lower its use of antibiotics.

Therefore Japan has received a score of +1.

*Analyst: Michael Warchol*

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to develop more accessible and easily usable vaccines, with an emphasis of the “prevention, control, and treatment” of neglected tropical diseases (NTDs) and antimicrobial resistance (AMR).\(^{964}\)

---


In further efforts to combat neglected tropical diseases, the Chancellor of Exchequer announced the creation of the Ross Fund in November 2015.\(^{965}\) This fund has been created by the British government to specifically work with antimicrobial resistance, prevention of fast-spreading diseases that have the potential to cause epidemics, and the prevention and treatment of a variety of neglected tropical diseases. An initial funding of GBP1 billion has been provided by the government. The specific details of this fund will be managed by both the Department of Health and the Department for International Development of the GBP1 billion, certain sums of money will go towards targeted issues.\(^{966}\) For example, GBP90 million is specifically for work in the eradication of malaria.\(^{967}\) Additionally, GBP100 million shall be used to further research into infectious diseases, including potential treatments. Finally, GBP115 million is being put towards the development of new diagnostic procedures as well as drugs and insecticides for malaria, tuberculosis and a variety of other infectious diseases.\(^{968}\)

Overall, the United Kingdom has complied with its commitment to support research and funding for vaccines, with an emphasis on NTDs and AMR. In 2015, it has demonstrated its compliance through the funding of further important research, as well as by forming projects and partnerships to ensure the long-term success of this commitment. Therefore, the UK has received a score of +1.

**Analyst: Kendra Dempsey**

### United States: +1

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to develop easily usable and affordable vaccines, with a focus on those aimed at preventing neglected tropical diseases (NTDs) and antimicrobial resistance (AMR).

The United States has cooperated with the international community on vaccine development in the context of NTDs and AMR. This longstanding partnership came into play again from 17 to 18 September 2015, during which the US-India Health Dialogue took place; both countries reaffirmed their commitment to dedicating Vaccine Action Program resources towards combatting AMR.\(^{969}\)

The United States has been active on issues of antimicrobial resistance on a national level. On 18 December 2015, the US Congress approved an omnibus bill that allocated funding to reduce antibiotic resistance and support syringe service programs. The bill will provide USD160 million to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s (CDC) Antibiotic Resistance Solutions Initiative, which supports national outbreak detection, preventive control measures and overall improved antibiotic use. An additional USD3 million will go toward the CDC's National Healthcare Safety Network for increased surveillance of antibiotic use and resistance patterns.\(^{970}\)

---


\(^{967}\) Chancellor George Osborne and Bill Gates to join forces to end malaria, HM Treasury, Department for International Development, The Rt Hon Justine Greening MP and The Rt Hon George Osborne MP (London) 22 November 2015. Access date: 28 January 2016.


The US has fully complied with its commitment to support the development of easily usable and affordable vaccines, with an emphasis on NTDs and AMR. Throughout 2015, the US actively participated in international partnerships that have led to breakthroughs in vaccine research and development, as well as earmarking national funding towards future projects. Therefore the US has received a score of +1.

Analyst: Aceel Hawa

European Union: +1

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to develop more accessible and easily usable vaccines, with an emphasis on the “prevention, control, and treatment” of neglected tropical diseases (NTDs) and antimicrobial resistance (AMR).

The EU has also created a project to fund vaccines for the hookworm virus, with this project benefitting India. The implementing organization is Academisch Medisch Centrum Bij de Universiteit van Amsterdam in the Netherlands, which has longstanding partnership between vaccine manufacturers in both India and Europe. The initial goal is to develop low-cost vaccines and diagnostics for the hookworm virus, with the goal of developing further vaccines for other NTDs. The total cost of this project is EUR418,000, with an EU contribution of EUR333,000. This project is expected to run until November 2018.

In December 2015, the EU gave a grant to for tropical disease research at the University of Glasgow. The fund will work to further development of vaccines for schistosomiasis, also known as snail fever. The 2015 European Research Council has provided EUR72 million to this research, with each grantee then receiving approximately EUR1.5 million each.

Additionally, EUR1.62 billion has will be provided by the European Council by 2016 to support the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. Also EUR15 million is being pledged specifically for research into testing and preventive measures for diseases like HIV/AIDS.

Although the details have not been fully ironed out, the Transatlantic Taskforce on Antimicrobial Resistance (TATFAR), a partnership between the EU and the United States, held a meeting on 22 October 2015. The focus of this meeting, as well as future meetings, is to put together a five-year action plan for fighting AMR, by defining how antibiotics should be used, and how to prevent resistance to them in the future. Final results from these meetings are expected to be released soon.

---

Overall, the European Union has complied with its commitment to support research and funding for vaccines, with an emphasis on NTDs and AMR. In 2015, they have demonstrated their compliance through the funding of further important research, as well as by forming projects and partnerships to ensure the long-term success of this commitment. Therefore, the European Union has received a score of +1.

*Analyst: Kendra Dempsey*
16. Climate Change: Growth Agenda

“The G7 commits to putting [protection of our climate] at the centre of our growth agenda.”

_G7 Schloss Elmau 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>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</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></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background**

Climate change is evolving to become a focal point of G7 governance. At the Deauville Summit in 2011, the G8 committed to undertake robust aggregate and individual mid-term reductions in carbon emissions.\(^{979}\) At the 2012 Camp David Summit, G7 leaders continued this trend by recognizing the need to mitigate worldwide emissions of carbon and other pollutants. In particular leaders committed to implement comprehensive actions to reduce carbon dioxide, greenhouse gas, and other short-lived climate pollutants.\(^{980}\) Emissions reductions efforts have been complemented by commitments to climate financing, as at the 2013 Lough Erne Summit when G7 members committed to “mobilizing jointly USD100 billion” of climate finance by 2020.\(^{981}\)

In 2015, world leaders renewed their emphasis on the need to mitigate climate change. A special paragraph of the G7 Leaders’ Elmau Declaration contains a “future of the planet” preamble, which explicitly characterizes the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21) at Paris, the United Nations General Assembly and Addis Ababa conference on financing development as key to the post-2015 development agenda and G7 efforts to reach those targets.\(^{982}\)

**Commitment Features**

As the commitment calls for “urgent and concrete action” on climate change, including transparency and accountability measures as well as drastic cuts to greenhouse gas emissions, full compliance requires that the centrality of climate change to a member’s growth agenda be demonstrated by concrete action along these lines.

The 2015 G7 declaration contains specific language as to what may constitute action on climate change. Goals include: the adoption of the COP21 protocol that is ambitious, robust, inclusive and reflects evolving national circumstances; his announcement or proposal of 2020 emissions targets; the implementation of

---


carbon market-based and regulatory instruments; the mobilization of private sector capital to unlock investment in low-carbon technologies.\textsuperscript{983}

Full compliance should therefore comprise action on a majority of these goals.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>The member country does not adopt the COP21 protocol or announce 2020 emissions targets AND does not implement carbon market-based regulatory instruments or mobilize significant private and public capital for investment in climate finance projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The member country adopts the COP21 protocol or announces 2020 emissions targets OR implements carbon market-based regulatory instruments or mobilizes significant private and public capital for investment in climate finance projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The member country adopts the COP21 protocol or announces 2020 emissions targets AND implements carbon market-based regulatory instruments or mobilizes significant private and public capital for investment in climate finance projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada: 0**

Canada has partially complied with its commitment to take urgent and concrete action on climate change through employing transparency and accountability measures as well as drastically cutting greenhouse gas emissions.

On 8 December 2015, Canadian Environmental and Climate Change Minister Catherine McKenna endorsed a 1.5°C global temperature increase goal, stating that on “the question for framing the temperature goal, [Canada] support[s] reference to striving for 1.5 [degrees].”\textsuperscript{984} McKenna assured the government’s commitment to the official 2°C goal, as established by 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21).\textsuperscript{985}

Canada has failed to announce an emissions reduction target specific to the COP21 forum.\textsuperscript{986} “The Canadian government remains bound to the pre-existing 2020 target of “[17 per cent] below 2005 levels.”\textsuperscript{987}

On 27 November 2015, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau announced that “Canada will contribute … $2.65 billion over the next five years” in contribution to the Green Climate Fund.\textsuperscript{988} The Green Climate Fund was established by the UN “with a goal of raising [US]$100 billion from both the public and private sector by 2020.”\textsuperscript{989}

\textsuperscript{984} COP21: Catherine McKenna endorses goal of limiting warming to 1.5 degrees, CBC News (Ottawa) 8 December 2015. Access date: 29 January 2016. http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/mckenna-cop21-paris-goal-1-3355409
Because the Canadian government has yet to announce a new 2020 emissions reduction target and to implement definite carbon pricing in every province or at a federal level, it is given a score of 0.

Analyst: Neel Aery

France: +1

France has fully complied with its commitments for concrete climate action and economic mobilization. As host of 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21) in December 2015, France has inherently adopted COP21 protocol, while also enacting and maintaining measures promoting mobilization of private and public capital investment.

France’s targets are in line with the policy report communicated in 2014 by the Council of the European Union, which helped structure the commitments of member states for the Paris agreement submitted on 6 March 2015. This mandated all member states under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) to communicate their greenhouse gas inventories as well as climate change measures and policies, which France expressed through its National Assembly in October 2014.

On 12 December 2015 the COP21 Paris agreement was reached within the UNFCCC. The agreement highlights France’s commitments to its emission targets for 2030, including a 40 per cent reduction in emissions, in comparison to levels in 1990, and a 30 per cent reduction in fossil fuel consumption relative to 2012. The agreement also entails expansion of renewable energy shares to 32 per cent and 40 per cent of both energy consumption and electricity production respectively by 2030. These targets have been set in order to reduce final energy consumption in 2030 by 20 per cent from 2012.

France’s current Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC) include USD1 billion towards the Green Climate Fund by 2018, acting as an instrument for mobilization of private investors and visibly signalling for low-carbon solutions. Through the Agence française de développement action plan, France also continues to push 50 per cent of its financial aid per year towards developing countries in the form of climate projects, with the plan continuing through 2016.

On 12 December 2015, the Paris agreement spotlights the Green Climate Fund as a vital economic aid moving forward post 2020. An understanding was also reached regarding the need for increased scaling of climate finances beyond USD100 billion beginning in 2025. The Green Climate Fund’s prevalence within the Paris Agreement, and the expected periodic increases in NDCs by member states cements France’s stance as a stable and growing contributor to climate finance projects, with its NDC to be renewed post-2020.

---

In April 2016, 177 countries including France were signatories to the Paris Agreement, effectively ratifying the document and therefore securing France’s climate measures and its NDC until it is further updated.\textsuperscript{999}

For both its strong target-based emission policies, and consistent focus on climate-oriented private capital investment strategies, France has achieved a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Narain Yucel}

**Germany: +1**

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to put climate protection at the centre of its growth agenda.

Germany adopted the protocol from the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21) after hosting negotiations for the climate accord from 19–23 October 2015 in Bonn.\textsuperscript{1000} When the COP21 measures were officially adopted, German Environment Minister Barbara Hendricks commented on the significance of the global alliance, and the need for decarbonization and strategies to cope with damage caused by climate change.\textsuperscript{1001}

German emission targets for 2020 have been set, striving for a 40 per cent reduction in carbon dioxide emissions since 1990, but despite steady reductions in emissions overall the transport sector is continuing to increase emissions and there is doubt as to whether Germany will meet these targets.\textsuperscript{1002} The German Ministry of the Environment has taken concrete action to further reduce carbon dioxide emissions, including joining the initiative United Nations Secretary Ban Ki-moon and the World Bank created to phase out routine flaring of gas at oil production sites by 2020.\textsuperscript{1003}

Germany has taken a leadership role in establishing the Carbon Market Platform to facilitate the creation of market-based policies and regulations that limit carbon usage.\textsuperscript{1004} The Ministry of the Environment took steps to launch this platform in order to fulfill the goals of the Schloss Elmau Leaders’ Declaration.\textsuperscript{1005}

In August 2015, Germany announced a climate partnership with Brazil, committing EUR550 million to finance environmental and clean energy programs for the country.\textsuperscript{1006}

Germany has fully complied with the commitment to put protection of the climate at the centre of its growth agenda. As a result, it has been awarded a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Sarah Millman}

Italy: 0

Italy has partially complied with the commitment to place climate protection at the centre of its growth agenda.

In June 2015, Italy hosted the Secretary General of the United Nation’s High Level Advisory Group on Sustainable Transport. This advisory group recommends improvements for sustainable transportation.

On 30 November 2015, Italian Prime Minister Matteo Renzi called for a binding deal at the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21). He also expressed Italy’s hopes that the United States, China and India would contribute their fair share of emission reductions.

During COP21 Italy announced an increase in international climate change finance of USD4 billion from 2015 to 2020. This increase in funds will be allocated to Italian firms to spur investment in low carbon technology.

In December 2015, Minister for Agriculture, Food, and Forestry Policies Maurizio Martina signed the appeal, “Let’s Not Eat Up The Planet! Fight Climate Change.” The minister said that it is important to understand how agricultural and food policies impact climate change.

Italy has voiced support for the COP21 principles but has taken no legislative steps to formalize the 2020 emission targets. It has provided financial incentives for private-sector capital to invest in low carbon technologies though it has failed to implement new market regulations to limit carbon emissions. Italy therefore receives a score of 0.

Analyst: Graydon Kelch

Japan: +1

Japan has fully complied with its commitment to place climate protection at the centre of its growth agenda.

After the G7 Schloss Elmau Summit in June 2015, Japan submitted its Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC), which saw an emissions reduction target of the equivalent of 18 per cent below 1990 levels by 2030 and demonstrates an active consideration and plan for the post-2020 period. However, the

---

target was not as aggressive as that of the European Union, for instance, which made a 40 per cent pledge below 1990 levels. On 30 November 2015, at the Leaders’ Event of the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21), Prime Minister Shinzo Abe revealed Japan’s new contributing policy called “Actions for Cool Earth 2.0,” and stated its two pillars as: “(1) strengthening innovative technologies, which is key to acting against climate change without sacrificing economic growth; and (2) providing support worth [JPY]1.3 trillion to developing countries in 2020.” These pillars complement the goals set out at the G7 Schloss Elmau Summit.

In keeping with this policy, on 28 January 2016, Japan, along with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Caribbean Community, launched the Japan-Caribbean Climate Change Partnership (J–CCC) — worth USD15 million — to foster policy changes for climate technology promulgation. UNDP stated that this step is in “tandem with the recent agreement by world leaders at the Paris Climate Conference to keep global warming below twenty degrees celsius, and further to pursue below 1.5 degrees celsius in order to avoid negative impacts to the Caribbean.”

The J–CCC will guide national plans to deal with the negative effects of climate change and diminish the dependency on fossil fuel imports with the goal of bringing in a low-carbon era across a greater portion of the world. This is a concrete step towards one of the commitment goals: the mobilization of significant capital for investment in climate finance projects.

In December 2015, Japan also agreed on the Paris agreement with nearly 200 other countries. Prime Minister Abe said that, in regards to combating climate change, Japan will “achieve (the goal) without sacrificing economic growth.” Complying with the COP21 proposal is a direct step towards active global action, although the World Resources Institute stated that Japan could provide more information on the use of international market mechanisms in reaching emissions targets, for example defining a limit in applying emissions reductions achieved internationally towards its national target.

