“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 http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/compliance.

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

For the compliance report on the 2016 Ise-Shima Summit, hosted by Japan from 26 to 27 May 2016, 19 priority commitments were selected from the total 342 commitments made. This final part of the interim report assesses compliance with those commitments as of 20 May 2017.

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 report’s authors and the 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 “background 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 previously led by Sarah Beard, the former chair of summit studies (July 2016 — 23 April 2017), and now managed by Sophia Glisch and Humayun Ahmed, the current co-chairs (24 April 2017 — Present). It would also not be possible without the support of Dr. Ella Kokotsis, director of accountability, Brittaney Warren, senior researcher, and Katie Andrews, co-director of the Compliance Unit. 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
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Executive Summary
The University of Toronto G7 Research Group’s Interim Compliance Report on the 2016 Ise-Shima Summit assesses the compliance of the G7 members with 19 priority commitments of the 342 commitments they made at their summit in Japan on 26-27 May 2016 (See Table A). These selected commitments reflect the breadth of the summit agenda. The analysis covers actions taken by G7 members since 28 May 2016, the day after the summit, until 20 May 2017. This report builds on the interim compliance report that measured progress up to 17 January 2017, soon after Japan handed over the G7 presidency to Italy.

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.

For the assessment period of 28 May 2016 to 20 May 2017, the average compliance score for these 19 commitments was +0.49 (75%), a decrease from the 2016 interim score of +0.51 (76%) and the final score of +0.65 (83%) for the 2015 Schloss Elmau Summit. It is also a decrease from the final score of +0.63 (82%) for the 2014 Brussels Summit.

Compliance by Member
Germany and the European Union received the highest compliance score of +0.67 (83%), followed by the United States at +0.63 (82%) and Canada at +0.58 (79%) (see Table C). Italy with +0.21 (61%) had the lowest score.

Compliance by Commitment
The commitments on the Paris Agreement on Climate Change and on maritime security ranked first at +1.00 (100%) followed by the commitment on cyber stability at +0.88 (94%) and the combat against terrorist financing at +0.75 (88%) (see Table D). At +0.75 (88%) each, the commitments on the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, on terrorist financing and on refugees were in third place. The lowest-scoring commitment was on strengthening women’s engagement in emergency response situations at −0.63 (19%).

The Compliance Gap Between Members
These results from the Ise-Shima Summit show a difference of 0.46 between the highest and lowest compliance scores. This gap is larger than the gap of 0.39 at the same midway point between the 2015 and 2016 summits, although much higher than the final score for 2015 (0.71).

Future Research and Reports
The information contained within this report provides G7 members and other stakeholders with an indication of their compliance with nineteen commitments during the 2016–17 period, which spans from 28 May 2016, immediately following the 2016 Ise-Shima Summit, to 25 May 2017. 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: 2016 Priority Commitments Selected for Assessment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>“We reiterate our commitments to using all policy tools — monetary, fiscal, and structural — individually and collectively, to strengthen global demand and address supply constraints, while continuing our efforts to put debt on a sustainable path.” (G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>“The G7, continuing to take a leadership role, commits to taking the necessary steps to secure ratification, acceptance or approval of the [Paris] agreement as soon as possible and calls on all Parties to do so striving for a goal of entry into force in 2016.” (G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>“We recognize that strengthening capacity of developing countries in tax policy and administration is indispensable to level the global playing field. To enhance both quantity and quality of assistances in this area, we are committed to the principles of the Addis Tax Initiative along with encouraging other countries to make a similar commitment, and we request that the Platform for Collaboration on Tax be actively utilized to provide an opportunity where developing and developed countries and relevant organizations can share information and knowledge on a regular basis.” (G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>“We are committed to applying the necessary political will to reach a TTIP agreement as early as this year, provided that it is ambitious, comprehensive, high standard and mutually beneficial, with a view to harnessing the full potential of the transatlantic economy as soon as possible.” (G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>“[Recent outbreaks of Ebola and Zika underscore the imperative to improve prevention of, detection of and response to public health emergencies, whether naturally occurring, deliberate or accidental.] In that respect, we remain committed to advancing compliance with the WHO’s IHR objectives including through the Global Health Security Agenda (GHSA).” (G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>“We are committed to ending AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria, working in partnership with the Global Fund (GF) and others.” (G7 Ise-Shima Leader’s Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>“We commit to promote a strategic framework of international cyber stability consisting of the applicability of existing international law to state behavior in cyberspace, the promotion of voluntary norms of responsible state behavior during peacetime, and the development and the implementation of practical cyber confidence building measures between states.” (G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>“We reassert our commitment to countering terrorist financing as declared in the G7 Action Plan on Combating the Financing of Terrorism at the G7 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors’ meeting in Sendai.” (G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>“We commit to work to support the implementation of relevant UN Security Council resolutions, to bolster information sharing, to strengthen border security, to improve aviation security, to counter terrorist financing, to fight against trafficking of cultural properties, to prevent and counter violent extremism, to step up our engagement with the private sector and to further coordinate our capacity building assistance.” (G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>“We are committed to supporting displaced persons and their host communities and to working towards a long-term, sustainable post-conflict stabilization and rehabilitation of Syria and to eradicating conditions conducive to violent extremism.” (G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>“[We urge Ukraine to maintain and enhance the momentum in its fight against corruption and its judicial reform, including the Prosecutor General’s office.] We are fully committed to providing long-term support to this end.” (G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>“We reiterate our commitment to maintaining a rules-based maritime order in accordance with the principles of international law as reflected in UNCLOS, to peaceful dispute settlement supported by confidence-building measures and including through legal means as well as to sustainable uses of the seas and oceans, and to respected freedom of navigation and overflight.” (G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>“We remain committed to the universalization of the treaties and conventions relevant to, amongst others, preventing and combating the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, in particular the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention.” (G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration on Non-proliferation and Disarmament)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>“We support adoption of an ambitious Montreal Protocol HFC phase-down amendment in 2016, and intend to provide additional support through the Multilateral Fund following adoption of an amendment for its implementation.” (G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Building on the G7 Broad Food Security and Nutrition Development Approach, we endorse the G7 Vision for Action on Food Security and Nutrition, which outlines collective actions in the priority areas of: (i) empowering women; (ii) improving nutrition through a people-centered approach that recognizes the diverse food security challenges people face across the rural to urban spectrum; and (iii) ensuring sustainability and resilience within agriculture and food systems.” (G7 Ise-Shima Summit Leaders’ Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>“In order to encourage the active role of women in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) careers, we strive to remove gender bias in careers, through promoting institutional change and creating legal and policy environments which effectively advance gender equality, and thereby increase the number of female students in STEM fields, and broaden the participation of women in research, engineering and entrepreneurial careers. Such efforts will be promoted through our collective and individual efforts, including through the G7’s ‘Women’s Initiative in Developing STEM Career[s] (WINDS).’” (G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>“We are committed to support refugee and internally displaced women and girls as well as for those affected by conflicts and disasters, by providing assistance to empower them and develop their resilience, and to prevent and respond to sexual and gender-based violence.” (G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>“Towards this end, the G7 will work individually and collectively to advance our shared priorities through relevant international fora including the Conference of State Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) and its subsidiary bodies, the OECD as well as promoting implementation of the Declaration Against Corruption adopted at the Anti-Corruption Summit hosted by the United Kingdom on May 12, and the ministerial declaration adopted at the OECD Anti-Bribery Ministerial Meeting on March 16.” (G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration on G7 Action to Fight Corruption)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>“[Recognizing the importance of the international multi-stakeholder efforts such as the Open Government Partnership, the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and its integrity work, and the UN Global Compact, we pledge to move the anti-corruption global agenda forward while effectively building synergies with the relevant anti-corruption initiatives and instruments, especially through:] Emphasizing the importance of EITI in making the extractive sector more transparent, and consequently deterring corruption.” (G7 Action to Fight Corruption)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For the full list of commitments, please contact the G7 Research Group at g8@utoronto.ca.*
Table B: 2016 G7 Ise-Shima Final Compliance Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</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>Trade: Transatlantic Trade &amp; Investment Partnership</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macroeconomics: G7 Ise-Shima Econoic Initiative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health: Global Fund</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health: Global Health Security Agenda</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change: Montreal Protocol Amendment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change: Paris Agreement</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>Gender: Strengthening Women’s Engagement</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Women’s Initiative in STEM Careers</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development: Addis Tax Initiative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Agriculture: Food Security and Nutrition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime &amp; Corruption: International Cooperation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime &amp; Corruption: extractive Industries Transparency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism: Combatting Terror Financing</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism: International Cooperation</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria: Refugees</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-proliferation: Weapons of Mass Destruction</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine: Corruption and Judicial Reform</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Security: Maritime Security</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Cyber Stability</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Average</td>
<td>+0.58</td>
<td>+0.26</td>
<td>+0.67</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
<td>+0.28</td>
<td>+0.53</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>+0.67</td>
<td>+0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Final Compliance Average</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
<td>+0.67</td>
<td>+0.86</td>
<td>+0.24</td>
<td>+0.48</td>
<td>+0.86</td>
<td>+0.81</td>
<td>+0.95</td>
<td>+0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Interim Compliance Average</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>2014 Final Compliance Average</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>2013 Final Compliance Average</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>+0.39</td>
<td>+0.33</td>
<td>+0.33</td>
<td>+0.78</td>
<td>+0.72</td>
<td>+0.61</td>
<td>+0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Interim Compliance Average</td>
<td>+0.44</td>
<td>+0.44</td>
<td>+0.28</td>
<td>+0.28</td>
<td>+0.17</td>
<td>+0.56</td>
<td>+0.61</td>
<td>+0.61</td>
<td>+0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Final Compliance Average</td>
<td>+0.71</td>
<td>+0.65</td>
<td>+0.76</td>
<td>+0.29</td>
<td>+0.65</td>
<td>+0.65</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
<td>+0.39</td>
<td>+0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table C: 2016 G7 Ise-Shima Final Compliance Scores by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2016 final</th>
<th>2016 interim</th>
<th>2015 final</th>
<th>2014 final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+0.39</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>+0.67</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>+0.67</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>+0.67</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>+0.95</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>+0.58</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>+0.53</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>+0.44</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>+0.28</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>+0.44</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>+0.26</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>+0.49</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>+0.65</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spread</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D: 2016 G7 Ise–Shima Final Compliance Scores by Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change: Paris Agreement</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Security: Maritime Security</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Cyber Stability</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health: Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism: Combatting Terrorist Financing</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria: Refugees</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Agriculture: G7 Vision for Action on Food Security and Nutrition</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Women’s Initiative in Developing STEM Careers</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development: Addis Tax Initiative</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism: International Cooperation to Counter Terrorism</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health: Global Health Security Agenda</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime and Corruption: Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime and Corruption: International Cooperation on Anti-corruption Initiatives</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine: Corruption and Judicial Reform</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade: Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership</td>
<td>+0.25</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macroeconomics: G7 Ise-Shima Econoic Initiative</td>
<td>+0.25</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-proliferation: Weapons of Mass Destruction</td>
<td>+0.25</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change: Montreal Protocol Amendment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Strengthening Women’s Engagement in Emergency Response Situations</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Trade: Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership

“We are committed to applying the necessary political will to reach a TTIP [Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership] agreement as early as this year, provided that it is ambitious, comprehensive, high standard and mutually beneficial, with a view to harnessing the full potential of the transatlantic economy as soon as possible.”

_G7 Ise-Shima 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></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></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>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</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>+0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background**

The Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) is a trade and investment agreement that is currently being negotiated between the European Union (EU) and the United States (US). The two G7 members launched negotiations on the agreement in 2013, for the purpose of adding “growth and jobs to both sides of the Atlantic by boosting trade and investment.”

Representatives of the US government and the European Commission believe that TTIP will be a mutually beneficial free trade agreement that will expand market access for EU and US businesses and consumers.

According to the Office of the United States Trade Representative, TTIP will serve a range of purposes. First, it will further open markets and expand the USD465 billion in goods and services exported to the EU — the United States’ largest export market — which already supports an estimated 2.2 million American jobs. Secondly, it will strengthen rules-based investing to bolster the investment relationship between the US and the EU which represents the world’s largest investment relationship. The US and the EU currently maintain a total of nearly USD4 trillion in investment in each other’s economies, supporting nearly 7 million jobs. Third, TTIP will tackle costly “behind the border” non-tariff barriers that impede the flow of the goods and services trade. TTIP will also seek to significantly decrease the cost of differences in regulation and standards.

---

by promoting greater compatibility, transparency, and cooperation.\textsuperscript{6} It will also enhance cooperation in the development of rules and principles on issues of global concern, including those concerned with developing market-based disciplines for state-owned enterprises, combating discriminatory localization barriers to trade, and promoting the global competitiveness of small- and medium-sized enterprises.\textsuperscript{7}

According to the European Commission, European firms will be able to export more goods and services to the United States, and secure government contracts with TTIP.\textsuperscript{8} They will also be able to import more of the goods and services they require to make an assortment of products.\textsuperscript{9} They will be able to determine when a product counts as being made in Europe and not in the US. Finally, they will be able to invest in the United States more readily.\textsuperscript{10}

The TTIP was first addressed by the G7 at the 2015 Schloss Elmau Summit, where G7 leaders pledged to “immediately accelerate work on all TTIP issues, ensuring progress in all the elements of the negotiations, with the goal of finalizing understandings on the outline of an agreement as soon as possible, preferably by the end of this year.”\textsuperscript{11} The G7 remains supportive of TTIP, as this commitment illustrates.

**Commitment Features**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Political will is an abstract concept that is hard to quantify. However, the Oxford Living Dictionaries define it as a “political intention or desire … specifically the firm intention or commitment on the part of a government to carry through a policy.”\textsuperscript{13} Thus, the actions of member states demonstrating the application of the necessary political will could include, but are not limited to: scheduling or attending high-level meetings discussing TTIP; publishing up-to-date publicly-available information regarding advancements in the negotiation process; or pushing for the signature of TTIP both domestically and abroad. Signature of TTIP would also counts towards compliance with this aspect of the commitment.