Japan has adopted the COP21 protocol, announced emissions targets, and will mobilize significant capital for investment in climate finance projects, thus earning a score of +1.

**Analyst: Tina Vulevic**

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom fully complied with its commitment to place climate protection at the centre of its growth agenda.
On 12 December 2015, the United Kingdom adopted the protocol at the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21), with Prime Minister David Cameron recognizing the significance of the agreement and emphasizing the UK’s continued commitment to cutting emissions. The UK has also set an emissions targets of 35 per cent reduction by 2020, resulting in a carbon budget level of 2,544 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent.

While the UK has not implemented new carbon market-based regulatory instruments since the Schloss Elmau Summit, the country has stood by its 2008 Climate Change Act, taking concrete steps to meet annual goals and carbon budgets. New renewable energy subsidies and a feed-in tariff scheme were introduced in 2015 to continue working towards targets.

In September 2015, Cameron committed GBP5.8 billion of the UK’s foreign aid budget to dealing with climate change in developing countries, a move that aligns with the COP21 focus on global assistance and concrete financial policies to mitigate the effects of climate change. The mobilization of significant public capital for investment in international climate finance projects satisfies the second feature of the commitment.

Therefore, the UK has been awarded a score of +1.

**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to place climate protection at the centre of its growth agenda.

In December 2015, the United States agreed to comply with the protocol of the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21). Secretary of State John Kerry confirmed US approval of the plan, saying that each of the countries present had “reached an agreement that, fully implemented, will help us transition to a global clean energy economy and ultimately prevent the worst, most devastating consequences of climate change from ever happening.”

The recognition and acceptance of the COP21 proposals indicate a step in the right direction towards mitigating climate change.

In January 2016, President Barack Obama’s administration likewise received the go-ahead from the US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit to initiate the Clean Power Plan. By 2030, the federal plan intends to reduce carbon dioxide emissions at existing power plants country-wide by approximately one third.

---

By reducing the legal amount of emissions from new coal-based plants, the plan also seeks to encourage investors and developers to start turning to cleaner sources of energy, such as wind.\(^{1031}\)

Although the successful implementation of the plan cannot yet be determined due to its being only recently adopted in August 2015, its approval on a federal level demonstrates a clear commencement of energy reform.\(^{1032}\) The extension of the production tax credit, which further emphasizes the need to shift to wind and solar energy through 2019, is also a conscious step made by the Obama administration towards complying with its climate change commitment.\(^{1033}\)

In August 2015, USAID announced a USD41 million investment in “off-grid renewable energy projects in India.” The investment is part of a renewable energy deal reached during Obama’s 2015 visit to India.\(^{1034}\) Similarly, on 29 March 2016, USAID and the Asian Development Bank agreed to provide USD848 million for the development of solar parks in India.\(^{1035}\)

The United States has invested in the development of climate technologies both domestically and abroad. Therefore, the United States is awarded a score of +1.

**Analyst: Tina Vulevic**

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with the commitment to climate change by announcing 2020 emission targets and by harnessing private and public capital for investment in climate finance projects.

The European Union has striven to keep the global temperature from rising 2°C above pre-industrialized temperatures. The European Union is working to cut its members emissions, encouraging major polluters to take action against climate change, and bringing climate change forward as an issue.\(^{1036}\)

In October 2014 European Union Leaders agreed to update emission and climate targets by 2030. Cuts in greenhouse gas emissions by 40 per cent compared to 1990 levels, as well as minimum 27 per cent shares in renewable energy and a 27 per cent minimum improvement in energy efficiency were promised.\(^{1037}\)

The EU has promised to cut at least 20 per cent of greenhouse gas emissions compared to 1990 levels, increase the share of renewable energy to 20 percent and improve in energy efficiency by 20 per cent by 2020.\(^{1038}\)

---


\(^{1036}\) Climate Change, European Union (Brussels), January 15th, 2016 Access date: January 26th, 2016 http://europa.eu/pol/clim/index_en.htm

\(^{1037}\) Climate Change, European Union (Brussels), January 15th, 2016 Access date: January 26th, 2016 http://europa.eu/pol/clim/index_en.htm

\(^{1038}\) Climate Change, European Union (Brussels), January 15th, 2016 Access date: January 26th, 2016 http://europa.eu/pol/clim/index_en.htm
The European Union has made action on climate change a priority, and as such has committed to spend 20 per cent of its budget from 2014 to 2020 on actions related to climate change. The commitment of up to EUR180 billion represents the European Union’s commitment to climate change.\textsuperscript{1039}

Furthermore, the European Union’s LIFE program has committed EUR864 million towards a specific sub-programme dedicated to climate action for 2014 to 2020. The LIFE program is the European Union’s environment and climate action funding instrument. This amount is triple the budget that LIFE had from 2007 to 2013.\textsuperscript{1040}

Thus the European Union has been awarded a +1 for not only contributing public capital investment in climate change projects, but also for announcing positive 2020 emission targets.

\textit{Analyst: Thomas Robson}
17. Climate Change: Low-Carbon Strategies

“[We] commit to develop long term national low-carbon strategies.”

*G7 Schloss Elmau 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>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>−1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</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</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Background

Low-carbon strategies, also called low-emission development strategies (LEDS), are national economic development plans that require states to cut their carbon emissions. In 1992, low-carbon strategies were adopted in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)[1041], and have since featured in the European Union’s measures to find alternatives to greenhouse gas. The United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Environmental Programme and the World Bank have also incorporated low-carbon development programs.

The G7 has been committed to working towards climate sustainability in a formal capacity since the 2005 Gleneagles and 2007 Heiligendamm Summits.[1042] The leaders reiterated this commitment at the 2015 Elmau Summit and emphasized that “urgent and concrete action is needed to address climate change.” Furthermore, the leaders supported climate change management strategies, including the UNFCCC policy of reducing greenhouse gas emissions 40 per cent to 70 per cent for 2050 as compared to 2010 levels, and the development and deployment of “innovative technologies” geared at transforming the energy sectors.[1043]

### Commitment Features

This commitment exclusively focuses on the development of long-term national low-carbon strategies. Member countries will not be evaluated on the extent of their implementation of these strategies.

Accordingly, short-term priority actions, which are sometimes included in national documents alongside longer-term measures (e.g., as in the Green Growth and Climate Resilience National Strategy for Climate Change and Low Carbon Development released by the Republic of Rwanda in October 2011), are not relevant to this commitment.[1044] As several media sources have noted, this commitment centres on creating a

---

low-carbon global economy “in the long-term,” with low-carbon targets set to 2050 and no-carbon targets set to 2100, so measures to develop shorter-term projects do not constitute compliance.  

Although the leaders’ declaration mentions “developing and deploying innovative technologies,” this commitment only concerns the development of strategy, not technology.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member does not make any progress towards developing long-term national low-carbon strategies, or focuses solely on short-term strategies/solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member makes some progress towards developing long-term national low-carbon strategies. This can take the form of working groups, pending legislation, a strategic review etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member has demonstrated clear progress in the development of a long-term national low-carbon strategy. Any proposed strategy must target low carbon by 2050 and no-carbon by 2100.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada: 0**

Canada has partially complied with its commitment to reach low-carbon levels by 2050, and no-carbon levels by 2100. While having not unveiled a national strategy, the country has committed to working alongside provinces in developing strategies to reduce carbon emissions on a per-province basis.

The majority of the provinces have established carbon reduction goals, to varying degrees. On 29 January 2016, the federal, provincial, and territorial governments all announced their commitment to build upon the Declaration of the Premiers of Canada: Quebec Summit on Climate Change (14 April 2015). This declaration recognizes that “transition to a resilient and lower-carbon economy by 2050 is necessary to ensure the sustainable development of provinces and territories.” The provinces also announced the creation of four committees, which will be under the leadership of the provincial and territorial Ministers of Energy. They will identify initiatives to be implemented that will further meet the shared goals identified in the Canadian Energy Strategy, which seeks to actively pursue lower greenhouse gas emissions, before reporting to the Provincial premiers in 2016.

However, the country has yet to adopt any specific legislation limiting carbon emissions by 2050 and 2100. The provinces, for their part, are contributing in the following ways: British Columbia has committed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 80 per cent below 2007 levels by 2050. Alberta has committed to covering 78 per cent to 90 per cent of provincial emissions with a carbon-tax by 2030, as well as reducing emissions by 50 per cent below “business as usual” level, or 14 per cent below 2005 levels. Saskatchewan has committed to action for years, allowing legislation (the Management and Reduction of
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Greenhouse Gases Act), but without creating goals for 2050 or 2100.\textsuperscript{1052,1053} Ontario has committed to lowering its carbon emissions to 80 per cent below the 1990 level.\textsuperscript{1054} Manitoba has committed to reducing its emissions by over half from 2005 levels by 2050, and to be carbon-neutral by 2080.\textsuperscript{1055} Quebec has committed to 2020 levels 20 per cent below the 1990 emissions, and created a committee to look in to reducing levels to 37.5 per cent below 1990 levels by 2030.\textsuperscript{1056,1057} New Brunswick has established guidelines for reductions of 10 per cent below 1990 levels by 2020, and 75 per cent to 85 per cent below 2001 levels by 2050.\textsuperscript{1058} Nova Scotia has committed to reducing emissions by 10 per cent from 1990 levels by 2020.\textsuperscript{1059} Prince Edward Island has committed to reducing emissions to 75 per cent to 85 per cent below 1990 levels by 2050.\textsuperscript{1060} Newfoundland and Labrador has committed to reducing emissions to 10 per cent below 1990 levels by 2020, and 75 per cent to 85 per cent below 2001 levels by 2050.\textsuperscript{1061} The Yukon territory has committed to capping emissions in 2010, reducing emissions by 20 per cent (from 2009) by 2015, and becoming carbon-neutral by 2020.\textsuperscript{1062} The Northwest Territories has committed to returning to 2005 emissions levels by 2030, and Nunavut has not released any plan or commitment to carbon reduction goals.\textsuperscript{1063,1064}

More recently, Canada has also begun to develop a national low-carbon strategy. As of 19 April 2016, the Government of Canada’s Climate Change webpages note that the federal government will “join with the provinces and territories to take action on climate change”. The government has also explicitly noted that it aims to develop a Canadian Energy Strategy, set a national target for climate change and carbon, and endow a CAD2 billion Low Carbon Economy Trust to fund carbon-reducing projects. However, none of these projects have as yet been expressly undertaken, and no national target has as yet been set.\textsuperscript{1065}

Canada, on a provincial level, has thus begun to announce commitments for carbon reduction, to varying degrees. As a country, it has committed to continue to build upon these provincial commitments and develop

national commitments in the future, without having yet passed any official legislation, and without having defined a clear national commitment to work towards.

For these reasons, Canada has been awarded a partial score of 0.

**Analyst: Mitchell Mittelstaedt**

**France: +1**

France has fully complied with its commitment to develop long-term national low-carbon strategies.

Much of France’s action on climate change in 2015 involved preparation for the 21st Conference of Parties (COP21) held in November to December of the same year. On 16 July 2015, COP21 President and Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Development Laurent Fabius issued a joint statement alongside Mexican Secretary of Social Development José Antonio Meade Kuribrena, as a demonstration of the two country’s commitment to addressing climate change. The statement claimed that “Mexico and France have decided to step up their cooperation on climate change by encouraging the establishment of strategic alliances fostering the transfer of clean technologies and scientific knowledge, and strengthening national capacities to ease the transition to a carbon-free economy. The two countries will also work together on soil decontamination, ocean acidification, and such areas as sustainable waste management and sustainable transportation.”

In addition, the statement “[urged] the countries in a position to do so to set out in 2020 indicative targets for lowering the carbon intensity of their economies by 2050.”

On 17 August 2015, France passed an energy transition law that placed a cap on French nuclear power production, reducing its contribution to France’s electricity production from 75 per cent to 50 per cent. The law aims to bring renewable energy to 23 per cent of gross energy consumption by 2020 and 32 per cent by 2030, with the ultimate goal of having renewable energy account for 40 per cent of the country’s electricity production.

Furthermore, on 28 September 2015, during the United Nations General Assembly in New York, France confirmed its commitment to increasing its annual climate finance from EUR3 billion to EUR5 billion by 2020 as part of a global commitment to mobilize $100 billion to support climate efforts in developing countries. Additionally, France pledged to increase its annual climate adaptation finance to EUR1 billion by 2020.

Notably, on 23 November 2015, France adopted its own low-carbon strategy (stratégie nationale bas-carbone, or SNBC) in anticipation for COP21. The strategy entails reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 40 per cent by 2030 (as compared to 1990 levels) and 75 per cent by 2050. The government has set five-year carbon budgets, or greenhouse gas emission limits, till 2028. The SNBC outlines sector-specific recommendations for transition into a low-carbon economy.
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From 30 November to 12 December 2015, France hosted the COP21 for the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). At the EU level, France had advocated for a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 40 per cent by 2030, followed by a reduction of 60 per cent by 2040.\textsuperscript{1073}

On 12 December 2015, a historic global climate mandate, subsequently referred to as the Paris Agreement, was reached at COP21 in Paris, where 195 countries agreed to keep the global temperature rise below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and to make efforts towards limiting the figure to below 1.5°C. The first global evaluation following the agreement is to take place in 2023, and then further evaluations will occur at five-year intervals to follow.\textsuperscript{1074}

In sum, France has both taken pivotal steps to combat climate change on a global scale and proposed a national low-carbon strategy with targets set to 2050. Within this strategy, France has also acknowledged zero net emissions by 2100 as a long-term goal.\textsuperscript{1075} France has thus received a score of 1 for its progress towards developing long-term national low-carbon strategies.

Analyst: Ahmed Hasan

**Germany: +1**

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to develop long-term national low-carbon strategies in order to achieve reduced emissions targets set for 2050 and emissions neutrality by 2100.

At the Elmau Summit of June 2015, the G7 mandated the formation of the “Carbon Market Platform” to develop low-carbon strategies. As current G7 President, Germany led its formation; its first event took place in Berlin from 8–9 October 2015. The aim of this initiative is to provide an annual platform for developing market strategies to improve approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. As the founding state, Germany will act as its chair for an initial three-year period, accompanied by a rotating co-chair.\textsuperscript{1076} On 12 December 2015, German Federal Environment Minister Barbara Hendricks also announced that Germany is inviting the international community to join the G7 Carbon Market Platform.\textsuperscript{1077}

On 9 June 2015, the German Federal Government mandated the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB) to begin the dialogue process to create the “Climate Action Plan for 2050.” The primary aim of this plan is to limit global temperature increases to 2°C above pre-Industrial Revolution levels by opening dialogue with the federal states, municipalities, associations and citizens before being formally adopted by German Cabinet in 2016.\textsuperscript{1078} The plan emphasizes the need to achieve the 2°C goal via long-term decarbonization and emissions neutrality.\textsuperscript{1079}

On 30 November 2015, in an address to 21st Conference of the Parties in Paris, Chancellor Angela Merkel reiterated Germany’s commitments to limit rising global temperatures and reduce domestic emissions by 80–
95 per cent by 2050 by transforming sectors such as industrial production, mobility, energy generation, thermal insulation and energy efficiency.\(^{1080}\)

Also on 30 November 2015, Germany announced its collaboration with Norway, Sweden, Luxembourg, Switzerland and the World Bank Group to develop the USD500 million “Transformative Carbon Asset Facility” (TCAF) initiative. This initiative aims to help developing countries develop low-carbon economies and reduce emissions by providing policy advice and financial incentives beginning in 2016.\(^{1081}\)

In conjunction with the TCAF initiative, on 30 November 2015, Germany and 12 other national governments formally launched the Carbon Pricing Leadership Coalition with the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. This coalition aims to help countries reduce carbon emissions through carbon pricing policies.\(^{1082}\)

On 9 December 2015, the BMUB pledged USD7 million in conjunction with the British Children’s Investment Fund to assist developing states to establish initiatives to measure greenhouse gas levels using the newly established monitoring, reporting and verification trust fund. By establishing a transparent system to monitor emissions and their environmental effects, the German government hopes to ensure that countries' pledges for reduced 2050 emissions will be met. Approximately 20 countries will receive support, including Costa Rica, Ghana and Vietnam.\(^{1083}\)

Finally, on 12 December 2015, Germany signed the Paris Agreement alongside 195 other countries, including the European Union. By signing the Paris Agreement, Germany pledged to uphold internationally binding commitments to limit global warming to well below 2°C above pre-industrial revolution levels by developing long-term low-carbon strategies. The Paris Agreement also calls for non-binding efforts to limit temperatures to 1.5°C, as well as emissions neutrality by 2050.\(^{1084}\)

Due to domestic legislative initiatives and international funding commitments to develop long-term low-carbon strategies, Germany has aptly demonstrated its commitment to ensuring the development of low-carbon strategies both nationally and in partnership with the international community.

Germany therefore receives a compliance score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Riam Kim Mc-Leod}

\textbf{Italy: 0}

Italy has partially complied with its commitment to develop long-term low-carbon strategies in order to achieve reduced carbon emissions by 2050 and emissions neutrality by 2100.
On 6 June 2015, the Italian Federal Ministry of Environment, Land and Sea implemented the National Adaptation Strategy, which provides a national framework to develop strategies to achieve goals such as eventual carbon emissions neutrality and low global temperatures.\(^{1085}\) While this plan addresses long-term low-carbon strategies, the brunt of its strategic focus lies in the Climate Adaptation Strategy, which establishes specific short-term objectives to be updated every five years.\(^{1086}\)

On 30 November 2015, at the 2015 COP21 Leaders Event, Italian Prime Minister Matteo Renzi announced Italy’s pledge of EUR4 billion towards fighting climate change from 2015 to 2020.\(^{1087}\) Although a short-term pledge, on 7 December 2015, Italian Minister for the Environment Gian Luca Galletti asserted the importance of using this pledge to achieve carbon neutrality by 2100 and limit rising global temperatures. He also declared that Italy should commit more funding to achieve these goals.\(^{1088}\)

Also at the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21) on 30 November 2015, Italy joined 12 other national governments in launching the Carbon Pricing Leadership Coalition (CPLC). The CPLC aims to reduce carbon emissions by helping states implement efficient carbon pricing policies such as carbon taxes and cap-and-trade systems.\(^{1089}\)

On 12 December 2015, Italy, along with 195 other countries including the European Union, signed the COP21 Paris Agreement. By signing this agreement, Italy commits to internationally binding obligations to limit global warming to well below 2°C above pre-Industrial Revolution levels by developing long-term low-carbon strategies. The Paris Agreement also calls for non-binding efforts to limit temperatures to 1.5°C and to achieve emissions neutrality by 2050.\(^{1090}\)

On 15 December 2015, the European Commission approved the new “Interreg” program between Italy and Slovenia focusing on four priorities, of which the second is “cooperating for low carbon strategies.” Although the majority of funding is coming from the European Regional Development Fund, Italy and Slovenia are co-financing EUR13.7 million for this project.\(^{1091}\)

Although Italy has pledged some funding and initiated some legislative action, its initiatives focus primarily on short-term strategies. Italy has not yet clearly stated a national low-carbon strategy.

Italy therefore receives a score of 0 for making some progress towards developing long-term low-carbon strategies.

**Analyst: Riam Kim Mc-Leod**

---


Japan: −1

Japan has not complied with its commitment to develop long-term low-carbon strategies in order to achieve reduced carbon emissions by 2050 and emissions neutrality by 2100.

Prior to the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in Paris, the Japanese government presented, on 17 July 2015, a draft report of its intended nationally determined contribution (INDC). This report outlined greenhouse gas emission reduction goals and strategies for environmental sustainability.1092

According to its INDC, Japan is aiming for a 26 per cent reduction of 2013 emission levels by 2030. Japan experienced its second highest emission rate on record over the year of 2013 (up by 10.8 per cent from 1990 levels), after all nuclear reactors were discontinued and replaced with coal power plants following the Fukushima disaster in 2011.1093 Furthermore, the Japanese government is planning to significantly increase the country’s active coal power plants.1094

These plans fall far short of low-carbon 2050 goals, both by providing very short-term projections and not scaling to significant reductions by 2050. Under these conditions, Japan’s coal consumption will remain an important source of energy for Japan until at least 2030.1095 Independent research has been done to show that more significant emission reduction goals are in fact feasible (at least a 25 per cent reduction from 1990 levels without nuclear energy).1096,1097

The Japanese government has laid out a strategy for environmental sustainability focuses on the short term, does not address carbon consumption concerns and does not measure up adequately to the reduction targets of other major emitters.

Therefore Japan has received a score of −1.

Analyst: Hussain Jasim

United Kingdom: +1

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to develop long-term low-carbon strategies to achieve low carbon levels by 2050 and no-carbon levels by 2100.

The UK has shown its commitment to reduce global greenhouse gas emissions by billing the Climate Change Act 2008 which aims to achieve a legally binding goal of an 80 per cent emissions reduction from 1990 levels by 2050. This act aims to improve carbon management and help the transition to a low-carbon economy.1098

The 80 per cent emissions reduction aim is consistent with limiting global temperature rise under 2°C. The act has established a five-yearly carbon budgets system to ensure its regular progress towards the long-term target. It also serves to provide a level of predictability for UK firms and households to plan and invest for low-carbon economy.\(^\text{1099}\)

A report released in January 2016 to the European Commission, outlines some of the long-term progress to reduce carbon emissions. It shows data on renewable energy generation and consumption for renewable electricity, heat, transport sectors, biomass use, commodity prices and greenhouse gas savings. Good progress has been made towards the 2020 Renewables Energy Target. For instance, the average final renewable energy consumption of 6.3 per cent successfully exceeded the interim target of 5.4 per cent set by the Renewable Energy Directive for 2013–2014. One of the ambitious objectives is to meet 30 per cent of electricity consumption from renewables in 2020, through the use of onshore wind and solar generation. The UK remains on track to reach its goal by showing that almost a fifth of electricity was regenerated from renewables in 2014. Moreover, the UK’s National Renewable Energy Action Plan has initiated the first Renewable Heat Incentive, a GBP400 million annual fund that supports household and businesses which convert to renewable heat. The government has also offered additional support and increased the budget to GBP1.15 billion in 2020/21. Furthermore, it is tackling the problem at source by phasing out all unabated coal-fired power stations by 2025.\(^\text{1100}\)

On 30 November 2015, at the leaders’ event at the 21st Conference of the Parties in Paris, the UK’s Prime Minister, David Cameron, announced that the world needs a deal with a “binding legal mechanism” that includes a “five-year review” against the targets.\(^\text{1101}\) In addition, he suggested that the deal needs to have financial support for the poorest and most vulnerable countries. The UK committed to increase their support to international climate finance by at least 50 per cent and to provide at least GBP5.8 billion between 2016 and 2021.\(^\text{1102}\)

The government is investing in ways to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by ensuring secure, low-carbon energy supplies to 2050 without jeopardizing its economy. It has been proactive in keeping its commitment, by creating an award-winning 2050 Calculator, a user-friendly model which lets a range of audiences explore ways in which the UK can best meet energy needs while reducing emissions. Using real scientific data, the public can create their own UK emissions reduction pathway and explore the wider implications of their pathway. This interactive tool is not only engaging and unique, but it also raises awareness amongst the people. The 2050 Calculator has been shown to be effective and it received over 100 responses from across the energy and climate change community in 2011, eight months after its launch.\(^\text{1103}\)


The Fifth Carbon Budget: The next step towards a low-carbon economy, published by the Committee on Climate Change in November 2015, outlined several ways to reduce carbon emissions. It also included the progress towards meeting carbon budgets while having the cost-effective path to 2050.\textsuperscript{1104} Thus, the UK receives a compliance score of +1 for its comprehensive strategies towards developing long-term low-carbon strategies for 2050.

\textit{Analyst: Christelle Ah Sen}

\textbf{United States: +1}

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to develop long-term low-carbon strategies.

In August 2015, President Barack Obama released the final Clean Power Plan, which established the first set of national standards to limit carbon pollution from power plants, in conjunction with limits placed on soot and other toxic emissions.\textsuperscript{1105} The Clean Power Plan also set out standards to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 32 per cent from 2005 levels by 2030.\textsuperscript{1106} In addition, the Clean Power Plan is also significant, for driving aggressive investments in clean energy technologies that will continue to lower the costs of renewable energy.

Obama’s Clean Power Plan also highlights continued US action on climate change. Through aiming for reductions in emissions from power plants, the largest source of US greenhouse gas emissions, the Clean Power Plan is the capstone of prior steps by the Obama administration to reduce emissions.\textsuperscript{1107} The proposed Federal Implementation Plan, released by the US Environmental Protection Agency at the same time as the Clean Power Plan, will provide a model for states to implement individual low-carbon strategies. The Federal Implementation Plan will also ensure that the Clean Power Plan standards are achieved in every state.\textsuperscript{1108}

In addition, the 2014 US-China Joint Presidential Statement on Climate Change also emphasized the commitments of both countries to a transition to low-carbon and climate resilient economies.\textsuperscript{1109} This was reaffirmed at the 2015 United Nations Climate Change Conference. The US and China published a joint vision for the conference, in which both countries recognized the importance of national low-carbon strategies.\textsuperscript{1110} The importance of US-China commitments to a transition to low-carbon and climate resilient economies cannot be ignored, representing historic cooperation in their efforts to reduce carbon emissions.

Thus, the United States receives a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Sarah Tan}

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to the development of long-term national low carbon strategies.

The European Union also continues to monitor and push progress on meeting its 2020 and 2030 emissions targets. On 6 November 2015, the EU held the sixth Emissions Trading Scheme Compliance Conference, at which participants met to improve the quality of the scheme and to determine how to improve the emissions trading system.1111

On 2 March 2016, the European Commission published its framework for Union-wide implementation of the December 2015 Paris climate agreement. It also set a timeline for its 12-month legislative agenda, which includes “proposals for an Effort-Sharing Decision for sectors not covered by the EU Emission Trading Scheme and on land use, land use change and forestry (LULUCF), legislation to set up a reliable and transparent climate and energy governance mechanism for the post-2020 period, and the necessary policy proposals to adapt the EU’s regulatory framework in order to put energy efficiency first and to foster EU’s role as a world leader in the field of renewable energy.”1112

The European Union has therefore been awarded a score of +1.

*Analyst: Sarah Tan*

---

18. Climate Change: Copenhagen Accord

“We reaffirm our strong commitment to the Copenhagen Accord to mobilizing jointly USD100 billion a year by 2020 from a wide variety of sources, both public and private in the context of meaningful mitigation actions and transparency on implementation.”

G7 Schloss Elmau 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></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

At the G7 Schloss Elmau Summit on 8 June 2015, a Leaders’ Declaration was issued reaffirming the need for “urgent and concrete action [to address] climate change.”1113 In order to address the inadequacy and unavailability of funding for decarbonization projects, G7 Leaders have committed to mobilizing USD100 billion by 2020.1114 Although there have been a number of global advances on climate change, the Fifth Assessment Report issued by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is particularly crucial; the identification of a global warming target of 2°C acts as the cornerstone for much international environmental action. The 2009 Copenhagen Accord on which this commitment is based calls for “deep cuts in global emissions” in order to make this 2°C warming target.1115

Other key developments on climate change include the protocols agreed to during the 2015 Paris Climate Conference (COP21) this December. Based on a maximum average warming of 2°C, COP21 successfully resulted in over 90 countries pledging to reduce greenhouse gas emissions on a rolling basis to meet this target.1116 On 7 December 2015, the Sustainable Innovation Forum occurred alongside the COP21, aiming to unite business interests and innovation with the emerging need for a greener economy.1117

Commitment Features

The need to drastically reduce greenhouse gas emissions in order to meet global warming targets is at the centre of this commitment. The Leaders’ Declaration identifies the need for sufficient funding available to
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adequately carry out the provisions and goals laid out by the COP21 in December 2015. Providing funding to ensure that individuals in developing countries have access to climate change insurance, and supporting the development of a renewable African energy sector, are two key priorities.

In terms of funding sources, multilateral development banks as well as the private sector are identified as two primary sources apart from state contributions. The Green Climate Fund, which was created as an arm of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, is labelled as an integral recipient of funding within the immediate future.

Members will be evaluated based upon a continuation and extension of their efforts to raise funding for greenhouse gas reduction projects, from both the private and the public sector. Examples of such action could include a formal commitment by the state to contribute a set amount of funding towards global carbon reduction projects, or the development of a public-private partnership which would devote both state and private sector funding towards sustainable energy development.

To achieve full compliance, members must take complete steps to mobilize funding for emissions reduction projects, and follow through with some level of concrete action on the project.

**Scoring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member does not take actions to mobilize any funding for decarbonization projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member earmarks an amount for contributions BUT does not take any meaningful action in terms of project implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member commits a level of funding towards decarbonization projects AND follows through with the implementation of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lead Analyst: Sarah Harrison*

**Canada: 0**

Canada has partially fulfilled its commitment to jointly mobilize USD100 billion by 2020, based upon the 2009 Copenhagen Accord.

A report published by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development and the Climate Policy Initiative in October 2015 said that joint mobilization efforts from the 2009 Copenhagen Accord have only billion required by 2020.

On 27 November 2015, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau announced that Canada would contribute CAD2.65 billion over the next five years to combat climate change.

On 12 December 2015, at the conclusion of the 21st Conference of the Parties, Canada, as well as 195 other countries, negotiated and ratified the Paris Agreement.

---


In addition, Canada has not yet tackled the issue of rising greenhouse gas levels within Canada. In a report released on 27 January 2016, the National Energy Board said that regardless of energy prices within Canada, levels will continue to rise unless the government firmly applies policies designed to counter Canada’s emissions.\footnote{Governments must commit to greenhouse gas policies, NEB warns, CBC, 2016. Access date: 28 January 2016. http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/industry-news/energy-and-resources/neb-urges-more-aggressive-emissions-policies/article28412975/}

Canada therefore receives a score of 0 on its commitment to mobilize funding in alignment with the 2009 Copenhagen Accord.