It is also difficult to define what it means for TTIP to be an “ambitious, comprehensive, high-standard, and mutually beneficial” agreement. However, the US and EU have used similar language since the initiation of TTIP negotiations, so it is possible to interpret the meaning of the phrase based on statements from the two G7 members. In their report recommending the launch of TTIP, the High Level Working Group on Jobs and Growth noted that a mutually beneficial agreement would be “a comprehensive agreement that addresses a broad range of bilateral trade and investment issues, including regulatory issues, and contributes to the


development of global rules." This “comprehensive agreement would include ambitious reciprocal market opening in goods, services, and investment, and would address the challenges and opportunities of modernizing trade rules and enhancing the compatibility of regulatory regimes.” In terms of increased market access, the two parties have suggested that “ambitious outcomes” would be committing to removing tariffs on industrial and agricultural products, “opening up access to government procurement markets at all levels of government without discrimination for European companies,” opening up services markets in new areas, and increasing “liberalisation and investment protection.” Ambitious outcomes in addressing regulatory issues would involve greater regulatory harmonization and the reduction of non-tariff barriers. In this area, the European Commission has committed to maintaining its “high standards” on issues like food safety, environmental protection, and the precautionary principle. This commitment aims to allay the fears of advocacy groups that worry that regulatory harmonization will pressure the EU to downgrade its standards to those of the US. Finally, the two parties have committed to attaining “ambitious outcomes in … [developing] rules, principles, and new modes of cooperation to address shared global trade challenges and opportunities.” This includes issues of transparency, intellectual property rights, and sustainable development, amongst other concerns. Efforts to attain the parties’ goals in these areas will be interpreted as attempts to comply with their commitment to obtain a high-quality agreement.

Not all members of the G7 are party to TTIP. The EU, France, Italy, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the US must take direct action to comply with the commitment since they are involved. While Canada and Japan are not involved in TTIP negotiations, the G7 Research Group’s coding manual notes that the commitment has been issued collectively. As a result, the Group presumes that all members should comply, and suggests that they can comply by acting in a supportive way, and by taking actions that help or do not harm the TTIP agreement.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member does not apply the necessary political will to reach an agreement on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) by 2016 AND does not work towards achieving an ambitious, comprehensive, high standard and mutually beneficial agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member applies the necessary political will to reach a TTIP agreement by 2016 OR works towards achieving an ambitious, comprehensive, high standard and mutually beneficial agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member applies the necessary political will to reach a TTIP agreement by 2016 AND works towards achieving an ambitious, comprehensive, high standard and mutually beneficial TTIP agreement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


*Lead Analyst: Hélène Émorine*
Canada has partially complied with its commitment to apply the necessary political will to reach a TTIP agreement by 2016, and has somewhat worked towards achieving an ambitious, comprehensive, high standard and mutually beneficial TTIP agreement. Specifically, it has put into place the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA), which reflects a commitment to fostering free trade relations in the transatlantic economy, and thus shares the central aims of the TTIP. However, Canada has not fully complied with the commitment, because it has not explicitly supported the TTIP.

On 22 August 2016, Canada committed to CETA’s implementation as soon as possible, and put in place strategies to ensure that it can deliver a broad range of promotion and advocacy initiatives to support timely ratification.  

On 30 October 2016, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau signed CETA at the European Union-Canada Leaders’ Summit. Minister of International Trade Chrystia Freeland tabled the treaty and introduced implementing legislation in the House of Commons in the same month, with the expected implementation of the treaty to take place in 2017.

On 5 December 2016, Freeland announced that the federal government will spend CAD218 million over the next five years to create a new agency that will serve as a one-window international hub to attract investment to Canada. Freeland said that “there is real economic opportunity in the fact that we have broad support in Canada for our open society … It’s a tremendous moment to go out and promote Canada as the most attractive destination for foreign direct investment in a very turbulent world.”

On 15 February 2017, the European Parliament voted to approve the implementation of CETA. Currently, both parties are completing their respective legislative and regulatory processes that will bring all parts of the Agreement into force by Spring 2017. In response, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau noted that “Canada is pleased that the European Parliament has voted to support CETA and SPA [Strategic Partnership Agreement]. Today’s vote is an exciting milestone on the way to bringing the benefits of these progressive free trade and partnership agreements to Canadians and European.”

---


On 16 February 2017, Prime Minister Trudeau addressed the European Parliament, where he emphasized that CETA was an “ambitious” deal that “reflects a truly progressive trade agenda — one that protects the ability of societies to promote the public good.”

Canada has shown no explicit support for the TTIP, but its commitment to trade initiatives in support of a transatlantic partnership has demonstrated a political will that echoes the TTIP agreement; thus, Canada has been awarded a score of 0.

Analyst: Bethlehem Solomon

France: –1

France has not complied with its commitment to bring about the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP). The state has not worked towards achieving an ambitious, comprehensive, high-standard and mutually beneficial agreement, nor has it applied the necessary political will to reach an agreement by 2016.

On 26 June 2016, Prime Minister Valls stated that “the agreement on the table is unacceptable on these terms. France has defined its demands since the beginning. No progress has been made.” Points of disagreement with the United States that have caused France to oppose negotiations include food and agriculture, energy, health, public procurement, and cultural goods.

On 5 July 2016, Matthias Fekl, the Minister of State for Foreign Trade, the Promotion of Tourism, and French Nationals Abroad, said that it will be impossible for the European Union and the United States to conclude the TTIP negotiations by the end of 2016. Fekl said that the statements made by EU Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmström — that all EU members support the TTIP — are out of touch with what is happening in Europe.

On 30 August 2016, Fekl announced that his government demanded negotiations on TTIP to cease. Fekl stated that “there is no more political support in France for these negotiations” and that negotiations had reached a stalemate because of the United States’ systematic refusal to make concessions to the European Union. He said “we need a clear and definitive halt to these negotiations in order to restart on a good foundation.”

---

On 30 August 2016, French President François Hollande stated that the TTIP talks were “bogged down” and “too unbalanced,” making an agreement by the end of 2016 “impossible.”

Thus, France has not worked towards achieving an ambitious, comprehensive, high-standard, and mutually beneficial agreement, and it has not applied the necessary political will to reach a TTIP agreement by 2016. For these reasons, France has been awarded a score of −1.

Analyst: Nicolas Jonathan

Germany: +1

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to applying the necessary political will to reach a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership agreement as early as this year, as well as to ensuring that the agreement is comprehensive and mutually beneficial to both the European Union and the United States.

On 30 May 2016, the Government of Germany hosted an event in Bad Staffelstein with the Association of the Bavarian Economy. The event was titled Opportunities and Potential of the Free Trade Agreement with the United States. This was documented as a TTIP event by the Directorate for Trade of the European Commission.

On 28 August 2016, Sigmar Gabriel, Germany’s Vice-Chancellor and Minister of the Economy, stated that the TTIP negotiations have “de-facto” failed any prospect of a conclusive deal. In his remarks during a public Q&A session with ZDF, the German public service television broadcaster, Gabriel stated that “Europeans … must not succumb to American demands.”

However, on 1 September 2016, German Chancellor Angela Merkel stressed her continued support for an EU-US trade agreement. She stated her confidence in TTIP to provide valuable job opportunities and to ensure that the European economy does not fall behind the economy of Asia.

On 9 September 2016, the German Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (BMWi) published a press release regarding the TTIP advisory group’s meeting on investment protection. The Government of Germany urged the advisory group to provide information to public stakeholders in society, and suggested that improved transparency of the process was necessary.

On 8 October 2016, the German Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (BMWi) published a press release on the fifteenth round of TTIP negotiations, which took place on 3-7 October 2016 in New York City. The press release stated that the negotiations addressed the key TTIP pillar of regulatory cooperation. It also outlined two high-level meetings involving TTIP: the Council of Trade Ministers on 11 November, and the European Council on 20 and 21 October.

---


On 11 November 2016, Germany participated in the meeting of the Foreign Affairs Council, which reviewed developments in the TTIP negotiations and bilateral trade in light of the US elections.42

On 16 November 2016, German Chancellor Angela Merkel and United States President Barack Obama made a public appeal for continued cooperation between the US and the European Union on the transatlantic trade deal.43

On 17 March 2017, German Chancellor Angela Merkel held a joint press conference with President Donald Trump at the White House in the United States. She expressed her confidence that the TTIP is still a possibility under a bilateral deal between the European Union and the United States.44 The TTIP was an important agenda item for Merkel’s visit with Trump, who had previously indicated his intentions to renegotiate the TTIP deal.45

Germany has applied the necessary political will to reach a TTIP agreement by 2016 and has worked towards achieving an ambitious, comprehensive, high-standard and mutually beneficial agreement. Thus, Germany has been awarded a score of +1.

Analyst: Angela Min Yi Hou

Italy: +1

Italy has fully complied with its commitment to applying the necessary political will to reach an agreement on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) as early as this year, as well as ensuring that the agreement is comprehensive and mutually beneficial to both the European Union and the United States.

On 18 October 2016, Italian President Sergio Mattarella attended a bilateral meeting with United States President Barack Obama in Washington DC. President Mattarella stated that reaching an economic partnership between the United States and the member countries of the European Union, including Italy, could help both sides “reduce the loss in the future economic crises.”46 He urged all parties to finalize the negotiation between the two sides and to reach an agreement. President Mattarella said that Italy has tried to bring the TTIP topic back to the table for further negotiation in order to reach a final deal. After the bilateral meeting, President Barack Obama publicly said that both United States and Italy strongly support the TTIP, which can bring both countries investment benefits and improve both job security and economic growth.47

On 31 August 2016, Italy attended the European meeting hosted by the European Commission, and participated in discussions regarding TTIP. The Italian Minister of Economic Development, Carlo Calenda, said that TTIP had reached a difficult point in the negotiations, and that it was thus “necessary to assure the

commission maximum support to enable it to reach the ambitious result European governments rightly demand.\textsuperscript{48}

On 22 February 2016, Italy attended the 12th TTIP meeting in Brussels and participated in discussions regarding how to push the agreement further forward.\textsuperscript{49} The negotiation focused on the initial public procurement offer, market access, and investment. It aimed to reach an agreement on controversial issues, including the importing tariff and over-seas investment between the two sides. The member countries of the European Union, including Italy, also had a discussion on investment protection, transparency of communication, and their concerns about the possible impact of the TTIP on their domestic policies in areas such as environmental and food safety standards.\textsuperscript{50}

On 22 June 2015, in a speech to the European Commission, Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmström stated that Italy worked hard to ensure that the TTIP would improve the Italian economy and create multiple opportunities for business by applying crucial policies, including: (1) “eliminating tariffs” for importing goods from both sides; (2) “reducing regulatory barriers”; (3) “enabling Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs)”; (4) providing better protection for unique Italian products.\textsuperscript{51}

Italy has applied the necessary political will to reach a TTIP agreement by 2016, although no agreement was reached. It has also worked towards achieving an ambitious, comprehensive, high-standard, and mutually beneficial agreement. Thus, Italy has been awarded a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Yujing (Carina) Chen}

\section*{Japan: 0}

Japan has partially complied with its commitment to apply the necessary political will towards achieving an ambitious, comprehensive, high-standard, and mutually beneficial agreement that harnesses the potential of the transatlantic economy. Although the free trade agreement Japan is currently negotiating with the European Union is not explicitly linked to the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), both agreements reflect a commitment to fostering relations in the transatlantic economy.

On 13 June 2016, Japan and the EU hosted their fifth sector-to-sector meeting in Tokyo.\textsuperscript{52} The Japanese State Minister of Economy, Trade, and Industry Junji Suzuki engaged in dialogue with ambassadors from EU member states. All parties emphasized “the need for accelerating the negotiations in order to ensure that the agreement is both comprehensive and ambitious in scope.”\textsuperscript{53}

On 26 September 2016, Japan and the EU engaged in the 17th round of negotiations on a free trade agreement (FTA) in Brussels.\textsuperscript{54} The Japanese government referred to the Japan-EU Economic Partnership
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Agreement as one of the “mega FTAs” along with the Trans-Pacific Partnership and TTIP.\(^5\) The Japan-EU negotiations centered on areas such as market access, non-tariff measures and technical barriers to trade, procurement, intellectual property, and general and regulatory cooperation.\(^6\)

On 19 October 2016, Japan’s Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry published its White Paper on International Economy and Trade 2015. Under Part III “International Economic Policy” and “Section 5 — Initiative to Create New Rules,” the report declares Japan’s support for “alleviating non-tariff measures” and increasing global cooperation between corporations and governments to form international standards and regulations which are part of the TTIP.\(^7\)

On 16 December 2016, the European Union’s chief negotiator Mauro Petriccione stated that Japan and the EU have agreed set the end of 2017 as a new deadline for the EU-Japan free trade agreement.\(^8\) Japan hopes to remove tariffs imposed on Japanese cars and electronics, while the EU wants to eliminate Japanese duties on dairy and farm products.

On 19 March 2017, Prime Minister Abe and Chancellor Angela Merkel reiterated their hopes for a soon-negotiated EU-Japan free trade deal. In his statements, Abe emphasized the need for connectedness through technology and trade. He also praised “the benefits of free trade and investment… [and] wants to be the champion upholding open systems alongside Germany.”\(^9\)

On 20 March 2017, at a joint news conference Abe and Merkel spoke to the public again about the importance of “rais[ing] high the flag of free trade.” Abe also stated that Japan and Germany agree that “a free and open global order is the foundation of peace and prosperity.”\(^10\)

Japan has made no explicit declaration of support for the TTIP, but its commitment to trade initiatives in support of a transatlantic partnership has demonstrated a political will that echoes that of the TTIP agreement, and thus, Japan has been awarded a score of 0.

*Analyst: Angela Min Yi Hou*

**United Kingdom: 0**

The United Kingdom has partially complied with its commitment to apply the necessary political will to reach a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) agreement as early as this year, but has not actively worked to achieve a comprehensive agreement.