\textit{Analyst: Nick Allard}

\textbf{France: +1}

France has fully complied with its commitment to follow the Copenhagen Accord to mobilize resources towards greenhouse gas reduction and decarbonization projects.

On 2 June 2015, the French government outlined its new Air Quality Action Plan, which is designed to help reduce air pollution. While the purpose of this plan is not explicitly to reduce greenhouse gas and carbon emissions, it achieves this as well. The plan offers incentives for consumers to invest in lower-emission vehicles like free parking and preferential lanes for owners of less polluting vehicles. The plan also offers subsidies of EUR10,000 towards the purchase of clean vehicles. In addition, the plan provides a framework for replacing public transit vehicles with low-polluting vehicles, and actively involves municipalities to reduce pollution in urban centres.\footnote{Air quality action plan, Government of France (Paris, France) 3 June 2015. Access date: 27 January 2016. http://www.gouvernement.fr/en/air-quality-action-plan}


On 18 November 2015, the French government established the Energy Transition Act, which included in it the French National Low Carbon Strategy (SNBC), which carefully outlines French plans to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. They committed themselves to not only reducing national emissions but also to ensuring that they are not simply exporting their emissions to other countries.\footnote{Stratégie Nationale Bas-Carbone, Ministère de l’Écologie, du Développement Durable et de l’Énergie (Paris, France) December 2015. Access date: 27 January 2016. http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/15147-2_strategie-bas-carbone_4p_GB-3.pdf} The SNBC uses “carbon budgets” for various sectors of activity, namely transport, housing, industry, agriculture and waste. The SNBC shows that the French government will seek out public-private partnerships to help them to achieve these targets. It also refers to specific changes that the government will implement in each sector that will improve efficiency and reduce emissions.\footnote{Adoption of the National Low-Carbon Strategy for Climate, Government of France (Paris, France) 27 November 2015. Access date: 27 January 2016. http://www.gouvernement.fr/en/adoption-of-the-national-low-carbon-strategy-for-climate}
On 1 December 2015, the French delegation to 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21) committed France to spend EUR2 billion on renewable energy projects in Africa between 2016 and 2020. The initiative will be administered through the African Union.\(^{1129}\) This is a doubling of funds over previous commitments, and came alongside other commitments related to fighting climate change. This shows that France has committed not only to reducing emissions nationally, but also internationally.

In another international initiative, France also moved forward on its deal with India to develop India’s solar industry. The French President and the Indian Prime Minister launched the International Solar Alliance (ISA) alongside COP21 on 30 November 2015. The alliance includes 120 countries and is meant to encourage solar power generation in developing countries.\(^{1130}\) On 25 January 2016, French President Hollande travelled to India to lay the foundation stone of the future headquarters of the ISA, moving forward on France’s commitment to the ISA. He also announced that France would provide EUR300 million to the ISA during the same trip.\(^{1131}\) This move shows France is not only committing money towards greenhouse gas reduction, but is also making preliminary steps to carrying out those commitments.

Between June 2015 and January 2016, France engaged in several initiatives, including the SNBC to reduce emissions at home and several commitments to help reduce emissions abroad. It has also taken preliminary steps to carry out these initiatives.

France has thus been awarded a score of +1.

**Analyst: John Nicholson**

**Germany: +1**

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to mobilize USD100 billion towards sustainable environmental development in developing countries according to the Copenhagen Accord of 2009 that was reaffirmed by the G7 Summit in 2015.

The Green Climate Fund (GCF) program of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) recently published an annual progress report of the USD100 billion funding initiative for developing countries to receive financial support, and outlined Germany’s pledge to provide USD1.003 billion.\(^{1132}\) This is one of the top 5 funding contributions that year and demonstrates Germany’s recognition of the importance of this initiative.

The German national government has demonstrated commitment to mobilizing and increasing investments from the private sector; a report by the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development in partnership with the Federal Ministry on Environment, Nature Conservation, Building, and Nuclear, on national climate finance demonstrates a commitment to directly influence mitigation and adaption measures (for example special loan facilities or climate insurance schemes); and supports other partner countries in designing, implementing, and financing sustainable energy programs for private investments in mitigation methods for decarbonization.\(^{1133}\)

---


In sum, Germany has fully complied with its commitment to participate in jointly funding USD100 billion for climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies, as demonstrated by its national and international climate financing allocations, and cooperation with the private sector on climate initiatives. Therefore Germany receives a score of +1.

**Analyst: Michael Johnston**

**Italy: +1**

Italy has fully complied with its commitment to follow through on the 2009 Copenhagen Accord to mobilize resources towards greenhouse gas reduction and decarbonization projects.

On 9 October 2015, the Italian parliament introduced a new piece of legislation that would phase out coal-burning power plants in Italy. The first 23 to be closed have been selected because of their high pollution and low energy yield. The reasons cited in the legislation are that coal burning is relatively inefficient compared to other forms of energy production, and that it releases not only carbon dioxide, but also other harmful by-products. It also made note that Italy is currently producing energy far above consumption levels, and that the loss of power from closing the plants would not lead to power shortages.

On 1 December 2015, the Ministero delle Infrastrutture e dei Trasporti (Ministry of Infrastructure and Transport) issued Decree 1 December 2015, n. 219. N.219 allowed both individual consumers and businesses to convert their conventional gasoline-powered vehicles into electric vehicles. This decree is an important step in reducing carbon emissions by providing a lower-cost alternative to consumers to be able to use electric vehicles without needing to purchase a new vehicle.

Italy committed to funding and passed into law measures to fund decarbonization. On 28 December 2015, the Italian government passed “la legge 28 dicembre 2015, n.221.” In addition to numerous other measures to protect the environment, n.221 included several strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and carbon output. First, it created various amendments to existing legislation to incentivize the movement of power generation from fossil fuels to renewable energy. This includes the introduction of “oil free zones,” which are designated geographic areas which will focus on replacing oil and its products with renewable energy. It also imposed higher taxes on garbage incineration, and various measures to encourage people to choose walking or cycling over driving as a means of regular transportation.

Alongside n.221 the Ministero Dell’Ambiente (Ministry of the Environment) released their emergency program on 30 December 2015 to combat smog and air pollution. The anti-smog protocol focuses mainly on pollution reduction from vehicles. It devotes EUR405 million to bicycle and car sharing, sustainable transport, building electric fueling stations, making public buildings more energy efficient, and renovation of public administration buildings. The protocol also incentivizes bus travel with free buses. This protocol is a

---


clear example that Italy has not only committed money to greenhouse gas reduction, but it has also implemented it in a budget.1139

Italy has complied with its commitment to follow through on the 2009 Copenhagen Accord to mobilize resources towards greenhouse gas reduction and decarbonization projects. During the period between June 2015 and January 2016, Italy engaged in various initiatives towards decarbonization and greenhouse gas reduction, including phasing out coal-fired power plants, encouraging alternatives to cars, and other movements towards greater energy efficiency. Italy therefore receives a score of +1 for full compliance.

Analyst: John Nicholson

Japan: 0

Japan has partially complied with its commitment to follow through on the 2009 Copenhagen Accord goal of mobilizing USD100 billion towards greenhouse gas reduction and decarbonization projects.

On 26 November 2015, in preparation for 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21) in Paris, Japan announced that they would be increasing their current funding of climate financing in developing countries from JPY1 trillion to JPY1.3 trillion by 2020.1140 “The money will reportedly go to geothermal generation, railway systems, water-supply systems, and other projects.”1141

On 12 December 2015, Japan committed to work with 17 other countries to develop an international carbon market. It will create a market for carbon credits for companies in all 18 countries to bid and trade. The commitment was a part of the greater Paris climate deal reached 12 December 2015.1142

According to Germanwatch and Climatic Action Network Europe, two climate change think tanks, Japan is among the worst performers in climate protection. Japan was ranked according to five categories: (1) carbon dioxide emissions level; (2) changes in emissions from different sectors; (3) renewable energy; (4) energy efficiency; and (5) climate policy.1143

Japan has partially complied with its commitment to follow the Copenhagen Accord to mobilize resources towards greenhouse gas reduction and decarbonization projects. During the period of June 2015–January 2016, Japan made some commitments to reducing greenhouse gas emissions at home and abroad, but showed little to no signs of actively implementing these commitments in a tangible way. Japan therefore receives a score of 0 for partial compliance.

Analyst: John Nicholson

United Kingdom: +1

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to begin the mobilization of funding towards the goal of USD100 billion by 2020, in support of sustainable energy resource implementation in developing countries.

On 27 September 2015, the Department of Energy and Climate Change of the United Kingdom announced that the federal government had pledged to substantially increasing the total funding for vulnerable and developing countries to combat the issues of climate change as part of the Green Climate Fund (GCF), a program of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change from which developing countries receive financial support: the UK’s money for climate activities will be increased by at least 50 per cent, to a further GBP5.8 billion of funding from April 2016 to March 2021, including at least GBP1.76 billion in 2020, from within the existing budget for official development assistance.\textsuperscript{1144}

The GCF published a finance progress update in November 2015 reporting that the United Kingdom has pledged USD1.211 billion thus far.\textsuperscript{1145} The Private Sector Facility, of which the United Kingdom has representation on, is the sub-committee of the GCF that provides funding to private actors and “supports activities that especially enable domestic private investment in low carbon and climate resilient approaches,” demonstrates its commitment to the funding of programs through the private sector to decarbonize emissions in developing countries.\textsuperscript{1146}

The United Kingdom made significant progress on the target of mobilizing funding for climate change in 2014, and expanded upon these efforts throughout 2015. As such, it has fully complied with its commitment to jointly mobilize funding for climate change prevention and adaptation. Therefore, the UK receives a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Michael Johnston}

**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to mobilize funding for climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies, in line with the 2009 Copenhagen Accord.

On 3 August 2015, US President Barack Obama and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Gina McCarthy announced that they would release their Clean Power Plan, which will regulate the extent to which manufacturers and power plants in the United States can pollute.\textsuperscript{1147} The plan sets out achievable guidelines that seek to lower greenhouse gas emissions by 30 per cent from 2005 levels.\textsuperscript{1148}

Additionally, the US has played a vital role in shaping global climate policy discussions. On 12 December 2015, it was at the forefront of advocacy for the creation of a universal agreement that sets the world on a path towards a low-emission future.\textsuperscript{1149} President Obama, at the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21) held in Paris, stated that he believed it to be of the highest importance that the parties represented at that conference reach an agreement concerning tackling climate change.\textsuperscript{1150}

The resulting agreement reached at COP21 is the first deal of its kind because it not only includes the developed countries of the world, but also the developing countries such as India and China. Their inclusion in these negotiations are crucial given that they are two of the world’s largest polluters, yet have not been included in previous discussions.1151 The Paris Agreement was set to provide a strong foundation on which meaningful climate change policies can be built, around the world.1152

Overall, the United States has fully complied with its commitment to mobilize funding in line with the target of USD100 billion set by the 2009 Copenhagen Accord, because it has taken steps to increase climate financing unilaterally, while also cooperating with other countries to mobilize funding and set greenhouse gas reduction targets. Therefore the United States receives a scores of +1.

*Analyst: Nick Allard*

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to begin mobilizing USD100 billion towards sustainable environmental development and the lowering of emissions internationally, as was outlined in the 2009 Copenhagen Accord.

The European Environmental Agency (EEA), a body of the EU which includes some non-EU member states, released a statement in October 2015, months ahead of the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21) in Paris, confirming that the EU members have “collectively lowered their Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions by 24% overall, decreasing 23% over the period from 1999 to 2014 reaching the lowest levels on record.”1153

Preceding the COP21 in November 2015, the executive body of the EU, the European Commission, reported that at least 20 per cent of the European Union budget is now scheduled to be spent on climate change action by the year 2020.1154 This means that at least EUR14 billion, or an average of EUR2 billion per year, of public sector grants will support activities in developing countries between 2014 and 2020.1155

A recent report by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development in partnership with the Climate Policy Initiative (CPI) evaluated the international progress on the USD100 billion commitment so far; it demonstrated that the developed countries are well on track to meet their USD100 billion goal, and approximately USD62 billion has been mobilized in 2014 into programs towards sustainable energy development in less developed countries.1156

In November 2015, the Green Climate Fund (GCF) released its annual report outlining the pledges developed countries have made equalling over USD10 billion. The GCF was set up by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change to provide sustainable climate change response initiatives in developing countries, with nearly half the total number coming from EU members.1157 The GCF has begun

---


In sum, the EU has fulfilled its commitment to mobilize funding for the lowering of emissions in line with the 2009 Copenhagen Accord, by investing into concrete projects and setting funding targets for the future. It therefore receives a score of +1.

*Analyst: Michael Johnston*
19. Climate Change: Vulnerable Countries

“We will … intensify our support particularly for vulnerable countries’ own efforts to manage climate change related disaster risk”

G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>−1</td>
<td></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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the majority of countries vulnerable to climate change are located in South and Southeast Asia, and Africa. Countries that are economically dependent on agriculture are also more at risk. In particular the 2015 Maplecroft Climate Change Vulnerability Index named Bangladesh, India, Ethiopia, Nigeria and the Philippines the most vulnerable. The El Nino effect made 2015 the hottest year in history and has been linked to the extreme weather of 2015 such as the extreme heat waves, flooding, droughts and extreme storms that have occurred worldwide. It is believed that the planet has already passed the tipping point and that extreme weather events as a result of climate change will continue to increase.

In the future, supporting effective emergency response systems in the most vulnerable countries will become an important issue, especially to avoid climate migrants. However, usually the most vulnerable countries are also very poor and have less to spend on adapting to a rapidly changing environment. An example would be the impact of Cyclone Pam that demonstrates the consequences of not having enough resources to provide adequate disaster response.

---

After the Indian Ocean tsunami in 2004, the multilateral Hyogo Framework was created to reduce the risk of future natural disasters in part by increasing disaster preparedness measures. However, a decade later the framework has become overwhelmed by the large and extreme weather patterns. Instead, the G7 has committed to increasing funds available for mutual insurance companies such as the African Risk Capacity and the Caribbean Catastrophe Risk Insurance Facility. These common insurance companies raise funds among the participating countries, allowing for a faster response time. It has also been shown that these organizations save money that would have been spent on disaster relief and repair, the technology to measure and price the natural disaster has also led to an improved early warning system.

Commitment Features
This commitment is mentioned within the climate change section of the declaration and aims to improve the “support for vulnerable countries’ own efforts to manage climate change related disaster risk and to build resilience.” There are two very important details related to this commitment; the focus on vulnerable countries, and the support for their disaster risk initiatives. The term vulnerable countries applies to the level of influence extreme weather can have on the country’s socioeconomic structures. Furthermore, the G7 countries must provide support for the efforts put forth by these vulnerable countries, they cannot provide support in the form of their own framework. The commitment mentions a number of initiatives that have already been created.

In order for a country to achieve full compliance they must make a clear commitment to provide either financial or technical assistance to the vulnerable countries listed in the commitment. Compliance cannot be achieved if a country merely promises to take efforts to reduce climate change, it must be specifically related to climate change related risk. In addition to the specific requirements of the support, the framework in which the support is provided is also necessary for compliance.

Member countries must work closely together with the vulnerable countries within pre-existing risk insurance facilities. The risk insurance initiatives mentioned in the commitment are funds set aside to immediately ease extreme weather socioeconomic consequences.

Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member does not increase support vulnerable countries in managing disaster risk related to climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member provides support to vulnerable countries but does not actively work with them to improve managing disaster risk related to climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member provides support to vulnerable countries to manage disaster risk related to climate change through pre-existing frameworks established by vulnerable countries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lead Analyst: Emma de Leeuw

Canada: +1
Canada has fully complied with the commitment to intensify support for vulnerable countries’ efforts to manage disaster risk related to climate change.

Canada has been a major contributor towards climate risk insurance and has had past experience with these organizations. From 2007 until 2012 Canada provided CAD25 million to the Caribbean Catastrophe Risk Insurance Facility.\(^\text{1169}\)

Ahead of the 21st Conference of the Parties in Paris, on 27 November 2015, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau declared that over the next five years Canada will contribute CAD2.65 billion to helping developing countries adapt to and mitigate climate change.\(^\text{1170}\) The funding will be aimed at transitioning the poorest and most vulnerable countries into sustainable low-carbon economies as well as providing capacity within vulnerable countries to respond to climate change disasters.\(^\text{1171}\)

Although the exact details of the above-mentioned pledge have not yet been released, Canada has allocated CAD50 million to the G7 climate risk insurance initiative in developing countries.\(^\text{1172}\) This initiative will provide resources to developing countries to protect themselves against climate change related disaster risk, which over time helps build resilience against climate change disasters impacts.

Although the funds will support climate change initiatives in vulnerable countries, there is no specific emphasis on the support of vulnerable countries’ own pre-established efforts. During the 21st Conference of the Parties in Paris, Canada re-iterated support for vulnerable countries through multinational initiatives such as but not limited to the Least Developed Countries Fund, the G7 Initiative on Climate Risk Insurance, the G7 African Renewable Energy Initiative.\(^\text{1173}\)

Therefore Canada’s support for a number of pre-established frameworks warrants it a score of +1 for full compliance.

Analyst: Emma de Leeuw

France: +1
France has fully complied with its commitment to intensify its support for vulnerable countries’ efforts to manage disaster risk related to climate change.

On 29 June 2015, Laurent Fabius, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Development travelled to New York to participate in a meeting of the United Nations General Assembly on Climate.\(^\text{1174}\) Minister Fabius also co-chaired a ministerial meeting on climate with the UN Secretary General, during which he

called for “the mobilization of global policy makers in order to ensure that an ambitious and lasting agreement can be reached at COP21 [21st Conference of the Parties].”\textsuperscript{1175}

On 1 July 2015, a representative from the French Ministry of Ecology, Sustainable Development and Energy attended a Climate Finance Lab meeting in Venice to identify and strategize climate finance instruments aimed at, “climate change mitigation and adaptation in developing countries.”\textsuperscript{1176}

On 13 July 2015, Laurent Fabius, Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Development and Annick Girardin, Minister of Ecology, Sustainable Development and Energy travelled to Addis Ababa to partake in the third International Conference on Financing for Development.\textsuperscript{1177} While there, Minister Fabius and Minister Girardin reaffirmed their country’s commitment to assisting vulnerable countries in their efforts against climate disruption.\textsuperscript{1178}

On 1 September 2015, in the wake of large-scale flooding in Myanmar caused by a cyclone, Annick Girardin, Minister of State for Development and Francophony pledged EUR400,000 to “support food security and nutrition, notably for children.”\textsuperscript{1179}

On 12–13 October 2015, Annick Girardin, Minister of State for Development and Francophony, attended the International Forum on Identifying Nationally Determined Contributions to Climate Chance Action in Rabat, Morocco where she evaluated the progress of intended national nationally determined contribution in the face of climate disruption and to secure contributions from new donors.\textsuperscript{1180}

At a climate finance ministerial meeting in Lima, Peru, on 9 October 2015, the French Government reaffirmed its commitment to mobilizing USD100 billion and to increase its annual climate finance effort to EUR5 billion by 2020.\textsuperscript{1181}

On 3 November 2015, a subsidiary of AfD, Proparco agreed to provide a USD25 million loan to help construct two solar power plants in northern Chile in order to help develop renewable energies in Latin America.\textsuperscript{1182}


\textsuperscript{1176} Lab Advisor Meeting on the strategic direction and organization of The Lab, Climate Finance Lab (Venice) 1 July 2015. Access date: 3 February 2016 http://climatefinancelab.org/event/lab-advisor-meeting-on-the-strategic-direction-and-organization-of-the-lab/


On 3 November 2015, the Delegation for the External Action of Local Government of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Development launched a program called, “Decentralized cooperation for the climate,” whereby a call for climate-related projects led by local domestic governments to combat climate change abroad would be given financial support.\textsuperscript{1183}

On 2 December 2015, at the COP21 meetings hosted by France in Paris, the French Government and its G7 partners launched the climate risk and early warning systems program with a pledge of EUR10 million through 2016–17.\textsuperscript{1184}

On 9 December 2015, Régis Marodon, Director of the Latin America and Caribbean Department at AFD, signed a financial partnership agreement with the European Commission in order to create a technical cooperation program, which is financed via a EUR 4.2 million grant.\textsuperscript{1185} This will enable the Development Bank of Latin America (CAF) and its partners to “define and implement climate strategies at local level.”\textsuperscript{1186}

France has fully complied with its commitment to provide support to vulnerable countries to manage climate change related disaster risk through pre-existing frameworks established by vulnerable countries. As a result, France has been awarded a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Mathieu Sitaya}

\textbf{Germany: 0}

Germany has partially complied with its commitment to intensify its support for vulnerable countries’ own efforts to manage disaster risk related to climate change.

Germany has taken steps to ensure rising industrial countries sustain its commitment to the agreement to control climate change made at the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21). Germany announced EUR550 million would be provided to finance environmental and clean energy programs in Brazil. This will be with the focus of developing renewable energy sources in the country and the preservation of tropical forests.\textsuperscript{1187} A further EUR23 million was donated to Brazil to establish a rural land registry aimed at enhanced monitoring of deforestation.\textsuperscript{1188} In a visit to India, the German and Indian leaders expressed joint determination to boost clean energy in India. Over the next five years, Germany will provide India EUR1 billion to improve access to clean energy in India’s rural locations.\textsuperscript{1189} Thus Germany has taken steps to ensure the COP21 agreement is upheld.

Germany has been actively engaged in participating and promoting the COP21 agreement to reduce global warming. In a statement, Chancellor Angela Merkel praised the climate deal as the “real future course for the world in the direction of energy transition, a course for the world in the direction of reason considering the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}[\textsuperscript{1183}]
\item Update 1- Germany and Brazil join forces on climate change action, Reuters (United States) 20 August 2015. Access date: 5 February 2016. http://www.reuters.com/article/brazil-germany-climatechange-idUSL1N10V2D320150821
\item Update 1- Germany and Brazil join forces on climate change action, Reuters (United States) 20 August 2015. Access date: 5 February 2016. http://www.reuters.com/article/brazil-germany-climatechange-idUSL1N10V2D320150821
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
change in climate.” Germany could work as a facilitator and supporter in implementation, finance, technology and capacity building for countries to fulfill promises made for the COP21 agreement.

Germany’s efforts have focused on helping many developing countries in their necessary reform and transformation process financially. These efforts do not focus on intensifying support for vulnerable countries’ own efforts to manage climate change related disaster risk.

Therefore Germany receive a score of 0 for partial compliance.

**Analyst: Fernando Casanova**

**Italy: −1**

Italy has not complied with its commitment to intensify its support for vulnerable countries’ own efforts to manage disaster risk related to climate change.

Italy participated on various proactive efforts to provide aid to vulnerable countries easily affected by climate-related disasters, especially under the framework of the vulnerable countries. According to the World Bank’s statistics, the Italian official development aid has fallen under the United Nations and European Union target over the past few years, Italy’s effort to combat climate change is not entirely absent.

At the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21) in Paris in December 2015, Minister of Environment Gian Luca Galetti made a public statement outlining Italy’s engagement in sustainable energy and climate change adaption. However, its aid commitment from 2015 to 2020 has yet to be accomplished although accepted by numerous reluctant countries in the Caribbean. The memorandum of understanding in question was signed on the 23 November 2015.

Italy is also contributing to the overall progress on climate vulnerability by working with the CLIM-RUN project on climate information in the Mediterranean. This is an information sharing project funded by the EU to provide more reliable data on climate change, mostly for the local businesses and governments to plan ahead. This is a service expansion from the United Kingdom and Germany into more countries, and Italy is contributing to the information sheets and paying close attention through the Italian National Agency for New Technologies, Energy and Sustainable Economic Development.

Although Italy has made commitments to providing aid to vulnerable countries, it has failed to work with pre-existing frameworks. Furthermore, Italy’s inability to follow up on past commitments demonstrates a lack of compliance. Therefore Italy receives a score of −1.

**Analyst: Angela Hou**

---

1193 Italy will help vulnerable states to fight climate change. ItalyUN, 3 February 2016. Access date: 6 February 2016. http://www.onuitalia.com/eng/2016/02/03/13771/
Japan: +1

Japan has fully complied with its commitment to providing aid to countries particularly vulnerable to climate change and supporting disaster risk initiatives of the countries themselves.

On 23 June 2015, the Government of Japan provided Ghana with JPY8.5 million worth of emergency relief goods through the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA). This relief was in response to heavy floods that caused serious damage to the southern part of the country.1197

On 1 September 2015, the Government of Japan provided emergency relief goods, such as water purifiers and electric generators, through the JICA to Dominica in response to flood disasters caused by Tropical Storm “Erika.”1198 Additionally on 22 January 2016, Japan signed an agreement to provide an additional USD1.6 million in disaster resilience equipment to Dominica.1199

The Government of Japan also provided substantial aid to Myanmar over the course of several months in response to heavy flooding. On 14 August 2015, it provided JPY325 million in cooperation with various humanitarian nongovernmental organizations, such as the World Food Programme and the Red Cross.1200 Moreover on 2 October 2015, Japan provided an additional JPY1.2 billion for education to Myanmar; this assistance was for the reconstruction of schools, distribution of study kits, and holding workshops for disaster risk education through the United Nations Children’s Emergency Fund (UNICEF).1201

On 11 October 2015, JICA has provided emergency relief goods, in the form of fire extinguishing agents, to Indonesia in response to smoke pollution caused by forest fires.1202 Additionally on 15 October 2015, it dispatched an expert to Indonesia to aid the local government in dealing with smoke pollution.1203

On 1 April 2015, Japan and the Asian Development Bank began helping developing countries in the Asia-Pacific region tap into space-based technologies, such as GPS and satellites, to prepare and respond to natural disasters more efficiently and effectively.1204 The Japan Fund for Poverty Reduction provided a grant worth USD2 million to train government officials and local volunteers.1205

On 24 June 2015, the JICA signed a grant agreement with the Government of Bangladesh to provide up to JPY2.881 billion for the Project for Improvement of Meteorological Radar Systems. This project is to support the upgrading of meteorological radar systems into Doppler systems along with training technical personnel.1206

Before the Paris Conference on 26 November 2015, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe promised to increase Japan’s annual financial support to help developing countries combat climate change to JPY1.3 trillion by 2020, which is 30 per cent more than what Japan currently allocates.\(^{1207}\)

Due to Japan’s initiatives to help countries vulnerable to disasters related to climate change through financial and technical assistance and its efforts in creating and improving structures with which these states can better prepare themselves for climate-related disasters, Japan has been awarded a score of +1.

**Analyst: Raheeb Dastagir**

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to provide financial assistance to the vulnerable countries and has taken action to reduce climate change through cooperation.

Along with the rest of the G7 members, the United Kingdom has agreed to limit global warming to 2°C.\(^{1208}\) They hope to accomplish this by “reducing their carbon emissions, mobilizing USD100 billion a year for climate change mitigation, and facilitating more investment in developing nations.”\(^{1209}\)

Through a 50 per cent increase in government spending, the United Kingdom’s Department for International Development contributed to the International Climate fund and focused on increasing the resilience countries vulnerable to climate change shocks.\(^{1210}\)

The United Kingdom’s Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) settlement included two initiatives on climate change. The first initiative is to double DECC innovation program to GBP500 million over five years to “strengthen the future security of supply, reduce the costs of de-carbonization and boost industrial and research capabilities.”\(^{1211}\) The share of GBP1.7 billion of the government’s GBP5.8 billion International Climate Fund is going towards aiding the poorest and most vulnerable countries by helping them decarbonize and adapt to the effects of climate change.\(^{1212}\)

The United Kingdom will increase funding for the Renewable Heat Incentive to GBP1.15 billion in 2021 to ensure it reaches its goal.\(^{1213}\)

The United Kingdom will continue to play a leading role in international research efforts to reduce the costs of low carbon energy, working with other countries to strengthen international collaboration and transparency in clean energy research, development and demonstration.\(^{1214}\)

---

1208 G7 Leaders Agree on Action To Limit Global Warming to 2 Degrees, ThinkProgress, 8 June 2015. Access date: 2 Tuesday 2016 http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2015/06/08/3667069/g7-prioritizes-climate-change/
1209 G7 Leaders Agree on Action To Limit Global Warming to 2 Degrees, ThinkProgress, 8 June 2015. Access date: 2 Tuesday 2016 http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2015/06/08/3667069/g7-prioritizes-climate-change/
Therefore the United Kingdom has received a score of +1.

**Analyst: Nabiha Chowdhury**

**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to providing financial and technical support to countries particularly vulnerable to climate change.

On 15 May 2015, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) provided Nepal with an additional USD11 million to aid their earthquake response and recovery efforts, bringing the total US contribution to USD26 million since the earthquake in April. Moreover, five American military aircraft were deployed to deliver the emergency relief supplies and assist USAID’s Disaster Assistance Response Team, which was deployed to Nepal as soon as the earthquake hit.

On 6 August 2015, USAID announced an additional USD600,000 in humanitarian assistance to Burma in response to the heavy flooding, raising their total contribution to Burma to USD48 million since the start of the 2015 fiscal year. Additionally, a team of USAID disaster experts were also dispatched to assess damages and coordinate with local officials.

On 26 October 2015, President Barack Obama announced USD3 million in humanitarian aid to Indonesia to help fight forest fires and smoke pollution caused by El Niño.

Following the conclusion of the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21) in Paris on 9 December 2015, Secretary of State John Kerry announced that the United States would double its grant-based climate aid to developing countries. Furthermore, President Obama announced that the US with 10 other countries would contribute a total of USD248 million to the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF).

On 9 June 2015, USAID announced the launching of Climate Services for Resilient Development, a public-private partnership intended to developing tools, services, and technologies to strengthen the resilience of developing countries against climate change. This partnership launched with USD34 million in...
contributions from its founding-partner institutions, which include USAID, the United Kingdom government, Asian Development Bank and Google, among others. The United States Geological Survey (USGS) will contribute elevation data to help local authorities better prepare for climate change disasters, such as floods, droughts, landslides, etc. Currently, this partnership focuses its efforts in Asia, Latin America and Africa with countries, Bangladesh, Colombia and Ethiopia respectively, representing each region.