On 13 September 2016, the Prime Minister’s Office published a press release in support of the TTIP. This release stated that “on trade, the Prime Minister reiterated that we would continue to support EU free trade negotiations, including TTIP, while we remained full members of the EU.”\(^11\)

---


\(^{9}\) Japan’s Abe and Germany’s Merkel talk up free trade, urge ‘sluggish’ EU to sign key deal, CNBC. 19 March 2017. Date of Access: 1 April 2017. http://www.cnbc.com/2017/03/19/japans-aber-germanys-merkel-talk-up-free-trade-urge-sluggish-eu-to-sign-key-deal.html


In September 2016, Prime Minister Theresa May was quoted as saying that the UK was “open for business” and supports free trade.\(^62\)

On 27 October 2016, the UK trade minister signed a letter in favour of continued TTIP talks.\(^63\) However, due to the outcome of the Brexit vote, a decision to exit the EU bloc, any future TTIP agreement would no longer include the UK.\(^64\)

Upon the entry of the new US administration in January 2017, the UK recognized that TTIP would be a difficult path forward, and instead focused on similar free trade negotiations but within a bilateral agreement with the US.\(^65\)

On 15 March 2017, the UK International Trade Committee reviewed the potential impacts of TTIP on public services, however, this is only expected to be applied in an independent trade framework between the US and UK.\(^66\)

The UK applied the necessary political will to reach a TTIP agreement by 2016, although no agreement was reached. However, it has not worked toward achieving an ambitious, comprehensive, high standard and mutually beneficial agreement. Thus, the UK has been awarded a score of 0.

**Analyst: Kevin Lass**

**United States: 0**

The United States has partially complied with its commitment to applying the necessary political will to reach an agreement on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) as early as this year, as well as ensuring that the agreement is comprehensive and mutually beneficial to both the European Union and the United States.

On 11-15 July 2016, the 14th round of TTIP negotiations took place in Brussels, Belgium. United States (US) Trade Representative Dan Mullaney stated that the US and the EU had agreed on cross-cutting and sector-specific regulatory elements. More specifically, the US put forward proposals on trade defense, financial services, sectors, textiles, state-owned enterprises, good regulatory practices, and legal and institutional provisions.\(^67\)

---


On 15 July 2016, Dan Mullaney, Chief Negotiator for the United States, stated that the US fundamentally believes “that an ambitious T-TIP agreement is achievable in 2016, and that remains the goal of the United States.”

On 31 August 2016, US Trade Representative Michael Froman was interviewed by the German newspaper *Spiegel* and said that the US and the EU had made good progress in TTIP negotiations, with both parties agreeing to eliminate 97 per cent of tariffs and make regulatory approaches more transparent and collaborative. He said that both parties also identified potential actions in specific sectors to enhance consumer welfare, and agreed that the TTIP will contain strong labour and environmental obligations so that the TTIP can “raise global standards while improving people’s lives through increased growth and job opportunities.”

On 15 September 2016, EU Trade Commissioner Malmström met with US Trade Representative Michael Froman in Brussels and released a joint statement after the meeting: “We had a good meeting where we reviewed the substantial progress being made and discussed next steps for moving forward. We have directed our teams to make as much progress as possible during the next round, scheduled for the week of 3 October 2016 in New York.”

On 3-7 October 2016, the 15th round of negotiations took place in New York City, New York. EU Chief Negotiator Ignacio García Bercero stated that the United States and EU discussed regulatory coherence, technical barriers to trade, and plant and animal health (SPS). The United States agreed to cooperate in the following nine sectors: cars, pharmaceuticals, chemicals, cosmetics, ICT, pesticide, engineering, medical devices, and textiles.

On 7 October 2016, Dan Mullaney, Chief Negotiation for the United States, stated that the US is “committed as ever” to the success of the TTIP negotiations and is “ready to move forward on an agreement that is in our mutual economic interest.” Mullaney also called the TTIP “vital to strengthening our transatlantic relationship in a time of significant geopolitical uncertainty and uneven economic growth internationally. It will also give the US and the EU an opportunity to work together to raise global standards based on shared values.”

On 18 October 2016, US President Barack Obama met with Italian President Sergio Mattarella. President Obama publicly said that both the United States and Italy strongly support the TTIP, which can bring benefit to investments and improve both job security and economic growth.

---

74 Barack Obama stated that United States and Italy have reaffirmed their commitment to the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership free trade deal, Washington. 18 October 2016. Date of Access: 21 November 2016. https://sputniknews.com/world/201610181046468809-us-italy-ttip/
In November 2016, President Obama visited Europe, where he met with several leading EU officials, including Chancellor Merkel of Germany. Both Obama and Merkel made public appeals for continued cooperation between the US and the European Union on the transatlantic trade deal.\(^75\)

On 23 January 2017, US President Donald Trump signed an executive order to pull the US out of the Trans-Pacific Partnership;\(^66\) Donald Trump has declared an end to the era of multinational trade agreements, including the TTIP.\(^77\)

The US, under President Obama has applied the necessary political will to reach a TTIP agreement by 2016 and has worked towards achieving an ambitious, comprehensive, high-standard, and mutually beneficial agreement. The US, under President Trump, has not applied the necessary political will to reach a TTIP agreement and has not worked towards achieving an ambitious, comprehensive, high-standard, and mutually beneficial agreement. Thus, the US has been awarded a score of 0.

*Analyst: Sharon Ho*

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to applying the necessary political will to reach an agreement on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) as early as this year, as well as ensuring that the agreement is comprehensive and mutually beneficial to both the European Union and the United States.

On 28 June 2016, President of the European Commission Jean-Claude Juncker urged European leaders to publicly support trade talks with the US.\(^78\) A spokesperson detailed that “Juncker felt the EU leaders needed to now establish what they wanted from the TTIP talks.”\(^79\) Juncker further encouraged European leaders “to reconfirm the Commission’s mandate” in regards to a detailed trade agreement.\(^80\)

On 11-15 July 2016, the 14th round of negotiations took place in Brussels, Belgium. EU Chief TTIP negotiator Ignacio García Bercero stated that during the negotiations, the EU made a record number of ten new textual proposals. He also stated that following the negotiations, the US and the EU agreed on the outline of the future TTIP agreement.\(^81\)

On 6 September 2016, the TTIP Advisory Group set up by the EU held an assembly. After the assembly, the TTIP Advisory Group released a report outlining the discussion that took place during their meeting. The Chair explained that the current and second offers on tariff dismantlement now cover 97% off all tariffs on

---


EU goods.\textsuperscript{82} He followed up by stating that “the EU is in favour of an ambitious approach for non-agricultural tariffs, eliminating all within 7 years as long as this is reciprocal,” demonstrating that the EU is continuing to work towards a highly ambitious agreement with the United States.\textsuperscript{83}

On 15 September 2016, EU Trade Commissioner Malmström met with US Trade Representative Michael Froman in Brussels and released a joint statement after the meeting: “We had a good meeting where we reviewed the substantial progress being made and discussed next steps for moving forward. We have directed our teams to make as much progress as possible during the next round, scheduled for the week of 3 October 2016 in New York.”\textsuperscript{84}

On 7 October 2016, following the 15th round of negotiations, EU Chief TTIP Negotiator Ignacio Garcia Bercero was quoted in his opening remarks as saying, “in this round [of negotiations] we focused on consolidating texts and removing the differences we had in the existing proposals; or what we call in our trade jargon ‘removing brackets’.”\textsuperscript{85} He continued by explaining the process and details of the negotiations, saying that members “have spent a lot of time discussing the regulatory area, including regulatory coherence, technical barriers to trade, plants and animals health (SPS) and the nine specific sectors identified for cooperation before the talks has begun.”\textsuperscript{86}

On 16 November 2016, United States President Barack Obama and German Chancellor Angela Merkel made a public appeal for continued cooperation between the US and the European Union on the transatlantic trade deal.\textsuperscript{87}

On 17 January 2017, EU Commissioner Malmström and US Trade Representative Michael Froman released a joint assessment of the progress made in the TTIP negotiations: the statement acknowledges that there has been progress “on better access to markets for EU and US firms, on simplifying technical regulations without lowering standards and on global rules of trade.”\textsuperscript{88}

The EU has fulfilled its commitment to advocate for the urgent completion of the TTIP by applying the necessary political will to create a mutually beneficial agreement through public backing from EU leaders such as Chancellor Merkel, Ignacio Garcia Bercero, and European Commission President Juncker, and through the TTIP Advisory Group, which continues to work in detail on the language of the agreement, ensuring that the EU’s interests are maintained.


The EU has applied the necessary political will to reach a TTIP agreement by 2016 and has worked towards achieving an ambitious, comprehensive, high-standard, and mutually beneficial agreement. Thus, the EU has been awarded a score of +1.

*Analyst: Michael Johnston*
2. Macroeconomics: G7 Ise-Shima Economic Initiative

“We reiterate our commitments to using all policy tools — monetary, fiscal, and structural — individually and collectively, to strengthen global demand and address supply constraints, while continuing our efforts to put debt on a sustainable path.”

G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration

Assessment

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

Background

As was stated in the preface to the 2016 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration in the section on the global economy, “The global recovery continues, but growth remains moderate and uneven…Weak demand and unaddressed structural problems are the key factors weighing on actual and potential growth.”

As such, G7 leaders have made a commitment that seeks to strengthen global demand and address supply constraints.

Strengthening global demand and confronting supply constraints to the health of the labour market can be addressed through policy responses to global economic growth, particularly where “growth is inclusive and job-rich, benefitting all segments of our societies,” “overcoming disinflation,” “job creation and confidence,” “labour market reform,” and tax policies and budget compositions that “support productivity, employment, inclusiveness and growth.”

On issues regarding the labour market, the last meeting of the G8 Employment and Labour Ministers in October 2015 led to the Declaration on Action for Fair Production. Building on the sustainable global supply chains commitment from the Elmau Summit in October 2015, the Declaration highlighted ways in which key stakeholders, including governments, companies, international organizations, and labour groups, could ensure safe working conditions worldwide.

Commitment Features

The commitment calls for members to take actions in three areas: strengthening global demand, addressing supply constraints, and continuing efforts to put debt on a sustainable path. In order to be in full compliance with this commitment, members must take action in all three of these areas, both individually and collectively, and using monetary, fiscal, and structural policy tools.

---
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“Global demand and supply” are both very broad terms, for which reference to the Leaders’ Declaration can serve as a guide. As referenced in the background, much of this area refers to improving the labour market, and helping boost growth, productivity, and potential output. So for members to comply with these criteria, they must commit to “improving job opportunity and quality” through policy means. Actions that aid in “job creation and confidence” may include initiatives that promote job creation, targeted policies that “[advance] labor market participation by women, the youth and the elderly,” public-private partnerships for “effective resource mobilization,” increased public investment into industries for extended growth and opportunities, and labour policies that encourage businesses and corporations to hire more people.

The second part of the commitment speaks to “continuing our efforts to put debt on a sustainable path.” This area does not necessarily mean debt removal, only that debt remains “as a share of GDP on a sustainable path.” Many policies can fall in this area, but for compliance these measures must be taken specifically to address debt management.

In addressing issues within global demand and supply and debt management, the commitment references the use of “all policy tools — monetary, fiscal, and structural — individually and collectively” to achieve action in these fronts. While these are modes through which to achieve compliance, full compliance is not tied to the use of all of these tools. These policy descriptions are more for guiding modes of action. Members can be in full compliance even if they only use individual fiscal policies — what matters is that they address global demand and supply through job creation policies as well as through putting debt, as a share of GDP, on a sustainable path.

As the commitment emphasizes, there are multiple policy-focused means through which to address global demand and supply or debt management. Monetary policy refers to actions by a government’s central bank, mainly through interest rates, in “adjusting the supply of money in the economy to achieve some combination of inflation and output stabilization.” Fiscal policy is “the use of government spending and taxation to influence the economy.” Finally, structural adjustments are “changes to the way the government works” in efforts to improve economic operations conducted by a government for its state.

For full compliance, G8 members must take action in strengthening their labour markets and ensuring that their debt is sustainable.

Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member fails to take action to strengthen their labour market OR takes action that harms their labour market AND allows their debt to grow at an unsustainable rate as a share of their gross domestic product (GDP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member takes actions to stimulate job creation or strengthen their labour market OR takes measures to ensure sustainable levels of debt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member takes action to stimulate job creation OR strengthen their labour market AND takes measures to ensure sustainable levels of debt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada: +1

Canada has fully complied with its commitment to strengthen global demand and put debt on a sustainable path.

The Canadian government plans “to invest CAD120 billion in infrastructure over the next 10 years,” which may positively impact the global demand for Canadian products and services, considering in particular that CAD11.9 billion of this will be distributed within the next five years, commencing “right away.” Income tax levels for those making more than CAD 200,000 per year helps grow potential output for the average Canadian citizen. Both these fiscal policy changes indicate Canada’s commitment to improving the labor market, and to boosting growth, productivity, and potential output.

The Bank of Canada has also renewed Canada’s inflation-control target for a further five-year period, attempting to maintain the buying power of Canadian citizens, which has “reduced uncertainty, helping households and firms make spending and investment decisions with more confidence.” Improved confidence leads to general improvement in potential output, because citizens are more willing to make larger investments with the assurance that the Canadian economy is stable; improving national confidence will lead to job creation.

On 19 October 2016, the Bank of Canada also announced that it is maintaining its target for the overnight rate at ½ per cent. Maintaining the overnight rate shows that Canada is not adjusting the lowest available interest rate (a form of monetary policy) to change banks’ abilities to borrow money from central bank depositories. Maintaining this interest rate improves confidence because people know what to expect from central bank depositories, and thus can make more educated investment decisions.

Canada has also made continuing efforts to put debt on a sustainable path. “The amount of all domestic market debt that matures with one year relative to Canada’s GDP, is projected to decline from about 8 per cent in 2016-2017 to under 6 per cent over the coming decade,” indicating that the government is dedicated to reducing debt and its negative effects on the economy.

---

In sum, Canada has taken actions to strengthen its labor market, as well as global demand for Canadian products. Canada also took measures to maintain a sustainable debt and only use in moderation as a means to meet its financial requirements. As such, Canada has been awarded a score of +1.

*Analyst: Fred Randall*

**France: 0**

France has partially complied with its commitment to apply the necessary macroeconomic policies towards strengthening global demands, addressing supply constraints, and continuing efforts to put debt on a sustainable path. Although France has taken actions to strengthen the labor market, it has not taken measures to ensure sustainable debt.

According to the International Monetary Fund’s Country Report on France, made public on 24 June 2016, the French government has implemented “structural reform” efforts to benefit job creation and growth. Specifically, the report stated in section B.13 that the government “implement[ed] targeted policies to boost participation of underrepresented groups in the labor market, including youth, women, migrants, and older workers.”  

106 The report categorized this measure as an example of “strengthening aggregate demand in the near term.”

On 6 July 2016, former French Prime Minister Manuel Valls attended the International Financial Forum, organized by Paris EUROPLACE, where he delivered a keynote speech emphasizing the government’s goal to “create new jobs and boost purchasing power.”  