On 31 August 2015, USAID and NASA launched SERVIR-Mekong, a project aimed at assisting countries in the Mekong region (Burma, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam) to better prepare for natural disasters using satellite imagery, geospatial data and maps.

The United States has provided a great deal of humanitarian assistance to countries particularly vulnerable to climate change related disasters and it has actively worked with these countries to develop and upgrade systems to better cope with climate change related disasters.

Due to these actions, the United States has been awarded a score of +1.

Analyst: Raheeb Dastagir

European Union: +1

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to intensify their support to vulnerable countries’ own efforts to manage disaster risk related to climate change.

The European Union has identified the fundamental threats caused by global warming were human rights, labour, migration and displacement for the 20 states forming the Climate Vulnerable Forum (CVF). Engaging with efforts from CVF countries to tell the world the global warming limit of 2°C was inadequate, the European Union took steps to improve global climate goals.

The European Union has had a leading role in the implementation of the most recent international agreement for climate change at the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21). This seeks to limit global warming through a legally binding agreement and build resilience to climate change impacts in developing countries. The European Union was the first major economy to submit its intended nationally determined contributions to COP21. Commissioners from the European Union also led the first exploratory meetings

---

with the United States, Canada and various Latin American countries to fulfill the COP21 ambitious climate goal of reducing global warming to 1.5°C.\textsuperscript{1230}

The European Union has taken action to support vulnerable countries prepare for climate change. European Commissioner for Energy and Climate action, Miguel Arias Cañete and Secretary-General of the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States (ACP), Patrick Gomes signed the 11th European development fund intra-ACP strategy by ACP group and the European Commission. This allocated EUR475 million for climate change action, resilience building, and the environmental policies in ACP countries.\textsuperscript{1231} An agreement was also signed with the country of Bhutan to maintain the country’s forest coverage to at least 60 per cent of its surface area and a commitment for permanent carbon neutrality.\textsuperscript{1232} This is evidence of the importance the European Union has given to the specific needs of the least developed countries to increase resilience to climate change.

The European Union has shown full compliance and is thus awarded the score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Fernando Casanova}


20. Energy: Liberalizing Systems

“We reaffirm our support for Ukraine and other vulnerable countries in their ongoing efforts to reform and liberalize their energy systems.”

*G7 Schloss Elmau Summit Declaration*

**Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background**

In early March 2014, the Russian-owned energy company Gazprom announced that it would be increasing the price of its natural gas supplies to Ukraine. This was a reversal of a December 2013 agreement between Russian President Vladimir Putin and Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovych, in which Gazprom had reduced the price of natural gas from USD400 to USD270 per 1,000 cubic metres. The deal was widely interpreted as an attempt to intensify ties between Ukraine and Russia, and to strengthen Yanukovych’s position in the wake of his decision to axe an association agreement with the European Union in November 2013. Russia’s about-face resulted from protestors’ success in unseating Yanukovych in February 2014.

Gazprom’s words not only threatened Ukraine’s energy supply, but also the stability of the European energy network. Roughly 24 per cent of the EU’s natural gas is supplied by Gazprom, and approximately half of that amount is delivered via Ukraine. Moreover, Russia had proven itself willing to cut supply flows to Ukraine before during the crises of 2006 and 2009.

But it was Russia’s intensification of the conflict through its annexation of Crimea that catalyzed immediate action by the EU and the rest of the G7. Rob Bailey, a research director at Chatham House, noted that the situation in Crimea transformed the agenda of the March 2014 European Spring Council and altered the EU’s energy priorities. He noted that energy policy “had previously been focused on competitiveness and the energy price differential between Europe and the United States arising from the latter’s shale gas
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revolution, but European Council President Herman Van Rompuy underlined that the discussion was now ‘focused primarily on how to reduce [Europe’s] high energy dependency, particularly relevant of course in the context of the situation with Ukraine.’ In addition to the announcement of their decision to boycott the G8 Sochi Summit, the G7 members decided both “to discuss ways to strengthen our collective energy security,” and to “strengthen energy security” in Ukraine.

On 6 May 2014, the G7 released the Rome G7 Energy Initiative for Energy Security. The organization confirmed the central role of the Ukrainian crisis in the G7’s increased focus on energy security by noting that “Recent events highlight the need to address energy security challenges … We are extremely concerned by the energy security implication of developments in Ukraine, as a consequence of Russia’s violation of Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity.” They also agreed upon a series of seven principles to increase energy security, including a need to diversify energy sources and supplies. Finally, the G7 committed to strengthening the energy security of Ukraine.

In May 2015, G7 energy ministers met in Hamburg to review their actions and commitments in the area of energy security. The group’s self-assessment of their work reveals progress in the area of heightening Ukraine’s energy security. In Hamburg they reaffirmed their support for Ukraine and specifically expanded their concern to other vulnerable countries, noting that “this will include efforts to encourage investments in energy infrastructure and energy efficiency in Ukraine and other Energy Community countries.” G7 leaders welcomed this agreement and reiterated their general support for increasing the energy security of vulnerable states at the Elmau Summit.

**Commitment Features**

Full compliance with this commitment will require that G7 members take new action to support Ukraine and other vulnerable countries as they reform and liberalize their energy systems to increase their energy security. While the commitment does not specifically define who these vulnerable countries are, the European Commission has interpreted energy security vulnerability as dependence on a single natural gas supplier. This includes many states in central and eastern Europe, though to varying degrees. The Baltic States, Finland, Bulgaria, Slovakia and the Czech Republic are particularly at risk as they import close to 100 per cent of their natural gas from Russia. However, a recent stress test conducted by the European Union

---


indicated that a Russian natural gas disruption would also result in serious supply concerns for states like Romania, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Hungary and Poland.  

Efforts to increase the energy security of vulnerable states can take many forms. The G7 outlined seven principles for the creation of energy security within the Rome Initiative. These are 1) “development of flexible, transparent, and competitive energy markets, including gas markets”; 2) “diversification of energy fuels, sources, and routes”; (3) “reducing our greenhouse gas emissions, and accelerating the transition to a low carbon economy”; 4) “enhancing energy efficiency in demand and supply, and demand response management”; 5) “promoting deployment of clean and sustainable energy technologies and continued investment in research and innovation”; 6) upgrading and modernizing infrastructure; and 7) “putting in place emergency response systems.”

If G7 members take further action in any of these areas to support Ukraine and other vulnerable countries as they increase their energy security, they will have fully complied with their commitment in this area.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member takes no further action to support Ukraine OR other vulnerable countries to reform and liberalize their energy systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member takes further action to support Ukraine OR other vulnerable countries to reform and liberalize their energy systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member takes further action to support Ukraine AND other vulnerable countries to reform and liberalize their energy systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada: +1**

Canada has fully complied with its commitment to support Ukraine and other vulnerable countries as they reform and liberalize their energy sectors; Canada has provided Ukraine with aid and expert advice, and has demonstrated a commitment to playing a leadership role in providing such assets to other vulnerable countries.

On 12 June 2015, officials from the Canadian embassy participated in a meeting with members of the Ministry of Energy and Coal Industry of Ukraine and the United States Department of Energy to discuss cooperation on the development of an emergency response plan to enhance Ukrainian energy security. The representatives agreed that they would work together to produce a winter action plan for 2015 to 2016, as well as a sustainability plan. Mykhailo Bro-Ariyan, Head of the European Integration Department at the Energy and Coal Industry Ministry, noted that the winter action plan “would outline the necessary steps and volumes of gas, coal, and other energy resources for the heating season,” while the three-to-five year sustainability plan would “contain a whole system of emergency response in the energy sector.” In order to develop these documents, the participants decided that a group of experts from Canada, the US and the European Commission would visit Ukraine during the month of July to help the country compose these...
emergency response plans. Since the G7 Rome Initiative highlights the creation of emergency response systems as a vital component of energy security, Canada’s support for Ukraine’s efforts to reform their emergency response plans in this sector illustrate partial compliance with the commitment.

Moreover, in a 2 May 2016 press release regarding the recent G7 Energy Ministerial Conference in Kitakyshu, Japan, Canadian Minister of Natural Resources Jim Carr affirmed Canada’s commitment to “improving [Canada’s] domestic energy systems, fostering clean technology, and delivering policy and regulatory innovations to improve environmental performance and energy security globally.” This affirmation aligns with principles three and five of the Rome Initiative because it demonstrates a commitment to advancing the development of cleaner and more reliable Canadian energy systems as well as assisting similar developments globally.

Because Canada has worked to support the transformation of Ukraine’s energy sector and has demonstrated a manifest commitment to effecting similar transformations globally, it receives a score of 1 for full compliance.

Analysts: Sarah Beard and Michael Switzer

France: 0

France has partially complied with its commitment to support Ukraine and other vulnerable countries to reform and liberalize their energy systems. Although has made a number of efforts to support Ukraine in its attempts to reform its energy sector, it has not made similar efforts to support other vulnerable states during the compliance period.

On 28 January 2016, officials from the French Embassy in Kyiv met with the Ukrainian Parliamentary Committee on the Fuel and Energy Complex, Nuclear Policy and Nuclear Safety. Representatives from Energoatom, Ukraine’s nuclear power plant operator, were also in attendance, and noted that discussions revolved around “the need to develop nuclear energy as a low-carbon source … and the Ukrainian nuclear sector’s increasing independence from its traditional partner, Russia.” During this meeting, France took steps to support Ukraine’s energy reform and liberalization by suggesting that a parliamentary committee partnership be created to allow Ukraine to learn from French legislation on nuclear energy, and from their experience in adopting the European Union acquis communautaire in this area.

On 25 June 2015, France’s Assemblée Nationale ratified the Ukraine-European Union Association Agreement, which contains a chapter pertaining specifically to energy cooperation. Within the agreement,

the parties note that they are “committed to enhancing energy security, facilitating the development of appropriate infrastructure and increasing market integration and regulatory approximation towards key elements of the EU acquis, [and] promoting energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy sources.”1261 The agreement also commits Ukraine to adapting its legislation to comply with EU directives in the electricity, gas, oil and nuclear energy sectors, as well as in the area of energy efficiency.1262 French ratification of the document is an important step towards ensuring the Ukraine will follow through on these reforms, since deadlines for Ukraine’s adaptation of its legislation in the energy sector are often based around the date that the treaty enters into force. For example, Ukrainian legislation on energy efficiency must be harmonized with that of the EU “within eight years after entry into force of this Agreement.”1263 Thus, French ratification of the accord is an important step.

France provided Ukraine with further support for its energy security by hosting a Franco-Ukrainian Forum on Energy Efficiency on 23 September 2015. During the meeting, French Ambassador Isabelle Dumont congratulated Ukraine on the energy reforms that it had made during 2014.1264 Moreover, a number of French companies shared their knowledge on the subject at the conference and networked with Ukrainian companies to investigate the possibility of future cooperation in this area.1265

On 7 July 2015, the French government sent a mission of politicians and business leaders to Ukraine, led by the Secretary of State for International Business, Matthias Fekl.1266 A key focus of the visit was the secretary’s presentation on how France could help Ukraine develop in strategic sectors like renewable energy and energy efficiency.1267

However, French Environment Minister Ségolène Royal confirmed France’s interest in Gazprom’s proposed Nord Stream 2 pipeline on 8 October 2015.1268 Vulnerable states including Poland, Slovakia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia oppose the pipeline on the grounds that it will undermine key interests of the EU, and further destabilize Ukraine.1269

---

In conclusion, France has partially complied with its commitment to support Ukraine and other vulnerable countries as they reform and liberalize their energy systems. While France has supported Ukraine, there is little evidence that it has made similar efforts to help other vulnerable countries during the compliance period. Therefore, France receives a score of 0 for partial compliance.

*Analyst: Andreas Kyriakos*

**Germany: +1**

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to help Ukraine and other vulnerable countries reform and diversify their energy sectors.

Germany has provided Ukraine with help to increase its energy diversification and efficiency. On 4 November 2015, Andreas Gies, the Director of the Department at the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, signed an agreement to give Ukraine EUR136 million in loans and grants to finance projects in a number of areas “including projects to … support economic growth and the energy independence of the country.”

On 22 July 2015, Germany completed the ratification process signalling its acceptance of the Association Agreement between the European Union and Ukraine. Although the German Bundestag technically approved the agreement in March 2015, the ratification process requires that all documents must be submitted to the EU for the ratification to be completed. Given that the EU identifies Germany’s ratification date as 22 July 2015, this action does fall within the compliance period. The Association Agreement includes a chapter on energy, and commits Ukraine to making changes to its legislation in the energy sector and the area of energy efficiency to harmonize its laws with the **acquis communautaire** of the EU. Germany’s ratification of this accord is particularly important because the agreement cannot enter into force without ratifications from all EU members. Moreover, ratification is an important instrument to encourage Ukraine to undertake the reforms in a timely manner. This is because many of the deadlines that the EU has set for the country are not formatted as specific dates, but instead as a certain time period following the treaty’s entrance into force. One instance of this is in the area of energy efficiency, where Ukrainian reforms must be completed “within eight years after entry into force of this Agreement.”

Furthermore, Germany held a training program for Ukrainian government officials on “Energy Efficiency in Commercial and Public Buildings” from 1 to 10 June 2015. During the visit, the German government informed participants about issues including: 1) energy-saving technologies; 2) European standards of energy certification; 3) formation of European energy efficiency policies and instruments; and 4) “implementation of

---


energy efficiency measures in the fields of business, trade, and building maintenance; 5) “standards and principles of design and construction of passive and low-energy houses.” This program was also directed at educating Ukrainian officials about strategies for implementing a national emissions trading system in Ukraine itself. Although the project overlapped with the G7 summit, the program was not completed until a few days after the summit ended, and therefore it can count as compliance with the commitment. This event illustrates Germany’s efforts to provide Ukraine with best practices and knowledge as it makes energy efficiency reforms.

Germany has also made efforts to support energy reforms in other vulnerable countries. For example, on 12 October 2015, the German government-owned development bank, KfW, agreed to provide a loan of EUR100 million to fund a program to increase energy efficiency in multi-family buildings in Bulgaria.

Due to its support for energy competitiveness and diversification in Ukraine and other vulnerable countries, Germany receives a score of +1.

**Analyst: Leila Martin**

**Italy: +1**

Italy has fully complied with its commitment to support Ukraine and other vulnerable countries in their ongoing efforts to reform and liberalize their energy systems.

Italy has taken steps to support Ukraine’s reform of the energy sector. On 19 November 2015, Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko and Italian Prime Minister Sergio Mattarella signed an agreement to cooperate on various sectors of the economy, including energy.