107 He also stated that the French government is trying to “create the right conditions for attracting entrepreneurs willing to take risks.”

According to the G20 Information Centre’s 2016 Growth Strategy Update on France, published on 26 September 2016, the French government is supporting innovation through initiatives such as the “Invest for the Future Programme.” Within these programs, equity investment will hold a larger share than previous programs in order to ensure the access of small to medium-sized enterprises to adequate capital.  

108

From October 2016 to September 2017, the French government has and will participate in Open Government Partnership along with the World Resources Institute. This public-private partnership will mobilize and coordinate technical, digital, and financial resources to “support successful implementation of National Action Plans.”  

109

On 23 November 2016, the government of France hosted the 5th Strategic Attractiveness Council Meeting. Former French Minister of the Economy, Finance and Industry Michel Sapin attended the session, and stated that the government “support[s] investments and job creation” as a long-term priority.  

110 He outlined France’s goal to increase competitiveness over the past four years, and emphasized measures to reduce tax and social security deductions such as the CICE, or the Crédit d’impôt compétitivité emploi.

---

France has not used policy tools to deliver actions of debt management, despite national debt being one of France’s ten SDG (sustainable development goals) wealth Indicators.\(^{111}\) But France has acted to improve the opportunities and quality of jobs in the labor market. Thus, France has been awarded a score of 0.

*Analyst: Angela Min Yi Hou*

**Germany: 0**

Germany has partially complied with its commitment to apply the necessary fiscal and monetary policy to promote the strengthening of global demand and addressing supply constraints. Although it has complied with debt reduction domestically but it has shown no signs of complying internationally.

The German economy has shown signs of strength. The Hong Kong Shanghai Banking Corporation is reporting projections of fiscal to Germany’s surplus gross domestic product (GDP) of nine percent in 2016.\(^{112}\) The aforementioned budget surplus is expected to pressure German lawmakers to introduce more infrastructure (government spending) programs in the future. The European Central Bank and the Bundestag concur that the infrastructure plans that Germany is pursuing will benefit the Eurozone as a group. However, Germany may benefit most in both the short and long terms.\(^{113}\)

Strength in the domestic German economy has also been indicated through incising household incomes and labor market data. The Government of Germany has increased pensions and decreased taxes. Based on the Bundesbank forecast from the December report, the “memo item savings ratio” is expected to gradually decrease year over year. The ratio indicates savings of consumers, and the decrease in savings is a strong indication that supply constraints are being addressed.\(^{114}\)

Germany’s commitment to fiscal policy has also translated into investment in infrastructure. Finance Minister of Germany Wolfgang Schäuble supported the German position by stating in a recent interview, “We are playing our part in strengthening global demand. No other country in Europe is spending more on investment than Germany.”\(^{115}\) To translate the Wolfgang Schäuble’s words into actions, the Bundestag has approved EUR16.93 billion for investment into transportation and telecommunications.\(^{116}\) This marks the biggest-ever investment by the German government in this sector. The main goal of the government is to improve the railway and broadband development.\(^{117}\) The government is also supporting the steel industry by introducing legislation to increase production through infrastructure spending. The action allows for the retention of manufacturing jobs in Germany, and thus improves supply in the economy. Further, Germany has an aging population, which is expected to gradually increase government spending on industries such as healthcare. The government has used legislation to decrease healthcare costs. The E-Health Act of 2016,

---


promotes the use of new technology in hospitals, decreasing costs. Furthermore, the Hospital Structure Act helps to reduce inefficiencies in the hospital, and create a more productive environment.118

The Government of Germany has also agreed to take in asylum seekers entering Europe fleeing war torn countries, which could boost economic prospects. Chancellor Angela Markel has revised the European Union Law on refugees, which stated that refugees are obligated to be processed at the entry country to the European Union, allowing asylum seekers to plead refugee status independent of country of entry. Increasing accessibility to migrants, coupled with laws restricting welfare payments to asylum seekers119, will help Germany both strengthen global demand and support its aging population. Increasing immigration to Germany will also lead to a higher taxable population, increasing economic prospects. However, due to political contagion, Germany has decided to accept less immigrants than initially planned.120 In the December monthly report of the Bundesbank, it was concluded that immigration helped the labor markets of the economy, and that the latest move to decrease immigration has caused labor shortages in the economy.121 The same report indicates an increase in employment in the months to come.122

The Bundestag also passed a disability labor law that focuses on helping people with a disability have a better chance of being hired into the labor force.123 The law provides equal to better benefits for people who suffer from a disability. Historically, welfare payments tended to neglect disabled welfare recipients by giving lower welfare in comparison to recipients without disabilities. The law gives financial compensation to companies that hire persons with disability. The law in practice broadens the job force, increases incomes, and thus increases supply in the general economy.

Germany has also sought out more free trade agreements. The policy is meant to counter recent protectionist sentiments and policies that have contributed to the United Kingdom’s exit from the European Project and President Trump’s dismantling of the Trans Pacific Partnership.124 Specifically, Chancellor Markel has cited South America as an opportunity for a new free trade agreement125. Years in the making, the Canadian European Trade Agreement (CETA) was approved by the European Union, and will be going into effect. Bundestag members had objections to the legality of the Free Trade agreement between Germany and

Canada, but the high court of Germany has rejected the complaint, and has allowed the CETA to be signed by the German government\textsuperscript{126}, thus promoting strengthened global demand.

German exports remained unchanged after the UK referendum due to the increase of exports to emerging markets, who are focused on growth based on commodity price increases. Emerging markets also cushioned German export decreases to China. Germany provides many capital goods, while China is trying to evolve into a consumer-based economy.

The Growth and Stability Pact is agreed upon by all European member nations as a guideline on what gross domestic product (GDP) levels that are acceptable for entrance into the European Union. It also serves as a regulating body toward fiscal constraint of nations. As stated in the annual report compiled by the European Commission on compliance of Germany to the Growth and Stability Pact of the European Union, Germany complied fully with its medium-term objectives and is forecasted to meet the debt benchmark of the upcoming year.

Germany’s domestic policy efforts for debt suitability are different from their foreign policies. Greek debt balance sheets are of main concern for European Union sustainability, and in Germany’s interest to sustain. Although the aforementioned incentives exist, Germany has vied to not allow any debt reduction on Greek sovereign debt.\textsuperscript{127} This action goes against the principle of putting debt on a sustainable path.

The Finance Minister has enticed the International Monetary Fund to start debt reduction. These actions have created a risk in Greek debt becoming "explosive."\textsuperscript{128} Debt reduction is needed throughout the world to lessen the risk of default and in turn financial turmoil. Germany has worked against these principles in their heated negotiations with the Greek government.

In sum, while Germany has strengthened its global demand and addressed supply constraints, and also complied with debt reduction domestically, internationally, the government has shown signs of non-compliance. Thus, Germany is awarded a score of 0.

\textit{Analyst: John Efstatudakis}

**Italy: 0**

Italy has partially complied with its commitment to strengthen global demand, address supply constraints, and manage debt. Despite proactive measures’ being taken by the Renzi government to resurge the economy, Italy is still experiencing stagnation.

The majority of policy reform in Italy has been structural. Prime Minister Matteo Renzi introduced significant labour market reforms designed to increase labor-market flexibility and create incentives for long-term contracts.\textsuperscript{129} ‘The Jobs Act Labour Market Reform (JALM), passed by the Italian parliament in 2015, but implemented in 2016, is the most notable example. However, these reforms have disproportionately targeted Italian youth, where unemployment remains at staggering levels exceeding 30 percent. Prime Minister Renzi’s reforms did not apply to the country’s 3.5 million public-sector workers or to those already employed. The failure of these reforms in addressing public-sector workers’ concerns may actually discourage workers from moving jobs, thereby keeping the labour market rigid.\textsuperscript{130} Other structural reforms have been marginal or, even


at times, completely unsuccessful. The government has sought to reform public administration and education in an attempt to improve the competitiveness of its human capital. However, the investment climate remains poor mainly due to rigid labor laws, high labor cost, inefficient public service, and the judicial system.  

On the fiscal front, expansionary measures have been taken to increase aggregate demand. As Sustainable Government Indicators notes, some of the measures introduced are “the income bonus for lower incomes [in the form of a monthly EUR80 transfer payment], and tax reductions for businesses [via Regional Tax on Productive Activity reductions].” However, Focus Economics projects a lackluster economic outlook for 2017.

This year growth in gross domestic product will likely weaken, as private consumption decelerates and growth in fixed investment is held back by subdued domestic demand and tighter financing conditions. The probable standstill in pro-market reforms and the potential financial instability stemming both from Italy’s high public debt and from its distressed banking sector represent the main downside risks to the outlook.

Optimistically, Gentiloni’s objective of greater job creation and growth set out in his inaugural address signals his intention to revive the Italian economy and put his country on course with G7 priority commitments. However, because Italy has not yet strengthened global demand and retains considerable public debt, Italy has been awarded a score of 0.

**Analyst: Alexander Zafiris**

**Japan: 0**

Japan has partially complied with its commitment to strengthen global demand and address supply constraints, while putting debt on a sustainable path.

On 2 August 2016, the Japanese cabinet approved a stimulus package worth more than JPY 28 trillion. Much of package went towards infrastructure projects and the reconstruction of disaster zones. Another part of the funds went towards improving wages for child and elder care workers, as well as supporting small companies and low income families. This stimulus spending helps to create jobs and raise wages to increase consumption in the Japanese economy.

On 22 December 2016, the Japanese Ministry of Finance released the Draft Financial Year 2017 budget. In it, the salaries of childcare workers are increased by 2%. The government also committed to several structural reforms. To help women enter the workforce, the eligible period for maternity leave benefits are to be extended from 18 months to 24 months in cases where a childcare centre is difficult to find. Furthermore, the government will spend JPY 3.9 billion to support companies in adopting merit based wage systems to replace seniority dependent systems with the intent to build the “enabling environment for wage increase.” Finally, JPY 53 billion will be spent to bolster the tourism industry. This budget would allocate funds towards structural reform in the workplace to increase wages as well as developing the tourism industry, improving the quality of jobs and increasing consumption as well as advancing labour market participation by women.

---

On 31 January 2017, the Bank of Japan decided to maintain its ultra-loose monetary policy, defined by quantitative easing and making the benchmark interest rate negative, in its first annual board meeting. Although the intent is to counter deflation by encouraging lending and borrowing, this policy is controversial, with some economists arguing that it will damage the banking system and potentially lead to speculative bubbles.\(^{137}\)

The Japanese government’s economic plan, also known as “Abenomics,” is an aggressive approach to ending the Japanese economy’s decade long deflationary slump. While these policies’ commitment to improving the labor market and increasing demand is clear, it comes with the tradeoff of high deficit spending and unorthodox monetary policy. It is yet uncertain if this pattern of taking on more debt and maintaining negative interest rates is sustainable. As such, Japan has partly complied with its macroeconomic commitments and has been awarded with a score of 0.

**Analyst: Shaina Ong**

**United Kingdom: 0**

The United Kingdom has partially complied with its commitment to use all policy tools, individually and collectively, to strengthen global demand and address supply constraints, while continuing efforts to ensure sustainable debt.

On 8 March 2017, British Finance Minister Philip Hammond unveiled a budget that aims to manage Britain’s national debt. In his Spring Budget 2017 speech to Parliament, Hammond announced that the government plans to reduce borrowing as a means to lower the national debt.\(^{138}\) Hammond noted that “borrowing is forecast to be reduced by nearly three quarters by 2016-2017.”\(^{139}\) Hammond’s Spring Budget 2017 plan expects the UK government to “get debt falling as a percentage of GDP [gross domestic product] by 2020-21.”\(^{140}\) Britain’s national debt is estimated to be nearly GBP 1.7 trillion.\(^{141}\)

On 8 March 2017, Chancellor Philip Hammond announced that the government, in coordination with businesses and the public sector, will invest GBP 5 million to increase the number of returnships, helping people back into employment after a career break.\(^{142}\) Her Majesty’s Treasury, the UK government’s economic and finance ministry, reported that returnships “will be open to women and men with the aim of giving people who have taken lengthy career breaks the opportunity to refresh their skills and build professional networks.”\(^{143}\) “To help mothers returning to work after a long career break, the finance ministry stated that “the government will work with business groups and public sector organizations to identify how to boost further the opportunities for women returning to work.”\(^{144}\)

On 21 November 2016, Prime Minister Theresa May at the Confederation of British Industry (CBI)’s annual conference called for businesses to work closely with Britain to create greater job opportunities for the youth of society. In her speech, Theresa May told Britain’s biggest business group that some of the most innovative companies have pledged to invest in Britain’s future, helping to create jobs for communities all over the country. “Nissan’s decision to build 2 next-generation models at its plant in the North East, securing 7,000 jobs; GBP 500 million in expansion and 3,000 jobs from Jaguar Land Rover; an estimated GBP 1 billion in investment and 3,000 new jobs from Google; and Facebook announced a 50 percent increase in its workforce in the UK by the end of 2017.”145 May offered some inducements to those businesses that will play a role in creating jobs, promising an extra GBP 2 billion a year in support and investment.146

On 22 January 2017, Prime Minister Theresa May announced a plan for a modern Industrial Strategy that will drive growth across the United Kingdom, creating more high paid jobs and opportunities.147 Theresa May said that the government’s new modern Industrial Strategy “will be underpinned by a new approach to government, not just stepping back but stepping up to a new, active role that backs business and ensures more people in all corners of the country share in the benefits of its success.”148 The industrial strategy plans to help boost job opportunities for people by raising skill levels in lagging areas, supporting technical education to benefit young people, and ensuring everyone has the basic skills needed in a modern economy to thrive.149 To help create jobs, support businesses, and encourage growth for people across the north-west region, the government announced “a cash boost of £556 million”150 as part of the industrial strategy framework.

On 11 July 2017, Prime Minister David Cameron announced new investments and job creation in the UK aerospace industry. Cameron announced “£365 million in funding for new UK aerospace research and development projects and major partnership with Boeing to create 2,000 jobs in the UK.”151 Boeing and the government will work together to increase employment in the UK by making the UK a base for defence exports to Europe and the Middle East and by creating 100 new jobs at Boeing’s operational support and training base in Scotland and Boeing.152

Thus, the United Kingdom has been awarded a score of 0 for its efforts to strengthen global demand and address supply constraints. The UK took actions to improve the labour market, including initiatives to increase public investment into industries to help aid in job creation and boost growth.