On 10 July 2015, Italy signed a Memorandum of Understanding and Action Plan on a Joint Approach to Address the Natural Gas Diversification and Security of Supply Challenges as Part of the Central and South-Eastern European Gas Connectivity (CESEC) Initiative. Along with fifteen other countries, Italy has committed to “work together to accelerate the building of missing gas infrastructure links and to tackle the remaining technical and regulatory issues which hamper security of supply and the development of a fully integrated and competitive market in the region.” Participants that Italy will be working with to achieve this goal include Ukraine, Hungary, Bulgaria, the Slovak Republic, and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. By cooperating to support projects such as the Trans Adriatic Pipeline, and interconnectors
between Greece and Bulgaria, Italy will help Ukraine and other vulnerable countries in the region to diversify their energy sectors. The agreement’s ultimate goal is to ensure that each participating state has three sources of gas.  

Italy has also taken other steps to support other vulnerable countries in the region as they attempt to reform and liberalize their energy sectors. For example, on 10 June 2015, the Italian Embassy to Bulgaria helped to host a forum entitled “More Modern, More Competitive, Stronger: Environment and Energy Efficiency in Bulgaria.”  
During the conference, Italian and Bulgarian participants shared knowledge about ways of improving energy efficiency across all sectors, with the hope that this would provide participants with information about best practices.  
Marco Conticelli, the Italian Ambassador to Bulgaria, noted that “Energy efficiency means competitiveness, security, and [a] clean environment.”  

In conclusion, Italy has fully complied with its commitment to support Ukraine and other vulnerable countries as they reform and liberalize their energy sectors. This is largely due to its participation in the CESEC initiative.  
Therefore Italy receives a score of +1.  

**Analyst: Valerie Steckle**

### Japan: 0

Japan has partially complied with its commitment to take action to support Ukraine and other vulnerable countries in reforming and liberalizing their energy systems. It has supported Ukraine in upgrading waste treatment plants, which will aid in energy consumption management, but has not provided similar support to other vulnerable countries.

On 15 June 2015, the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) agreed to loan the Government of Ukraine over JPY1.08 billion for use in the Bortnychi Sewage Treatment Plan Modernization Project.  
These funds will enable the replacement of many of the machines within the treatment plant with tools that are more energy efficient and are more environmentally friendly. JICA noted that “a belt condenser for condensing the sludge produced in the water treatment process, a screw-press dryer for drying the sludge condensate, and improved fluidized bed sludge incinerators are among the areas where advanced Japanese technology for saving energy and reducing the environmental burden are expected to be used.”

---

From 30 November 2015 to 13 December 2015, Japan participated in the 21st Conference of the Parties of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. While there, Environment Minister Marukawa announced that Japan would provide JPY1.3 trillion in climate finance in 2020 to support developing countries to implement innovative energy technologies. This is a reinforcement of Japan’s 2013 Actions for Cool Earth (ACE) contribution to climate change actions, with an increase in funding of 1.3 times the previous amount. Without further clarification as to the intended recipients, there is little evidence to suggest that Japan has taken similar actions to help vulnerable states.

Japan has partially complied with its commitment by supporting Ukraine, but has failed to work with other vulnerable states. Therefore Japan receives a score of 0.

**Analyst: Valerie Steckle**

**United Kingdom: 0**

The United Kingdom has partially complied with its commitment to support Ukraine and other vulnerable countries to reform and liberalize their energy systems. It has done so through numerous funding announcements to support market reform, fossil fuel divestment, and the promotion of energy efficient policies and behaviour in Ukraine.

During the compliance period, the UK government announced GBP150,000 in funding to support the Energy Community Secretariat’s efforts to reform Ukraine’s energy legislation between August 2015 and March 2016. This funding has been specifically allocated to help the Energy Community Secretariat integrate the electricity provisions of the Third Energy Package (TEP) into Ukrainian law. The TEP is a European Union initiative that aims to fully integrate the EU gas and electricity markets as a means of maximizing energy market effectiveness, reducing prices, and increasing security of supply. It is an important tool to ensure energy liberalization through the adoption of EU best practice. The Energy Secretariat has used UK financing to hire three international experts to draft twenty-four secondary legal acts that will “cover, inter alia, rules on day-ahead and intra-day markets, security of supply and supply of electricity to the customer.”

On 4 November 2015, the British Embassy in Kyiv announced an initiative to support the promotion of energy efficient policies in Ukraine through a network of local partners. The project aims to create a

---

targeted campaign to inform and motivate consumers to use energy-saving technologies, reflecting the best practices of similar UK campaigns.\(^\text{1300}\)

The Government of the UK has also committed GBP159,000 to help the Ukrainian government identify new job opportunities for coal workers who will be put out of work as the country moves away from coal energy.\(^\text{1301}\) This project, which began in August 2015 and will last until March 2016, is being implemented by the Management Consultants of Ukraine.\(^\text{1302}\) This projects illustrates the UK’s commitment to energy reform in Ukraine because it supports the Rome Initiative’s commitment of “reducing our greenhouse gas emissions, and accelerating the transition to a low carbon economy.”\(^\text{1303}\) By enabling movement away from coal-powered industries, the UK will help Ukraine reduce its greenhouse gas emissions.

The UK is also helping to fund an international conference in Ukraine in 2016 entitled “Ukrainian Energy Infrastructure and Legislation: Challenges and Opportunities for Practical Integration with Energy Systems of Central European Countries.”\(^\text{1304}\) The UK Government has noted that the initiative “aims to deepen the dialogue between Ukraine and EU countries on the safety and reliability of the electricity and natural gas supply, diversifying energy sources, [and] expanding the zone of market competition outside the EU.”\(^\text{1305}\)

Finally, the UK has channeled approximately GBP31,000 into a project with the State Agency on Energy Efficiency in Ukraine that began in August 2015 and will last until March 2016.\(^\text{1306}\) The goal of this initiative is to share the best practices of the UK’s Green Investment Bank to explore environmentally friendly investment criteria and promote energy efficiency.\(^\text{1307}\)

While the UK has fulfilled its commitment to supporting Ukraine’s energy reform and liberalization, there is little evidence that it has placed a similar amount of effort in aiding other vulnerable countries.

In its November 2015 National Security Strategy and Strategic Defence and Security Review, the UK announced its decision to invest GBP1.3 billion in a Prosperity Fund “to promote the economic reform and development needed for growth in partner countries.”\(^\text{1308}\) While the fund will address many issues, one of its priorities is to support energy reform.\(^\text{1309}\) However, although vulnerable countries in Eastern Europe would likely be eligible to receive some of these funds, the fund’s priority countries are Brazil, China, India, Mexico,
South Africa, Korea and Turkey.\textsuperscript{1310} As a result, this funding is not specifically directed at aiding vulnerable states in Eastern Europe and cannot count towards Britain’s final compliance score.

In conclusion, the UK has partially complied with its commitment to support energy reform and liberalization in Ukraine and other vulnerable countries. The UK therefore has received a score of 0.

\textit{Analyst: Andreas Kyriakos}

**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to support Ukraine and other vulnerable countries to reform and liberalize their energy systems. It has made new efforts to enhance the energy security of Ukraine, and has provided diplomatic support to help improve the energy security of the broader region within the current compliance period.

On 7 December 2015, US Vice President Joe Biden announced that the US would provide Ukraine with USD190 million to allow it to take action on various issues including the need to strengthen energy security.\textsuperscript{1311} Biden made this statement during a short working visit to Ukraine where he urged Ukrainian officials to continue pressing for reforms.\textsuperscript{1312} White House officials noted that part of this fund would go towards reform efforts aimed at “increasing efficiency, transparency, and resilience in the energy sector.”\textsuperscript{1313}

The US also cooperated with Canada and the European Union in a joint working group to help Ukraine construct an emergency energy action plan.\textsuperscript{1314} However, efforts to create an action plan specific to the winter of 2015 to 2016 took place during the compliance period.\textsuperscript{1315} On 12 June 2015, Bryan discussed the plan with representatives of Energoatom, Ukraine’s nuclear power plan operator, and noted the importance of their involvement, stating that “Energoatom will have the opportunity to point out any gaps in the plan, be they to do with financing, regulatory issues or legislative measures. On all of these issues, we are ready to offer our help.”\textsuperscript{1316} Following this, twenty experts from countries including the US travelled to Ukraine to work on both the action plan and a three-to-five year sustainability plan in July 2015.\textsuperscript{1317} On 2 November 2015, the Minister of Energy and Coal Industry of Ukraine, Volodymyr Demchyshyn, met with members of the group to discuss the implementation of the plan and reforms of the energy sector.\textsuperscript{1318}


Finally, on 14 July 2015, the fifth Energy Security Dialogue between the US and Ukraine took place. During this meeting, the US “committed to working with Ukraine and international partners to further strengthen reform efforts and Ukraine’s energy security.”

The US has also taken steps to encourage the diversification of energy supply in Eastern Europe by providing support for the opening of the Southern Gas Corridor (SGC). The SGC aims to reduce Europe’s energy dependence on Russia by buying liquefied natural gas from Azerbaijan instead. For example, the US has strongly supported the construction of the Interconnector Greece-Bulgaria (IGB) pipeline, which would connect to the Trans Adriatic Pipeline (TAP) and form a part of the SGC. The IGB is particularly important for Bulgaria, which relies upon Russia for 95 per cent of its natural gas imports and currently has few alternative supply options.

While US support for Bulgarian energy security commenced prior to the compliance period, it has made new efforts to illustrate its support since the G7 Elmau Summit. In part, this may be due to the project’s slow pace of implementation, and Greece’s declaration of support for the Russian-backed Turkish Stream pipeline in June 2015. For example, on 10 June 2015, US Special Envoy and Coordinator for International Affairs Amos Hochstein met with Bulgarian President Rosen Plevneliev regarding the IGB. Between 13 and 14 October 2015, Hochstein travelled to Greece for trilateral meetings with Greek and Bulgarian government officials to discuss the need to speed up plans for the construction of the IGB pipeline. Following the meeting, he said that “there was significant progress on the Greek-Bulgarian pipeline and discussions were useful … We encourage both sides to discuss openly, so to reach a solution.” He also emphasized “the importance of continuing progress on the IGB pipeline, as well as the need for diversification of energy sources.”

On 4 December 2015, US Secretary of State John Kerry visited Greece and commended the country for its decision to support of the TAP and IGB pipelines, stating that “These are very important energy projects, and they will not only strengthen Greece’s economy, but they will help advance regional stability and prosperity.” On 10 December 2015, Bulgaria and Greece signed an agreement to build the IGB pipeline.

---

The US has fully complied with its commitment to support energy reform and liberalization in Ukraine and other vulnerable countries. Therefore, the US receives a score of +1.

**Analyst: Sarah Beard**

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to encourage energy reform and liberalization in Ukraine and other vulnerable countries.

The EU has helped Ukraine undertake energy reforms by supporting its efforts to develop an emergency response plan for the winter of 2015–2016 during the compliance period. A group of experts from the European Commission cooperated with delegates from Canada and the United States to help Ukraine prepare for increased energy demands during July 2015.

In addition to providing advice on an emergency action plan, the EU strengthened Ukraine’s energy security by holding talks with Ukraine and Russia to ensure stable flow of natural gas supply throughout the winter. EU Energy Commissioner Miguel Arias Cañete noted that a new gas package was important in order to: 1) ensure that Ukraine has enough supply for the winter; 2) maintain a stable gas flow from Russia to the EU; 3) illustrate that Russia is a “stable gas supplier.” Thus, prior to the expiry of a Ukrainian-Russian gas price deal on 31 March 2015, the EU began to broker talks to extend the discount price that Ukraine had been paying Gazprom. While meetings held from March to early June 2015 do not count as compliance, the EU continued its mediation attempts following a decision by Ukraine to stop buying gas from Russia in late June 2015. Meetings occurred throughout the summer, and the parties reached an agreement on 28 September 2015. While tensions between the two countries rose again in November, Ukraine declared that it had stored enough gas to cover demand for the winter. Although the EU’s efforts to ensure a stable gas supply for Ukraine from Russia does not necessarily illustrate support for energy reform and diversification in the country, they are vital to enhancing the state’s energy security.

Furthermore, on 10 July 2015, the European Commission signed a Memorandum of Understanding with some members of the EU and Energy Community on the need to integrate their energy markets to improve energy security in the region. The European Commission noted that “the move comes after the Commission’s 2014 gas ‘stress tests’ found that most countries in Central and South-Eastern Europe do not have access to a diversified gas supply due to missing infrastructure links or long-term supply contracts to a single supplier. Other problems in the region include a lack of competition and the inefficient use of
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interconnections.” 1339 As such, the group agreed to improve energy infrastructure and reform energy regulations in a number of these states. Signatories included Ukraine, Hungary, Slovakia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Bulgaria. 1340 This indicates the EU’s commitment to supporting energy reform and liberalization in Ukraine and other vulnerable countries.

Evidence of this support for the improvement of energy security in other vulnerable countries can be illustrated by the EU’s Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) initiatives. On 15 July 2015, EU member states agreed to designate EUR150 million for energy infrastructure projects across Europe, with the majority of the projects based in Eastern Europe and the Baltic Region. 1341 The European Commission noted, “The projects will increase energy security by contributing to the completion of an EU energy market and increasing the integration of renewable energy on the electricity grid. 1342 They will also help end the energy isolation of some EU countries from Europe-wide energy networks.” 1343 Supported proposals include a number of projects in vulnerable states. For example, funding has been allocated to build the Lithuanian part of the Litpol Link, which aims to incorporate the Baltic States and Poland further into the European electric grid. 1344 A part of the money will also go to the gas sector through work on the expansion of an underground gas storage unit in Bulgaria, and the construction of a gas line between Poland and the Czech Republic. 1345

The EU committed a further EUR217 million for energy projects in vulnerable countries on 19 January 2016. 1346 In particular, CEF will finance a proposal to increase energy diversification and efficiency through construction of a natural gas pipeline from Bulgaria to Austria through Hungary and Romania. 1347 The European Commissioner for Climate Action and Energy stated that the projects would “help secure supplies and fully integrate Europe’s energy market” and would be “crucial to ensuring efficient use of our energy resources.” 1348

Furthermore, the Council of the EU adopted the EU Energy Diplomacy Plan on 20 July 2015. 1349 At this time, the Council directed the High Representative and the European Commission to use “foreign policy instruments and channels for engagement … to ensure … the long-term energy supplies to and transit

through Ukraine.” They also committed to providing support for the construction of the Southern Gas Corridor (SGC) and “promoting energy reforms, including energy efficiency” among members of the Energy Community. This organization includes vulnerable countries such as Hungary, Slovakia, Poland, the Czech Republic and Bulgaria.

On 24 June 2015, Maroš Šefčovič, the Vice President of the European Commission, made a speech at the German Institute for Economic Research that highlighted the EU’s progress and commitment to creating an internal energy market by supporting energy diversification and by investing in new technologies through European Fund for Strategic Investment.

Finally, the European Commission sought the power to vet energy deals between member states and Russia in order to promote energy liberalization and security in January 2016. At this time, Šefčovič outlined the draft energy security rules that would help the EU move towards a single energy union that reduces Russian gas hegemony. In conclusion, the EU’s efforts to aid energy stability across Europe by supporting negotiations between Russia and Ukraine, and to decrease Russian gas dominance through an integrated EU energy market indicate that it has fully complied with its commitment to support energy reform in vulnerable countries. Therefore, the EU receives a score of +1.