---

United States: 0

The United States has partially complied with its commitment to strengthen global demand, address supply constraints, and keep debt on a sustainable path.

Individuals entering the labor force, both employed and unemployed, have been in decline since early 2015, with no policies implemented to increase these numbers.153 Wage growth as well as productivity have lagged.154 With unemployment continually increasing, the economy must provide more than just new jobs; there needs to be an investment made in growth, productivity, and education.

In December 2016, there were 178,000 new jobs created.155 However, the labor force participation rate, measuring the number of individuals looking for work, continually increases, while wages have remained the same.156 Additionally, labor market participation by women has not changed in the country since 1950.157 While more jobs have been created, they have not effectively helped the job confidence or labor market participation of minorities.

Where debt is concerned, the United States has publically stated that “honoring the full faith and credit of our outstanding debt is a critical commitment.” United States Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin stated that extreme measures would be taken to avoid defaulting on debt, showing the United States’s commitment to putting its debt on a sustainable path. Debt ceilings are being put into place as leverage to demand spending cuts. The Treasury also has numerous cash conversion strategies in place to help ease into repayment of the debts.159

In sum, the United States has put measures into place to tackle their commitments. However, while these measures indicate progress, nothing substantial has been implemented. As such, the United States has been awarded a score of 0.

---

European Union: +1

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to strengthen global demand, address supply constraints, and reduce debt.

Amidst political and economic speculation about the future of the European Union, the world’s second largest economy is on the road to recovery. Brexit, the refugee crisis, and the rise of nationalism have certainly forecasted doubt about the EU’s economic acumen, but the economic bloc has fared well. The EU continues to be carried by its economic powerhouses, with Germany and France leading the way, while southern European states lag behind.

---

The EU’s main policy tool has been interest rate adjustment via the European Central Bank. Ultra-easy monetary policy (low interest rates) fueled the domestic economy in 2016, while the external sector (exporters) benefited from a relatively lower euro.\footnote{\textit{Economic snapshot for the euro area.} Focus Economics. 2017. Retrieved from: http://www.focus-economics.com/regions/euro-area.} The effect of the ECB’s loose monetary policy has been noted through increased aggregate demand and increased borrowing and spending from companies. Furthermore, in the troublesome economies of Southern Europe, the ECB has pledged to extend its programme of quantitative easing (QE). QE is a form of monetary policy in which market interest rates are reduced at different maturities, allowing economies to stimulate spending by increasing liquidity, pushing up asset prices, producing wealth effects, lowering borrowing costs, and hence stimulating aggregate demand.\footnote{Irene Kostaki. “Monday’s monetary dialogue tabled the topics of the risks regarding a possible extension of the quantitative easing.” New Europe. 2017. Retrieved from: https://www.neweurope.eu/article/draghi-support-monetary-policy-measures-still-needed/} QE, and its associated aforementioned policies, will largely target Southern European states such as Italy, Greece, Spain, and Portugal to increase aggregate demand and relieve their debt burdens.

The EU has showcased an improving labour market in Northern and Central Europe and the Eurozone has posted 14 consecutive quarters of economic growth. The overall outlook for the EU’s compliance with G7 priority commitments continues to be strong, but the bloc will need to address the regional disparities between North and South. Moreover, unemployment has returned to single digits for the EU on aggregate, but it is still worrisome in the more troubled European states. As such, the EU has been awarded a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Alexander Zafiris}
3. Health: Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria

“We are committed to ending AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria, working in partnership with the Global Fund (GF) and others.”

_G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ 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>+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>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

Infectious diseases — i.e., diseases that can be spread from one person to another[^62] — are among the top causative agents of death worldwide, and particularly in the developing world.[^63] In particular, tuberculosis, malaria, and HIV/AIDS are among the most problematic infectious diseases in existence.

Human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), the first disease-causing agent considered, is a virus that weakens immunity, making the individual more susceptible to infections and cancers, and culminating in acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS), a condition within which the individual develops cancer, infections, or other serious clinical issues.[^64] HIV/AIDS is a major global public health issue. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), there were approximately 36.7 million people living with HIV/AIDS and approximately 1.1 million dying of it in 2015 alone.[^65] While HIV/AIDS is present nearly everywhere to some extent, 25.6 million of these 36.7 million people were located in sub-Saharan Africa, accounting for more than two-thirds of the global total of incident HIV infections.[^66] As prevalent as HIV/AIDS is, further, it is estimated that only 60 percent of those living with HIV are aware of their HIV status, highlighting the need for HIV testing services and awareness generation mechanisms.[^67] Finally, HIV/AIDS is not presently curable, though antiretroviral drugs (ARVs) are used to help control the virus in affected individuals and prevent transmission.[^68]

Tuberculosis (TB) is another particularly prevalent disease, caused by a bacterium that mainly affects the lungs.\textsuperscript{169} As of 2015, it was ninth on the list of top ten causes of death globally.\textsuperscript{170} Specifically, in 2015 alone, there were 10.4 million incident (new) cases of TB worldwide, along with 1.4 million TB deaths.\textsuperscript{171} The vast majority of new cases (60 per cent) involved individuals from India, Indonesia, China, Nigeria, Pakistan, and South Africa.\textsuperscript{172} TB is also notable in that it often co-occurs with HIV/AIDS, another of the three diseases targeted by this commitment. An additional 0.4 million deaths resulting from TB occurred specifically among people living with HIV.\textsuperscript{173} Thankfully, unlike HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis is treatable and curable with a standard six-month course of four antimicrobial drugs; without access to and proper administration of this form of treatment, however, disease spread and death are possible.\textsuperscript{174}

Malaria, the third disease considered, had the most current cases as of 2015. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), there were approximately 212 million cases and 429,000 deaths associated with malaria in 2015.\textsuperscript{175} This disease, caused by parasites that are transmitted via female Anopheles mosquitoes, is both life-threatening and widespread.\textsuperscript{176} It mostly affects the developing world, and, like HIV/AIDS, is most abundant in sub-Saharan Africa, which carries a disproportionately high share of the globe’s malaria burden (approximately 90% of all cases and 92% of deaths).\textsuperscript{177} Malaria, like tuberculosis, is preventable and curable.\textsuperscript{178} The main method of abolishing malaria is vector control, which involves using measures like insecticide-treated mosquito nets (long-lasting insecticidal nets, or LLINs) and indoor residual insecticide spraying (IRS) to reduce transmission by targeting mosquitoes.\textsuperscript{179} Antimalarial drugs, which can be administered both to locals living in high-transmission areas and to tourists, are also useful in preventing disease development. Unfortunately, both insecticides and drugs are capable of being subverted by resistance. While resistance is not a pressing concern in most affected regions, certain malaria-endemic areas seem to be experiencing widespread resistance to insecticides, and resistance to previous generations of medicines has problematized malaria control efforts and reversed child survival gains in the past, implying that resistance may pose a problem in the future if further antimalarial agents and insecticides are not discovered and synthesized.\textsuperscript{180} While many infectious diseases are managed using vaccines, there is at present no licensed vaccination against malaria, though one — the RTS S/AS01 — successfully withstood a seven-country

clinical trial, received positive feedback from the European Medicines Agency in 2015, and is on its way to its first pilot implementations, which are due to begin in 2018.\textsuperscript{181}

HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria prevention and treatment attempts have decidedly reduced the burden that these diseases represent. For example, HIV/AIDS incidence fell by 35 per cent between 2000 and 2015.\textsuperscript{182} TB incidence has fallen by an average of 1.5 per cent per year since 2000.\textsuperscript{183} Finally, malaria incidence fell by 21 per cent globally between 2010 and 2015.\textsuperscript{184} However, further surveillance of, and response to, these diseases is required for their timely elimination and eventual eradication. Key issues to target include better supporting sub-Saharan Africa where HIV/AIDS and malaria are concerned, furthering HIV testing and awareness, developing a cure for HIV, controlling tuberculosis in the six countries within which it is the most prevalent, and accounting for insecticide and drug resistance in malaria. To these ends, the World Health Organization runs policy, advocacy, and implementation programs like the Global Malaria Programme (GMP), which “coordinates … global efforts to control and eliminate malaria”\textsuperscript{185}, and the Global TB Programme, which aims to “advance universal access to TB prevention, care and control, guide the global response to threats, and promote innovation.”\textsuperscript{186} In addition, the United Nations (UN) runs UNAIDS, which aims to reduce sexual transmission of HIV, prevent HIV among drug users, eliminate new infections in children, help 15 million people access treatment, and avoid associated TB deaths, among others.\textsuperscript{187} However, where financing these endeavours is concerned, the vast majority of funding towards HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria elimination efforts is derived from the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (the Global Fund).

The Global Fund describes itself as “a 21st-century partnership organization designed to accelerate the end of AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria as epidemics”\textsuperscript{188} through providing funding to programs run by local experts. It was founded in 2002, and represents a collaboration between “governments, civil society, the private sector and people affected by the diseases”\textsuperscript{189} for which funding is secured. It is important to note that the G7 was instrumental in creating the Global Fund; specifically, in 2001, the G7 wrote, “we have launched with the UN Secretary-General a new Global Fund to fight HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis,” and committed USD1.3 billion to the Fund at that time.\textsuperscript{190} Subsequently, Global Fund commitments, either directly in terms of the Global Fund or in terms of HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria efforts, were pursued every year. At present, the Global Fund raises nearly USD4 billion per year.\textsuperscript{191}

The G7 has aligned with the goals of the Global Fund since the Global Fund’s inception; in fact, by the time the Global Fund was created in 2002, the G7 had already been pursuing health-related decision-making on

health and disease since 1980.\(^{192}\) For the entirety of the G7’s history, HIV/AIDS has been the subject of 41 commitments; malaria has been the subject of 13 commitments; finally, alignment with the Global Fund itself has been the subject of 12 commitments.\(^{193}\) Notably, the G7 has also had above-average performance where these commitments are concerned. Fighting to prevent HIV/AIDS (+69%), and tuberculosis (+62%), as well as supporting the Global Fund (+58%) are among the issues on which it has displayed the best compliance. It has also displayed excellent compliance with its commitments to combat malaria (+100%).\(^{194}\) Where the Global Fund specifically is concerned, the G7 countries’ compliance from 1983 to 2008, in order from highest to lowest, was 83% (Canada), 67% (France, Japan, Russia, and the United States), 50% (the UK and the EU), and 33% (Italy and Germany).\(^{195}\)

**Commitment Features**

This commitment calls upon G7 countries to “[end] AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria,”\(^{196}\) implying that significant efforts should be made by all member countries to eliminate — and, eventually, eradicate — these diseases.

In order to achieve this goal, G7 member countries are to “work in partnership with the Global Fund and others.”\(^{197}\) As such, G7 members will be expected to engage with — and contribute to — the Global Fund. Compliance with this component of the commitment primarily entails contributing funding to the Global Fund. Indeed, the G7 Leaders’ Declaration follows this commitment with the pledge that “To this end, we fully support a successful 5th replenishment of the GF [Global Fund], taking the opportunity of the GF replenishment conference in Montreal in September.”\(^{198}\) However, compliance could also be evidenced by a G7 member’s attendance at relevant meetings, commitments to providing funding prior to the 2017 Taormina Summit, encouraging other G7 members to contribute, or raising awareness of the Global Fund’s work.

Full compliance will indubitably, however, involve more than solely contributing to the Global Fund. Some independent initiative in addition to partnering with the Global Fund should be taken to merit a +1 score, given that the G7 commitments explicitly mentions partnering with “others.” These projects should also involve attempts at eliminating all three diseases, though particularly profound attempts at targeting one disease at a time could also be considered sufficient.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>G7 member makes no efforts to eradicate HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria through support for the Global Fund AND fails to engage with other organizations to combat these diseases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>G7 member makes an effort to eradicate HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria through the Global Fund OR engages with other organizations to combat these diseases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>G7 member makes an effort to eradicate HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria through the Global Fund AND engages with other organizations to combat these diseases as well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lead Analyst: Sohaib Ahmed*

---

Canada: +1

Canada has fully complied with its commitment to ending HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, working in partnership with the Global Fund and others.

Canada hosted the Fifth Global Fund Replenishment Conference on 16–17 September 2016 in Montréal, Quebec to fight HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria.200 Prime Minister Justin Trudeau proclaimed that “Canada will continue to lead by example, and show the world what we can accomplish when we unite in pursuit of a larger goal,” and pledged CAD804 million towards this cause for 2017-2019. This is a 23 per cent increase in Canada’s contribution to the Global Fund since the last replenishment pledge. CAD785 million of this pledge will go directly to the Global Fund. The other CAD19 million in funding will support the Wambo.org initiative of the Global Fund, which aims to supply developing countries with safe and reliable health care products at a decreased cost.

That being said, 42 organizations within Canada which provide services, and support for people with HIV/AIDS were in jeopardy202 after a recent change to the Public Health Agency’s HIV and Hepatitis C Community Action Fund.203 This fund, which invests CAD24.6 million per year to Canadian communities, was redesigned “to foster innovation, encourage more collaboration and partnerships, maximize efficiencies and increase the effectiveness of community-based investment.”204 To address problems arising from the change, on 9 November 2016, Minister of Health Jane Philpott stated that organizations rejected from funding will receive transitional project funding until 31 March 2018.205 Meanwhile, the Public Health Agency will work with organizations who received cuts in their current funding to aid in their transition.206

On 1 December 2016, Minister Philpott pledged CAD3.5 million “to fund the work of Canadian HIV/AIDS researchers who are engaged in cutting-edge biomedical and clinical research, as well as those working in the communities most vulnerable to HIV infection, including Indigenous communities.”207 This contribution has been made for the purposes of achieving the 90-90-90 targets set out by the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS). These targets “aim to ensure that 90% of HIV positive people will know their

---

status, that 90% of people who know their status receive treatment, and that 90% of those on treatment have suppressed viral loads.”

In addition, Canada will contribute up to CAD$85 million to TB REACH, an initiative of Stop TB Partnership, aiming to provide innovate techniques to improve diagnoses and treatment of tuberculosis. This project will run from 31 May 2016 to 31 March 2021. The end goal is to both to advance detection and care, especially for women and children afflicted with the disease, on a theoretical level, and to increase the implementation of new successful approaches for the detection and care of these vulnerable populations.

Canada has contributed to the Global Fund, and is working with other initiatives for the same cause. As such, Canada receives a score of +1.

**Analyst: Lucy Liu**

**France: +1**

France has fully complied with its commitment to eradicate tuberculosis, malaria and HIV/AIDS by contributing to the Global Fund, setting up the 5% Initiative, and engaging with health and humanitarian organizations worldwide.

France is one of the founding countries of the Global Fund and main political and financial supporters. As the leading European Contributor, France has committed to contributing EUR 3.016 billion (USD 3.8 billion) to the Global Fund, with EUR 2.396 billion already dispersed. Compared to the United States, France is the second largest contributor worldwide.

France expressed their keen leadership in global health by announcing that they will contribute EUR 1.08 billion to the Global Fund for a three-year period, beginning in 2017. This contribution fits well with France’s commitment to global health, strengthening healthcare systems, advancing human rights and providing specialized health care programs for vulnerable populations.

On February 15, 2017, France’s Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Development, Jean-Marc Ayrault, and Minister of State for Development and Francophonie, Jean-Marie Le Guen, met with Mark Dybul, Director of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.

During this meeting, France reaffirmed their strong commitment to working with the Global Fund to eradicate AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.

France is one of twenty dynamic members on the Global Fund Board and an active participant in Country Coordination Mechanisms, which submits funding applications to the Global Fund on behalf of the entire

---


country.\textsuperscript{214} France is represented in 25 countries by its regional health cooperation counsellors and embassy staff.

In addition to contributing to the Global Fund, France has also set up their own funding channel for eradicating AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, named the 5\% Initiative.\textsuperscript{215} This initiative supports French-speaking countries in designing, implementing, monitoring, evaluating the impacts of grants provided by the Global Fund to improve the effectiveness and impact on health care for these countries. The 5\% Initiative also assists French-speaking countries with accessing resources from the Global Fund and deploying the received financial resources.

To complement their contributions to the Global Fund, France collaborated with Brazil, Chile, Norway and the United Kingdom to launch UNITAID, a global health organization dedicated to finding new ways to prevent, diagnose and treat AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis more efficiently and effectively by improving availability of medicines and diagnostic tools.\textsuperscript{216} France also funds numerous humanitarian organizations with health programmes, including the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization (GAVI), World Health Organization, and the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS).\textsuperscript{217}

In conclusion, France has demonstrated significant efforts towards the eradication of AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria through financial funding to the Global Fund, setting up their own indirect funding channel, the 5\% Initiative, as well as collaborating with and funding health and humanitarian organizations. Therefore, France is awarded with a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Vicky Vuong}

\textbf{Germany: +1}

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to make an effort to eradicate HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria through the Global Fund, and to engage with other organizations to combat these diseases.

On 15 September 2016, Germany pledged EUR800 million to the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria.\textsuperscript{218} Dr. Gerd Müller, Federal Minister of Economic Cooperation and Development, announced the contribution at the Global Fund’s Fifth Replenishment Conference in Montreal. The pledge will contribute to the Global Fund for the 2017 to 2019 funding cycle, and is a 33 percent increase from Germany’s 2013 pledge.\textsuperscript{219}

In addition to Germany’s pledge to the Global Fund, Germany has partnered with other organizations to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. Germany has supported organizations with programmes to combat the diseases and to develop relevant drugs and vaccines.

On 27 July 2016, the Government of Germany contributed USD4.4 million to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) field budget.\textsuperscript{220} The ICRC is an international organization that provides emergency

humanitarian assistance for victims of war and other conflict, including through medical care for HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria.221

On 11 November 2016, the Government of Germany contributed USD452,459 to the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) for coordination and support services.222 The OCHA is a part of the United Nations Secretariat, and operates to mobilize and coordinate humanitarian action through national and international partnerships to respond to disasters and emergencies, including through programmes to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria.223

On 30 November 2016, the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) announced a EUR50 million investment in product development partnerships (PDPs) for the development of drugs and vaccines for neglected and poverty-related diseases including HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria.224 The PDPs’ strategy is to attract researchers and drive innovation through economic incentives. The PDPs include the Medicines for Malaria Venture (MMV) for the development of drugs against malaria, the International Partnership for Microbicides (IPM) for the development of microbicides for women for HIV prevention, and the Global Alliance for TB Drug Development (TB Alliance) for more affordable tuberculosis drugs.225

On 31 December 2016, Germany pledged USD656.3 million to the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunizations (GAVI) over 2016 to 2020.226 GAVI is an international organization and public-private partnership created in January 2000 to improve access to vaccines and immunizations in lower-income countries by leveraging financial resources and expertise for the affordable, accessible, and sustainable provision of vaccines and immunizations.227 The coalition includes national governments, international organizations, philanthropic institutions, the private sector, and research and public health institutions. GAVI collaborates with the Global Fund and accelerates research and development efforts for vaccines and related products to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, among other diseases.228 Germany has been a GAVI donor since 2006, and previously contributed a total of USD208 million in direct funding from 2006 to 2015.229

In sum, Germany has made an effort to eradicate HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria through the Global Fund, and has engaged with other organizations to combat these diseases. Thus, Germany has been awarded a score of +1.

Analyst: Alison Dillman

Italy: +1

Italy has fully complied with its commitment to pledge and contribute to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria. In addition, Italy has contributed and collaborated with non-GFFATM organizations to fulfill this commitment.

Historically, Italy has been a major donor to the Global Fund and ranks eighth among all the public sector contributors.230

On 27 June 2016, Italy announced a pledge of EUR130 million for the 2017-2019 Global Fund’s Fifth Replenishment Cycle to aid in reaching the USD13 billion goal. This denotes a 30% increase from Italy’s previous EUR100 million contribution.231,232

On 16 September 2016, in Montreal, at the Fifth Replenishment conference, Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation Paolo Gentiloni publicly praised the GFFATM after pledging to increase contributions.233 In addition, the new contribution amount also offers a specific part “Italian technical assistance” to the Global Fund’s programs.234 In affirmation of the pledge, Vice-Chair of Friends of the Global Fund Stefano Vella added: “Minister Gentiloni’s decision confirms the importance of the Global Fund for the Italian cooperation, reaffirms the role of our country among the major donors of the Fund and the Italian commitment towards a fairer world for all, and for an universal access to health which shall include young people, women, girls and especially the most marginalized and vulnerable populations.”235,236

On 7 April 2017, Italy delivered their pledge to the Global Fund and further increased it to EUR140 million, for a final 40 percent increase.237

Italy has been steadfast in its financial initiatives to contribute to various global health organizations — mainly to Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance.238 Gavi is an alliance of multiple governments, corporations and private donors who have a mission to “[save] children’s lives and [protect] people’s health by increasing equitable use of vaccines in lower-income countries.”239 Many of Gavi’s initiatives are specifically targeted towards vaccine research and development in AIDS and malaria. Because tuberculosis already has good vaccines, Gavi does not focus on it — therefore, Italy’s contributions to Gavi are strictly for malaria and AIDS.

In December 2016, Italy pledged an increased commitment for the 2016–2020 Gavi pledge cycle of a total of USD465.5 million, accounting for 5.4% of the USD9.2 billion goal from all donor contributions.\(^{240,241}\)

Thus, Italy receives a score of +1 due to its 40% increase to the Global Fund, and its independent endeavors with Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance, in the global fight against infectious diseases.

*Analyst: Avinash Makkala*

**Japan: +1**

Japan has fully complied with its commitment to support the Global Fund in fighting HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria.

Overall, Japan is the fifth largest contributor to the fund.\(^{242}\) With its contribution to the fifth replenishment of the fund, Japan has made a pledge of USD800 million, and has a contribution as of 31 December 2016 of USD658,494,573.\(^{243}\)

Japan has also been involved in strengthening and advancing other initiatives towards fighting the three diseases targeted by the Global Fund. The Global Health Innovative Technology Fund (GHTF), launched in Japan in 2013, aims to collaborate between Japanese and international research and development entities in streamlining drug development to fight infectious diseases.\(^{244}\) In March 2016, the fund had risen to USD96 million in investment towards research and development using Japanese innovation.\(^{245}\)

Japan has continued its flagship program for African development. In August 2016, the Sixth Tokyo International Conference on African Development was held. One of the main aspects of the conference was the World Bank and Global Fund’s commitment to investing USD24 billion into Africa over the next three to five years, targeting universal health coverage to fight infectious diseases.\(^{246}\)

The Government of Japan has also collaborated with the World Bank, the World Health Organization, the Japan International Cooperation Agency, the Global Fund, and the African Development Bank to launch “UHC in Africa: A Framework for Action,” a report summarizing universal health care in the region, and outlining “key areas critical to achieving better health outcomes, such as financing, service delivery, targeting

---


vulnerable populations, mobilizing critical sectors and political leadership.\textsuperscript{247} Japan will also hold a higher-level annual meeting sometime in 2017 to monitor the progress of universal health care (UHC) in Africa.\textsuperscript{248}

The Government of Japan and the World Bank Group also recently launched Pandemic Emergency Financing Facility, a global financing mechanism designed to protect the world against deadly pandemics.\textsuperscript{249} This initiative involves the creation of the first-ever insurance market for pandemic risk, providing enhanced preparation for pandemics and health security.

On 22 December 2016, Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe announced that the Japanese government would be providing USD330 million to Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance.

In sum, Japan has both contributed to the Global Fund and cooperated with partners to move forwards in the minimization and eradication of HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria in general. As such, Japan receives a score of +1.

Analyst: Nicole Mahadeo

United Kingdom: 0

The United Kingdom has partially complied with its commitment to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. The UK has provided generous support to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, but does not appear to have taken new actions in partnership with other organizations to fight these diseases.

On 16 September 2016, the British Government pledged GBP1.1 billion to the Global Fund.\textsuperscript{250} This is a three-year pledge, with GBP366 million to be provided each year.\textsuperscript{251} As a result of this contribution, the Global Fund will be able to buy an estimated 40 million bed nets for the prevention of malaria, provide antiretroviral therapy for 1.3 million people with HIV, and treat 800,000 people with tuberculosis.\textsuperscript{252} The pledge was made by the British delegation participating in the Global Fund’s Fifth Replenishment Conference.\textsuperscript{253} The UK emphasized the need for program evaluation in its statement, noting that it would withhold 10 percent of the funds if the action taken does not achieve satisfactory results.\textsuperscript{254} The British government also


noted that it “will also use a proportion of its investment to leverage up to £100 million from the private sector to specifically to target malaria.”\textsuperscript{255}

The UK has taken actions outside of the compliance period to partner with other organizations to fight AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. However, it has not committed new funding in partnership with other organizations since the Ise-Shima Summit.

Historically, the UK has worked with other organizations like the previously mentioned Gates Foundation to create change in the field of infectious diseases. Although there has been little change to the UK’s HIV programs, the British government has continuously supported the Community HIV/AIDS Prevention Strategy, and funded needle and syringe programmes.\textsuperscript{256}

On 25 January 2016, a joint announcement by UK Chancellor of the Exchequer George Osborne, former International Development Minister Justine Greening, and Bill Gates committed GBP3 billion to combat malaria.\textsuperscript{257} The British government’s portion of this contribution was pledged for a five year period, with GBP500 million to be donated annually.\textsuperscript{258}

On 2 October 2016, the media reported that an individual with HIV who was treated with a new therapy in the Research in Viral Eradication of HIV Reservoirs (RIVERS) trial had no indicators of the virus in his blood following the “kick and kill” treatment.\textsuperscript{259} The trial’s goal is to not only kill active HIV cells, but dormant ones as well. This trial, which will not release full results until 2018, has been funded by the UK government through the National Health Service and the National Institute for Health Research, in cooperation with universities like Oxford and Cambridge.\textsuperscript{260}

The UK has contributed to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria, but has not generated new partnerships with other organizations to combat these diseases during the compliance period. For this reason, the UK receives a score of 0.

\textit{Analyst: Jerry Liu}

\textbf{United States: +1}

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to make an effort to eradicate HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria through the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, and to engage with other organizations to combat these diseases.

The United States is the largest donor to the Global Fund.\textsuperscript{261} On 15 September 2016, US Ambassador to Canada Bruce Heyman pledged that it would donate USD1 dollar for every USD2 dollars donated by other

donors, up to a sum of USD4.3 billion to the Global Fund, subject to Congressional approval.262 This pledge is 7 per cent larger than the US pledge for the Global Fund’s Fourth Replenishment Conference, and has a projected impact of USD96.7 billion in economic gains, 2.7 million lives saved, and 100 million new HIV, tuberculosis, and malaria infections averted.263 Between 16 and 17 September 2016, a delegation from the US participated in the Global Fund’s Fifth Replenishment Conference in Montreal.264

In addition to pledging to the Global Fund, the US has also partnered with other organizations to help combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis (TB) and malaria.

The US has made key contributions to the fight against HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria through programs including the US President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), the International AIDS Vaccine Initiative (IAVI), the President’s Malaria Initiative (PMI), the Global Drug Facility of the Stop TB Partnership, and the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS).265 These organizations help with combating diseases and developing relevant vaccines and drugs.