Analyst: Leila Martin
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“We thus reaffirm our support for the consistent implementation of and strive to alignment of our own ODA-supported investments with the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT) and the CFS Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems”

Annex to the Leaders’ Declaration

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

The maintenance and improvement of food security and agriculture systems is crucial to the eradication of poverty, hunger and malnutrition worldwide.\textsuperscript{1356} The management of access to natural resources is extremely important as availability fluctuates and the global population increases.

Official development assistance (ODA) is the flow of money, resources or services to regions or countries on the qualified recipient states listed by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development.\textsuperscript{1357} For several years, the value of ODA transactions to least developed countries (LDCs) on the DAC list has declined as ODA flows are travelling towards countries that are more economically stable.\textsuperscript{1358} The implementation of international guidelines is prudent in order to move towards sustainable development and investment.

The first marks of progress towards responsible investment and sustainable agriculture began with the international agreement on the Voluntary Guidelines on the Governance of Tenure of land, fisheries and forests in the context of national food security (VGGT).\textsuperscript{1359} The VGGT aim to “[promote] secure tenure rights and equitable access to land as a means for eradicating hunger and poverty.”\textsuperscript{1360} The endorsement of this agreement on 11 May 2012 by the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) and aided by the European Union have since encouraged implementation by a variety of international groups.\textsuperscript{1361}

Reinforcing this agreement, in October 2014, the CFS made an international agreement on responsible investment in agriculture and food systems.\textsuperscript{1362} The non-binding agreement deals with a wide range of investments in food and agriculture, and can be used as a structure for the development of programs, national policies, agreements and contracts.\textsuperscript{1363} It represents a collaborative effort to create regulated rules for investing responsibly that help promote nutrition and food security.\textsuperscript{1364}

At the 2015 Elmau Summit, the G7 initiated a collaboration to relieve 500 million people from malnutrition and hunger by 2030.\textsuperscript{1365} This involves the re-endorsement of the commitment of ODA of 0.7 per cent of the gross national income by G7 members.\textsuperscript{1366}

**Commitment Features**

The commitment describes the process of investment through which the leaders aim to reduce hunger and malnutrition. Achieving this goal in the context of responsible investment in agriculture and food systems, the annex of the leaders’ declaration involves implementing ODA-supported investments and private capital in order to “strive to alignment” with VGGT and CFS Principles.\textsuperscript{1367} This suggests the G7 leaders’ aims to reduce hunger and malnutrition lie in ODA investments to LDCs that incorporate both transparent governance and equitable land, agriculture, food and resource tenure.\textsuperscript{1368}

Therefore, measures that are not investments in LDCs and lack transparent governance and equitable tenure of land, agriculture, food or resource, are not the focus of the commitment and do not constitute full compliance. The absence of sustainability in a measure does not help reduce hunger or malnutrition, and also does not constitute full compliance.

Partial compliance involves a member’s responsible investment with transparency and equitable tenure, but directed towards countries other than LDCs. The investment can foster sustainable agriculture or food systems, yet it does not reduce hunger or malnutrition effectively.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member does not abide by VGGT and CFS in Agriculture and Food Systems Principles of transparent governance and equitable tenure AND does not implement ODA-supported investment to LDCs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member abides by VGGT and CFS in Agriculture and Food Systems Principles of transparency and equitable tenure BUT does not implement ODA-supported investment to LDCs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member abides by VGGT and CFS in Agriculture and Food Systems principles of transparent governance and equitable tenure AND implements ODA-supported investment to LDCs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lead Analyst: Narain Yucel*

Canada: 0
Canada has partially complied with its commitments to food and agriculture by abiding by Voluntary Guidelines on the Governance of Tenure (VGGT) and Committee for World Food Security (CFS) principles of transparency and equitable tenure but not implementing new investments supported to official development assistance (ODA) to least development countries (LDCs).

Canada continues to support the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition, a partnership consisting of various stakeholders that addresses "key constraints to inclusive, agricultural-led growth in Africa." The New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition is committed to the VGGT and CFS principles of equitable tenure and transparent governance. Canada leads the project in Senegal and has pledged a total of CAD80 million to invest in food security and agriculture by 2017. However, this project began before the compliance period and thus will not be considered in the scoring.

Canada is continuing its project, which is expected to end in 2018, to support LDCs such as Mali, Bangladesh, Mozambique and Tanzania by contributing approximately CAD5.5 million to address rural poverty issues including the issue of land tenure. This project also began before the Elmau Summit and will not be considered in the scoring.

Canada has complied with the VGGT and CFS principles of transparent governance and equitable tenure, but failed to implement new ODA-supported investments to LDCs. Therefore, it has been awarded a compliance score of 0.

Analyst: Jerome Newton

France: 0
France has partially complied with its commitment to food and agriculture by adhering to the Voluntary Guidelines on the Governance of Tenure (VGGT) and Committee for World Food Security (CFS) principles of transparency and equitable tenure but not implementing new investments supported to official development assistance (ODA) to least development countries (LDCs).

On 15 October 2015, Minister of State for Development and Francophonie Annick Girardin chaired the meeting of the National Council for Development and International Solidarity. The role of this council is to "enable regular coordination between the different development and international solidarity stakeholders around the goals and guiding principles of French development policies, the coherence of public policies in the area of development and the resources for official development assistance."

In October 2014, the Agence française du développement (AfD) published an operational guide titled “Guide to due diligence of agribusiness projects that affect land and property rights” intended to guide investors using...
the VGGT framework. France stated that it will “refuse to support projects that go against the principles promoted in the Voluntary Guidelines.”

France continues to support Madagascar’s rural actors through a project, started in 2014, that seeks to improve land tenure. The AfD is financing EUR4 million in this project.

France continues to abide by the principles of transparent governance and equitable tenure but has not implemented new ODA-supported investments to LDCs. Thus, it has been awarded a score of 0.

**Analyst: Doris Li**

**Germany: +1**

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to support the Voluntary Guidelines on the Governance of Tenure (VGGT) and Committee for World Food Security (CFS) principles of transparency and equitable tenure and implemented new investments supported to official development assistance (ODA) to least development countries (LDCs).

In 2015, Germany’s Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development launched an initiative to fight malnutrition and provide better food security. Its accompanying report, entitled “A World Without Hunger Is Possible,” highlights key principles of the special initiative which demonstrate Germany’s commitment to the principles of transparency and equitable tenure. The initiative was established in March 2015 but Germany has maintained its support of the program and thereby fulfills its commitment to the G7 mandate.

On 4 September 2015, Germany invested in the placement of 920 solar panels to power the facilities of the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Centre in Texcoco, Mexico. The Centre stores “the world’s largest native biodiversity collections” maize and wheat and works towards producing more resilient crops for farmers in LDCs. The Centre’s Director-General stated that “By investing in a sustainable solar energy generating system for CIMMYT’s gene bank, Germany invests in the food security of the world.”

Germany is therefore awarded a score of +1 for full compliance.

**Analyst: Camille Beaudoin**

**Italy: 0**

Italy has partially complied with the agriculture commitment to support the Voluntary Guidelines on the Governance of Tenure (VGGT) and Committee for World Food Security (CFS) principles of transparency.

---


1379 German investment in CIMMYT helps secure the world’s most important maize and wheat collections, CIMMYT (Mexico City) 3 September 2015. Access date: 28 March 2016. http://www.cimmyt.org/en/where-we-work/global-activities/item/german-investment-in-cimmyt-helps-secure-the-world-s-most-important-maize-and-wheat-collections

1380 German investment in CIMMYT helps secure the world’s most important maize and wheat collections, CIMMYT (Mexico City) 3 September 2015. Access date: 28 March 2016. http://www.cimmyt.org/en/where-we-work/global-activities/item/german-investment-in-cimmyt-helps-secure-the-world-s-most-important-maize-and-wheat-collections
and equitable tenure and implement new investments supported to official development assistance (ODA) to least development countries (LDCs).

From 1 May 2015 to 31 October 2015, Italy hosted EXPO 2015 in Milan — a universal exhibition dedicated to showcasing the best of agricultural technology to be “able to guarantee healthy, safe and sufficient food for everyone, while respecting the Planet and its equilibrium.”

Although the Expo 2015 website does offer a “transparency” section, it is not used to discuss how Italy implements the VGGT and CFS standards, but rather, to disclose the transparency policies of EXPO 2015. However, on 9 June 2015, in a statement at the Ministerial Meeting of African LDCs, the President of the International Fund for Agricultural Development claimed that “EXPO 2015 is a testament to Italy’s commitment to food security. And this commitment is also underscored in Italy’s generous support to the Rome-based food agencies.”

On 13 July 2015, Matteo Renzi, Prime Minister of Italy, addressed the United Nations Conference on Financing for Development. He referred to the need for “more concrete international assistance …[referring] to the Least Developed Countries, which deserve increased support to create the basic conditions for the taking off of their own development process.” However, the Italian prime minister did not mention equitable land tenure or the importance of transparency.

Furthermore, in a cooperative partnership with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Italy is deeply involved in LDCs such as Tunisia and Ethiopia. According to the FAO, “food security has always been at the heart of the FAO-Italy Development Cooperation Programme.”

Currently, there are forty ongoing FAO projects supported and funded by Italy. Principally, interventions target the Near East and North Africa, and West Africa and the Sahel. However, there is no disclosure of Italy’s efforts to promote transparency and equitable land tenure.

Despite Italy’s efforts to support various LDCs and promote food security, it has failed to disclose its implementation or support of VGGT and CFS standards. Therefore, Italy is awarded a score of 0.

Analyst: Camille Beaudoin

Japan: +1

Japan has fully complied with the commitment on the Voluntary Guidelines on the Governance of Tenure (VGGT) and Committee for World Food Security (CFS) principles of transparency and equitable tenure but not implementing new investments supported to official development assistance (ODA) to least development countries (LDCs).

A 2014 ODA White Paper published by Japan’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs, it discusses Japan’s future development with its ODA program — namely the new Development Cooperation Charter provides peace and prosperity for Japan and the International community. The charter seeks to extend help for non-
military purposes by building a sustainable international community that addresses health and environmental issues along with other challenges.\(^{1387}\)

Since early 2016, the Japanese government has cooperated with the Agriculture Machinery Centre to provide power tillers to Bhutan. Such equipment will be delivered under the KR-II grant program to help mechanize Bhutan’s arable land.\(^{1388}\) Although the amount is yet to be determined, the Japan International Corporation Agency (JICA) maintains that helping to grow Bhutan’s agriculture is an important goal for Japan.\(^{1389}\) JICA provides multilateral aid through international organizations and bilateral aid through assistance directly given to LDCs.\(^{1390}\)

Japan is therefore awarded +1 for compliance for abiding by VGGT guidelines and providing ODA-investment to LDCs.

Analyst: Garrett Hajnal

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with the commitment on the Voluntary Guidelines on the Governance of Tenure (VGGT) and Committee for World Food Security (CFS) principles of transparency and equitable tenure but not implementing new investments supported to official development assistance (ODA) to least development countries (LDCs).

The Department of International Development has been vigilant in supporting the efforts of the Food and Agriculture Organization in Zimbabwe by contributing USD48 million to the Zimbabwe Livelihoods and Food Security Program.\(^{1391}\) This program teaches local farmers on smart agricultural practices, increases market accessibility and encourages the growth of more nutritious foods.\(^{1392}\) These efforts continued through 2015.

The United Kingdom has also made a continuous effort to support other projects internationally. Britain provides aid to the Livelihoods and Food Security Trust Fund (LIFT) in junction with other national donors. The fund attempts to improve the lives of small farmers in rural Myanmar (Burma) through the promotion of climate smart agriculture, development of skills and promotion of better business practices.\(^{1393}\) In addition, LIFT also provides nutrition aid to mothers and children between conception and the child’s second birthday.\(^{1394}\)

The UK further supports VGGT guidelines in China, Nigeria and Uganda.

Thus, The United Kingdom is awarded +1 for abiding by VGGT guidelines and providing ODA- supported investments to LDCs.

Analyst: Garrett Hajnal

---

1394 ‘Livelihoods and Food Security Trust Fund’ http://www.lift-fund.org
United States: +1

The United States has fully complied with its commitment on the Voluntary Guidelines on the Governance of Tenure (VGGT) and Committee for World Food Security (CFS) principles of transparency and equitable tenure but not implementing new investments supported to official development assistance (ODA) to least development countries (LDCs).

In July 2015, the United States/Food for Peace program donated “USD 21.3 million to the EMOP and USD 2 million to Protracted Relief and Recovery, allowing [World Food Programme] to continue vital programs.”[1395] This money that was donated was used to combat malnutrition in Jordan.

In 2015, The United States has pledged “[USD] 30 million for the third of three scheduled contributions under IFAD-9.”[1396] These funds are directly used by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), which “help[s] rural small-scale producers and subsistence farmers increase their productivity and incomes, improve food security, and integrate them into larger markets.”[1397] These payments are a part of the ninth replenishment of IFAD from the United States and will be re-established in the following year.[1398]

Over 2015, the United States donated funds to Feed the Future (FTF), the government’s global hunger and food safety initiative. The FTF “addresses the root causes of hunger and under nutrition, measuring progress through reductions in rates of poverty and stunting. This includes raising incomes of the poor, increasing the availability of food, and improving its nutritional quality.”[1399] “With a focus on smallholder farmers, particularly women, FTF supports countries in developing their own agriculture sectors to generate opportunities for economic growth and trade, which help reduce poverty, hunger, and stunting. FTF is also focused on helping to prevent food crises by building the resilience of vulnerable populations.”[1400] The United States budget towards FTF is USD900.3 million.[1401]

On 28 July 2015, plans were announced for a “commitment of over USD150 million in additional funding for Resilience in the Sahel-Enhanced (RISE), a program helping 1.9 million of the most vulnerable people in the Sahel break the cycle of crisis, escape chronic poverty, and reduce the need for humanitarian assistance. This will bring the total commitment to RISE to approximately USD290 million over five years.”[1402]

The US Agency for International Development (USAID) continues two projects to develop land and tenure and property rights in accordance to VGGT. The project on resilience and economic growth in the Sahel is the only new one in 2015, and is in act along multiple other projects that are ongoing which will last beyond 2018. “USAID’s Resilience and Economic Growth in the Sahel — Enhanced Resilience (REGIS-ER) program works to increase the resilience of chronically vulnerable people, households, communities and systems in targeted agro-pastoral and marginal agriculture livelihood zones in Niger and Burkina Faso.”[1402]
Therefore, the United States is awarded a score of +1 for full compliance.

*Analyst: Zachary Medeiros*

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with the commitment on by Voluntary Guidelines on the Governance of Tenure (VGGT) and Committee for World Food Security (CFS) principles of transparency and equitable tenure but not implementing new investments supported to official development assistance (ODA) to least development countries (LDCs).

Since July 2015, the Annual Action Program has allocated EUR 228.25 million to Food and Nutrition Security and Sustainable Agriculture around the world. These programs are targeted at LDCs and other developing countries: Cameroon, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Sudan, Uganda, Pakistan, Brazil and Colombia.\(^{1403}\)

Therefore, the European Union is awarded a score of +1.

*Analyst: Narain Yucel*

---