On 9 August 2016, IAVI announced that the US National Institutes of Health would be contributing up to USD98 million to the program for the purpose of speeding up the development of an AIDS vaccine.266 IAVI noted that it “will provide a range of product development services to advance the characterization and manufacturing of HIV envelope protein immunogens” designed by scientists supported by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases.267

In August and September 2016, the US coordinated with the government of Zimbabwe and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria to provide Zimbabweans with 1,785,000 long-lasting insecticidal nets to prevent the spread of malaria.268

On 23 September 2016, USAID announced the creation of the USAID Central Asia HIV flagship project, which “aims to decrease the number of HIV infections and HIV-related deaths in Central Asian countries including Tajikistan. The project will support HIV prevention, care, and treatment services in alignment with the United Nations program on HIV/AIDS 90-90-90 goals: by 2020, 90% of all people living with HIV will know their HIV status, 90% of all people with diagnosed HIV infection will receive sustained antiretroviral therapy, and 90% of all people receiving antiretroviral therapy will have viral suppression.”269 This project will

---

be funded by PEPFAR,\(^{270}\) which was launched in 2003, and is the United States’ commitment to the global fight against the HIV/AIDS epidemic. PEPFAR is responsible for building more secure families and helping stabilize fragile nations.\(^{271}\) A collaboration between PEPFAR and the Global Fund will serve to improve the investment and programmatic impact through more strategic use of resources and more efficient use of funds.\(^{272}\) The US Government has contributed an estimated total of more than USD70 Billion to the bilateral HIV/AIDS programs, the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, and bilateral tuberculosis programs from the 2014 fiscal year to the 2017 fiscal year.\(^{273}\)

On 3 November 2016, the US President’s Malaria Initiative donated USD18 million “to support early diagnosis and treatment of Malaria in pregnancy (MIP), while covering the cost of the current cure of malaria” in Rwanda.\(^{274}\)

On 24 March 2017, US Ambassador to Uzbekistan Pamela L. Spratlen spent World TB Day visiting the Kashkadarya Regional Tuberculosis Dispensary. The announcement, which was made by USAID, confirmed that both the US and Uzbekistan are committed “to eradicate TB through successful implementation of the World Health Organization’s End TB Strategy.”\(^{275}\)

On 16 March 2017, the administration of new President Donald Trump released their proposed budget, entitled, “America First: A Budget Blueprint to Make America Great Again.”\(^{276}\) Although it aims to decrease levels of funding for the UN and development banks, it does maintain global health initiatives such as PEPFAR, PMI, and the Global Fund contribution pledge for 2017.\(^{277}\)

The US has also taken action to combat these illnesses outside of the compliance period.

For example, during the Gavi pledging conference held in January 2015, the United States pledged USD1 billion, subject to congressional approval, for the 2015-2018 period.\(^{278}\) This includes a contribution for 2016 of USD235 million, which is the US’s largest contribution to the Vaccine Alliance to date.\(^{279}\) GAVI is an international organization and public-private partnership that aims to improve access to vaccines and immunizations in lower-income countries.\(^{280}\) The coalition includes both national and international


governments, public health and research institutions, the private sector, and philanthropic institutions.\textsuperscript{281} The United States is one of six donor countries that makes contributions directly to the Vaccine Alliance.

In conclusion, the US has made an effort to eradicate HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria by working with the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria in addition to other organizations. Therefore, the US has been awarded a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Siya Khanna}

\textbf{European Union: 0}

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to eradicate HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria in partnership with the Global Fund to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria and other partner organizations.

Between 16 and 17 September 2016, representatives from the European Commission participated in the Fifth Replenishment Conference of the Global Fund.\textsuperscript{282} In a statement made at the conference, the European Commission noted that the international community "need[s] to collaborate better with the other Global Health Initiatives, notably GAVI."\textsuperscript{283} The European Commission had already announced that they would be making a contribution of EUR470 million in March 2016, prior to the beginning of the compliance period.\textsuperscript{284}

On 19 September 2016, the European Commission increased this commitment by EUR5 million, bringing its overall pledge to a total of EUR475 million at the Fifth Replenishment Conference of the Global Fund. This additional funding is a EUR100 million increase from its previous commitment, and will cover the 2017-19.\textsuperscript{285}

The EU has also made additional contributions independently and in partnership with other organizations to combat these diseases outside of the compliance period.

For example, in 2012, the EU announced funding for new tuberculosis treatments through the Innovative Medicine Initiatives (IMI), a public-private partnership between the EU and the European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations (EFPIA).\textsuperscript{286} In particular, EUR14.8 million will be given to the PREDICT-TB\textsuperscript{287} project, which aims to enhance the diagnostic measures currently present for tuberculosis.


The project is under the EU’s Seventh Framework Programme, currently set at Horizon 2020. There are 19 participants in the project, including the Health Protection Agency and the UK.288

On 14 January 2016, the EU Commission and the EU’s Joint Action on HIV and Co-infection Prevention and Harm Reduction began “A three-year project to address the gaps in the prevention of HIV, tuberculosis (TB) and viral hepatitis.”289

On 28 January 2016, European Commissioner for Research, Science and Innovation Carlos Moedas announced that the EU would be making a EUR20 million loan to the company Transgene SA through the InnovFin Infectious Diseases Facility. This loan was provided to develop treatments for hepatitis, cancer, and tuberculosis.290

Although the EU has contributed significantly to the Global Fund, it has not partnered with other organizations to fight these diseases during the compliance period. As such, the EU is awarded a score of 0.

Analyst: Amna Zulfiqar

---

4. Health: Global Health Security Agenda

“[Recent outbreaks of Ebola and Zika underscore the imperative to improve prevention of, detection of and response to public health emergencies, whether naturally occurring, deliberate or accidental.] In that respect, we remain committed to advancing compliance with the WHO’s IHR [International Health Regulations] objectives including through the Global Health Security Agenda (GHSA).”

G7 Ise-Shima 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></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

The legally binding International Health Regulations (IHR) entered into force in June 2007, and comprise a legal framework geared at enhancing global public health security through the management of “collective defences to detect disease events and to respond to public health risks and emergencies that can have devastating impacts on human health.” In particular, the IHR “define the rights and obligations of countries to report public health events, and establish a number of procedures that WHO [World Health Organization] must follow in its work to uphold global public health security.” The consensus includes all WHO member states. Specifically, the framework calls on countries to meet criteria for “national health surveillance and response capacities” and to inform WHO of evidence for international disease spread risks.

Enhanced preparedness for and prevention of public health emergencies is a critical feature of global health security given recent infectious disease outbreaks. Yet, according to WHO, the Ebola crisis revealed a serious failure by states to properly implement the IHR. For this reason, an IHR Review Committee noted the need “to move from exclusive self-evaluation to approaches that combine self-evaluation, peer review and voluntary external evaluations involving a combination of domestic and independent experts.” As a result,

---
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WHO called for a move away from state self-assessment of implementation and introduced the Joint External Evaluation (JEE) tool in 2016. The Global Health Security Agenda (GHSA) helped to develop the JEE.

The GHSA is a partnership of countries, international organizations, and non-governmental stakeholders that was initiated in February 2014 to establish concrete commitments to achieve global health security and combat infectious disease threats. The GHSA recognizes the critical need for multilateral and multi-sectoral collaboration to prevent, detect, respond to, and recover from infectious disease threats to promote global health security. The US notes that the “GHSA accelerates action and spurs progress toward implementation of the World Health Organization’s International Health Regulations and other global health security frameworks.” It also emphasizes the need for assessments of national health capacity in prevention of and preparedness for public health threats.

Thus, the JEE tool is a comprehensive assessment tool for WHO’s 2005 IHR and GHSA-related capacities with measurable targets in preventing, detecting, and responding to public health threats.

Global health governance has been on the G7 agenda since the first commitment regarding health research on infectious disease at the 1996 Lyon Summit with increasingly broad efforts in global health security. The G7 Ise-Shima Summit Agenda includes comprehensive approaches to health and public health emergencies, identifying “the pursuit of universal health coverage … to ensure that all people have access to the health services they need without suffering financial hardship to pay for them.” The G7 Ise-Shima Summit Vision for Global Health recognizes that health system strengthening and comprehensive multi-sectoral approaches promote better preparedness for public health emergencies.

The G7 Health Ministers’ Meeting on 11-12 September 2016 produced the Kobe Communiqué reaffirming commitments regarding public health emergencies. Given the recent Zika and Ebola outbreaks, the ministers stated that “global health security remains high on the international agenda.” Thus, the G7 Ise-Shima Vision for Global Health states, “outbreaks of Ebola and Zika underscore the imperative to improve

---

prevention of, detection of and response to public health emergencies, whether naturally occurring, deliberate or accidental.”

Commitment Features
The commitment puts forward strategies for the prevention of, response to, and recovery from public health emergencies. The key target of the commitment is the advancement of WHO’s IHR objectives, including those effected through the GHSA. The commitment thus requires that G7 states take action in two areas to be considered to be in full compliance: 1) advancing WHO’s IHR objectives in general; and 2) advancing WHO’s IHR objectives through the GHSA specifically.

WHO notes that the implementation of the IHR requires states to: 1) “develop and strengthen specific national public health capacities”; 2) “identify priority areas for action”; 3) “develop national IHR implementation plans”; and 4) “maintain these capacities and continue to build and strengthen as needed over time.”

In order to help other states achieve these goals, the G7 Vision for Global Health includes a clear commitment to offer concrete assistance to support the development of partners’ national plans in coordination with relevant organizations including WHO. If G7 members take action to help countries develop such plans, it can be seen as an effort to meet WHO’s IHR objectives.

In order to achieve compliance with the G7’s commitment to advancing IHR objectives through the GHSA, G7 members must: 1) “assist these partners to achieve the common and measurable targets of the … JEE tool”; and 2) undergo their own assessments using the JEE tool, and share these evaluations through projects like the Strategic Partnership Portal.

Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member takes little to no action to advance compliance with WHO’s IHR objectives, including little to no action through the GHSA OR takes no action to advance WHO’s IHR objectives, including no action through the GHSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member takes action to advance compliance with WHO’s IHR objectives, but has not done so through the GHSA OR takes action to advance IHR objectives through the GHSA but not through any other means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member takes robust action to advance compliance with WHO’s IHR objectives, including through the GHSA AND other means.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada: +1
Canada has fully complied with its commitment to support the World Health Organization’s (WHO) International Health Regulations (IHR), including through the Global Health Security Agenda.

Between 15 — 17 May 2016, the Public Health Agency of Canada held a conference in Ottawa in order to develop a federal network on Lyme disease. The aim of this conference was to build a framework that will focus on prevention and reduction of Lyme disease-related health risk to the population.

On 22 May 2016, Minister of Health Jane Philpott chaired the Commonwealth Health Ministers’ Meeting and led Canada’s delegation to the 69th World Health Assembly (WHA) in Geneva, Switzerland. The

---
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meeting focused on two important global health challenges: first, universal health coverage “to improve access to and quality health care globally,” and second, health security that is “the capacity of all countries to preserve and protect the health of the population.”

On 11-12 September 2016, Canada participated in the Health Ministers’ Meeting held in Kobe, Japan. Minister of Health Jane Philpott and Chief Public Health Officer Dr. Gregory Taylor shared Canada’s approach with health leaders from G7 countries, WHO and other international organizations to take concrete actions to advance global health with a focus on “improving global capacity to respond to public health emergencies, combat antimicrobial resistance, encourage research and development, and build sustainable health systems.”

On 23 September 2016, Minister of Foreign Affairs Stéphane Dion announced that Canada will contribute CAD2.3 million to the International Atomic Energy Agency’s (IAEA) Renovation of the Nuclear Applications Laboratories ReNuAL project. Dion stated that “Canada supports the IAEA’s important scientific and technical work and its efforts to promote the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Our contribution to the IAEA ReNuAL project will help to advance important objectives related to the Global Health Security Agenda and ensure that nuclear technologies are used in a safe and secure manner that does not contribute to the threat of nuclear proliferation.”

On 17 November 2016, Minister of Health Jane Philpott and Minister of International Development and La Francophonie Marie-Claude Bibeau announced that Canada is backing its commitment of a CAD9 million investment to WHO to assist the comprehensive global approach to fighting Antimicrobial (Resistance AMR).

On 17 January 2017, Minister of Health Jane Philpott took part in the Health Policy Forum on the Future of Health held by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development in Paris, France including health ministers, policy makers, health system experts and stakeholders to discuss patient-centered care in global health systems. Philpott emphasized the role of the social determinants of health and stated that “with persisting health inequalities and emerging health threats, countries around the world, including Canada, need to find ways to make the delivery of high-quality health care more efficient and ensure that our investments in health systems improve patient health.”

On 24 February 2017, Dr. Siddika Mithani, President, Public Health Agency of Canada, on behalf of the Honourable Jane Philpott, Minister of Health, Canada represented Canada at the Seventeenth Ministerial Meeting of the Global Health Security Initiative held in Brussels also joined by ministers from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Mexico, United Kingdom, the United States and European Commission in Brussels to

discuss emerging concerns around health security, to look for collective action across different sectors to preserve and safeguard the population, and to reinforce health security on a global scale.³¹⁹

On 15 March 2017, The Government of Canada in partnership with Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) members held the ASEAN-Canada Global Partnership Program Forum in Vientiane, to discuss the cooperation among ASEAN nations on the need to strengthen the capacity of laboratories for dangerous and emerging pathogens thus reinforcing the bio-security and bio-safety, disease surveillance, and the capacity for regional inter-connectivity and building the ASEAN Emergency Operations Center network.³²⁰

Canada has also taken steps since the Ise-Shima Summit to advance IHR objectives through the GHSA. Canada is a member of the JEE Alliance,³²¹ and, on 29 June 2016, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau announced at the North American Leaders’ Summit that the country “plans to undertake a JEE in 2018.”³²² By scheduling a time to implement the JEE evaluation, the state has demonstrated its intent to fulfill its commitment.

Thus, Canada has been awarded a score of +1 for taking action to advance WHO’s IHR objectives, including through the GHSA.

**Analyst: Diva Turial**

**France: 0**

France has partially complied with its commitment to advance compliance with the World Health Organization’s (WHO) International Health Regulations (IHR) objectives, including through the Global Health Security Agenda (GHSA).

On 23 May 2016, France announced that it would donate EUR10 million to the Muskoka Fund, with the specific purpose to improve, “the sexual and reproductive health of teens and young people,” “nutrition and… healthcare systems.”³²³ The Muskoka Fund is a joint program operated by four United Nations agencies (WHO, UNFPA, UN WOMEN and UNICEF) with the specific purpose of ameliorating women’s health worldwide.³²⁴

In September 2016, André Vallini, Minister of State in charge of Development and Francophonie, represented France at the Fifth Replenishment Conference of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. Vallini reaffirmed France’s strong commitment to the Global Fund and reiterated President Hollande’s pledge to donate EUR1.08 billion over three years (2017-2019). This equates to EUR360 million per year.³²⁵

---


In October 2016, France adopted a concerted strategy to cope with “issues of population and sexual and reproductive health and rights.” France’s “External Action on the Issues of Population and Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights 2016-2020” outlines France’s response to the projection that the world population will reach 8.5 billion by 2030. Recognizing the potential health issues associated with a rapidly growing population, France affirms its intention to undertake a “rights-based approach” to sexual and reproductive health, with a particular emphasis on regions “where health and demographic challenges are more significant, namely West and Central Africa.”

On 1 December 2016, France renewed its commitment to the Global Fund by pledging EUR1.08 billion over the following three years. On 15 February 2017, Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Development, Jean-Marc Ayrault, reaffirmed this commitment to remain in line with France’s global health objectives.

In terms of advancing the WHO’s IHR objectives through the GSHA, France has not used the Strategic Partnership Portal (SPP) or any other assessment tool to reduce fragmentation. According to the SPP, France has not contributed any funding to the IHR core capacities since 2014. In addition, France has failed to utilize the Joint External Evaluation (JEE), a tool used to evaluate compliance with the GSHA.

In sum, while France has contributed to advancing the WHO’s IHR objectives, it has not committed to undergoing, sharing, and promoting evaluations through the JEE. Thus, France has received a score of 0 for partially complying to advance the WHO’s IHR objectives.

**Analyst: Ambika Varma**

**Germany: 0**

Germany has complied with its commitment to implement the International Health Regulations (IHR) set by the World Health Organization (WHO), but has not taken substantive action through the Global Health Security Agenda (GSHA).

Since 2013, the German Partnership Programme of Excellence in Biological Health and Security has helped partner countries in Africa, Central Asia, South America, and Eastern Europe strengthen their response to biological security risks, such as infectious diseases. The program had a budget of EUR25 million between

---

2013 and 2016, and an extended budget of EUR18 million for 2017-2019.\(^{334}\) This main use of this financial aid is to “recognise outbreaks of dangerous and highly contagious diseases, reduce infection and swiftly identify and eliminate the causes.”\(^{335}\)

From 1 November to 10 November 2016, laboratory professionals in Mali used equipment donated by the Germany to prepare for epidemic and biological attacks. Additionally, Germany has extended help to the G5 Sahel states of Burkina Faso, Mauritania, Niger, and Chad to improve “protection from cross-border biological dangers — whether caused by natural outbreaks of disease or by the use of biological pathogens.”\(^{336}\)

On 21 July 2016, German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier announced that German experts from the Bernhard Noch Institute for Tropical Medicine and the Robert Koch Institute, known as the European Medical Corps, have been deployed to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, where they will take action to “react effectively to future epidemics.”\(^{337}\)

On 22 February 2017, at the Third International German Forum, Chancellor Angela Merkel emphasized the continued importance of the threat imposed by infectious diseases during Germany’s G20 Presidency.\(^{338}\) The two-day Forum aimed to strengthen international cooperation and emphasized the importance of inter-sectoral, interdisciplinary and international approaches to global health. The Forum focused on opportunities related to information and communication technology in the health sector, antibiotic use, and neglected tropical diseases.\(^{339}\)

While Germany has thus evidently been supportive of the general goals of the IHR, no information about Germany’s use or encouragement of the Joint External Evaluation tool appears to have been published.

Germany’s adherence to the IHR commitments has been demonstrated by its crucial role in encouraging biological security in partner countries, though not through the GHSA; thus, Germany has been awarded a score of 0 for taking action to advance the WHO’s IHR objectives.

*Analyst: Jainetri Merchant*

**Italy: 0**

Italy has partially complied with its commitment to advance the World Health Organization’s (WHO) International Health Regulation (IHR) objectives, and to advance the WHO’s IHR objective through the Global Health Security Agenda (GHSA) specifically.

---


On 19 January 2017 Italian Prime Minister Paolo Gentiloni signed the National Prevention Vaccine Plan (Piano Nazionale Prevenzione Vaccinale [PNPV]) into action. The PNPV strengthened special national health capacities by ensuring access to health services, and increasing the availability of free vaccines with a special focus on groups of the population that are hard to reach and have low vaccination coverage. Lorenzin announced this was a crucial step towards prevention of future health care risks.

Italy has also taken the initiative to report outbreaks of disease within its borders. On 24 January 2017, Italy detected an outbreak of the H5N8 virus on Venetian farms, and subsequently reported it to the European Commission. The reporting of this outbreak meets the IHR objective of reporting public health events.

From a more international perspective, in June 2016, Italy pledged EUR130 million to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria for the three-year period beginning in 2017. Italian Under-secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, Benedetto Della Vedova, emphasized that, “these three epidemics are a cause and a consequence of poverty.”

Furthermore, on 26 October 2016 the Italian government provided financial assistance to Ukraine in order to develop a sustainable health care system which provides life-saving health services. The assistance was contributed via WHO, and totalled up to USD250,000.

On 7 April 2017, Italy contributed EUR140 million to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria for a three-year period. The Director General for the Italian Foreign Ministry’s Development Cooperation, Pietro Sebastiani, stated that “the Italian Government, together with the Global Fund, is firmly committed to reach the objective of a humanity free from AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. Our contribution for 2017-2019, the highest of the Italian Development Cooperation through the multilateral channel, confirms our steadfast support to the Global Fund and its mission.”

While Italy has worked towards the objectives of the IHR and is a member of GHSA, it has not taken any publicized actions to support the Joint External Evaluation tool.

---

As such, Italy is awarded a score of 0 for its broad commitment to the IHR as set forth by WHO, but not necessarily through the GHSA.

**Analyst: Sommeyah Awan**

### Japan: 0

Japan has fully complied with its commitment to following the World Health Organization’s (WHO) International Health Regulations (IHR) through the Global Health Security Agenda (GHSA).

At the United Nations General Assembly on 19 September 2016, the Minister of Health, Labour, and Welfare H.E. Mr. Yasuhide Shiozaki stated, on behalf of Prime Minister Shinzo Abe, that Japan intends to provide ongoing “support for … WHO’s emergency response reform.” In addition, the minister professed his country’s dedication to the promotion of universal health coverage (UHC) to “prevent and prepare against future emergencies.” Shiozaki finally discussed Japan’s leadership in providing financial support to the World Bank’s Pandemic Emergency Financing Facility (PEF) during the Ebola crisis, and Japan’s continued commitment to this fund in order to combat global health emergencies.

On 27 August 2016 at the Sixth Tokyo International Conference on African Development (TICAD VI) in Kenya, Prime Minister Abe outlined Japan’s commitment to improving healthcare throughout the African continent. Abe referenced the dire effect of Ebola and the need to take a two-pronged approach to combatting infectious disease in the future, “to have preparedness in the local areas, and for the entire international community to confront it.” Abe also committed to bolstering healthcare infrastructure by fostering “experts and policy professionals that will combat infectious diseases, for a total of 20 thousand people over 3 years” and by contributing USD500 million through the World Bank and Global Fund to aid African infectious disease prevention. Finally, Abe emphasized the importance of UHC and asserted Japan’s intention to “select countries to serve as models and provide assistance intensively to those model countries” in order to “increase the population benefiting from fundamental health services by 2 million people over the next 3 years.”

On 20 March 2017, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe held a Japan-France summit meeting with France’s President François Hollande and confirmed the intention to promote their bilateral cooperation in Africa with an emphasis on sustainable development, health and security.

While Japan has been supportive of the general goals of the IHR, no information about Japan’s use or encouragement of the Joint External Evaluation tool appears to have been published.

Thus, Japan has been awarded a score of 0 for its continued commitment to the IHR as set forth by WHO, but not necessarily through the GHSA.

---

United Kingdom: +1

The United Kingdom has fully complied with the commitment to advance the World Health Organization’s (WHO) International Health Regulations (IHR) objectives, including through the Global Health Security Agenda (GHSA).

The UK showed concrete commitment to furthering the IHR’s objectives by investing GBP112 million in clinical research facilities on 18 November 2016. According to Minister for Public Health and Innovation Nicola Blackwood, “We want to help other nations across the world with our gold standard science and research.” The UK government has also launched a GBP60 million call for research in global health. The money will be awarded to select institutions across the UK in April 2017.

Minister Nicola Blackwood recognized the global effect of epidemics when she asserted, “The sobering reality is that infectious diseases do not respect borders; this was made all too clear during the outbreaks of Ebola and Zika.” On 18 November 2016, the UK launched a new vaccine fund of GBP120 million to aid researchers in finding vaccines for diseases such as Ebola and Zika. Additionally, the government is allowing select researchers to compete for two separate awards of GBP60 million, making the UK the second largest investor in global health worldwide. Moreover, the UK is also supporting four projects with a contribution of GBP2.4 million to create vaccines for diseases that are related to bioterror, such as plague and Q fever.

On 1 November 2016, the UK government committed GBP20 million to the UK Public Health Rapid Support Team. This newly formed team will respond to countries around the world to control disease outbreaks within 48 hours. The team includes expert epidemiologists, microbiologists, infection prevention and control personnel, clinical researchers, and social scientists. The team will also work with foreign counterparts to train local authorities in controlling and preventing infectious disease abroad. Chief

---

Executive of Public Health Duncan Selbie said, “Speed is key in tackling infectious disease and with this new capability, we can now deploy specialists anywhere in the world within 48 hours, saving and protecting lives where an outbreak starts and helping to keep the UK safe at home.”367 The new team complies with IHR objectives to develop national IHR implementation plans and to develop specific national public health capacities.

On 23 January 2017, the Department of Health opened a competition to support the clinical development of vaccines against infectious diseases through a competition for academic, industry and government bodies with total funding of up to GPB35 million.368 The Small Business Research Initiative closed in April 2017 for projects lasting 24 to 36 months each valued up to GPB3 million. The Medical Research Council, funded by the Department of Health, has also contributed EUR26 million to The Native Antigen Company to develop a distinctive test for the Zika virus.369

In addition to taking substantive steps to advance WHO’s IHR objectives, the UK also served as the volunteer to pilot the GHSA’s Joint External Evaluation (JEE) tool in August 2015.370 While the JEE tool has not been subsequently used to assess the success of UK health security initiatives following the Ise-Shima Summit, the United Kingdom, as the first country to subject itself to assessment through the JEE tool, serves as an example for other countries.

Thus, the United Kingdom has been awarded a score of +1 for taking clear action to advance WHO’s IHR objectives, including through GHSA.

**Analyst: Ambika Varma**

**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to advance the World Health Organization’s (WHO) International Health Regulations (IHR) objectives, both through the Global Health Security Agenda (GHSA) as well as through external means.

The US has engaged in multi-sectoral efforts to achieve the WHO’s IHR objectives.371 This concerted effort to develop and strengthen national public health capacities has involved the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the US Department of Agriculture (USDA), the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the Department of Defense (DoD), the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and other relevant authorities.372

---


Since the launch of the GHSA in 2014, the United States has stood by its 2015 commitment to provide USD1 billion in funding to 17 at-risk nations.\textsuperscript{373} In addition, the United States has partnered with 30 other countries to facilitate partnerships and design roadmaps to achieve the GHSA targets.\textsuperscript{374} These 30 countries include: Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cote d’Ivoire, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Georgia, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Laos, Liberia, Mali, Mozambique, Pakistan, Peru, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda, Ukraine, and Vietnam.\textsuperscript{375,376}

The US is also one of the ten countries that constitute the GHSA Steering Group, which invests in the building of healthcare system capacities and the enhancement of coordination and commitment for countries, international organizations, and civil society to work together to achieve specific GHSA targets.\textsuperscript{377} Since the Ise-Shima Summit, the US has also maintained a strong working relationship with its nongovernmental sector (NGS) to aid in the implementation of the GHSA.\textsuperscript{378}

On November 4, 2016, President Barack Obama reaffirmed United States commitment to the GHSA by signing an Executive Order establishing long-term policy objectives for the United States to build upon, strengthen, and institutionalize its major goals.\textsuperscript{379} Specifically, the Executive Order established the senior level policy coordination mechanism for the government to support the GHSA initiative and defined specific roles and responsibilities for participating agencies.\textsuperscript{380}

In order to monitor its commitments to the IHR and GHSA objectives, the US supports the Joint External Evaluation (JEE) and its targets.\textsuperscript{381} In 2016, the United States became the sixth country to undergo and


publish a JEE for IHR implementation on the Strategic Partnership Portal.382 In addition, the United States plays an active role in providing technical and financial resources to implement JEE assessments in countries around the world.383

Thus, the United States has fully complied with its IHR-related commitments, and receives a score of +1.

Analyst: Sabrina Lin

**European Union: 0**

The European Union has partially fulfilled its commitment to advancing the World Health Organization’s (WHO) International Health Regulations (IHR) objectives, including through the Global Health Security Agenda (GHSA).

In September 2016, the EU increased its donation to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. At the Global Fund’s Fifth Replenishment Conference in Montreal (17-19 September), Neven Mimica, Commissioner for Development and Cooperation, pledged an additional EUR5 million to the fund. This sum, combined with the EU’s previous commitment made in March 2016, brings the European Union’s total financial contribution to EUR475 for 2016.384 The EU and its member states have been the largest contribution to the Global Fund since its creation in 2002.385

In October 2016, the EU invested EUR45 million through its Horizon 2020 programme to combat the Zika virus and other mosquito-transmitted diseases.386 Horizon 2020 is the EU’s largest and most comprehensive Research and Innovation programme, launched in 2014. The European Commission asserts that, “By coupling research and innovation, Horizon 2020 is helping to achieve this [an investment in our future] with its emphasis on excellent science, industrial leadership and tackling societal challenges.”387 The overarching goal of the programme is to “ensure [that] Europe produces world-class science, removes barriers to innovation and makes it easier for the public and private sectors to work together in delivering innovation.”388 Due to this emphasis on research and innovation, the EUR45 million will be used to support research on treatments, diagnostics and vaccines, and more conclusive risk assessment for these mosquito-borne diseases.389

---


The European Union is an advisory partner to GHSA, as such it is slightly unclear to what extent the Joint External Evaluation (JEE) tool could be applied to the EU.\textsuperscript{390} At this point, the EU has not completed a GHSA assessment, therefore, the JEE tool has not been used to assess the success of EU health security initiatives.

Overall, the EU contributed a significant amount to the increase of global health research and innovation, but did not do so through the GHSA tools. Thus, the European Union receives a score of 0.

\textit{Analyst: Ambika Varma}

5. Climate Change: Montreal Protocol Amendment

“We support adoption of an ambitious Montreal Protocol HFC [hydrofluorocarbon] phase-down amendment in 2016, and intend to provide additional support through the Multilateral Fund following adoption of an amendment for its implementation.”

G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration

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

Background

The ozone layer is a region of the Earth’s lower stratosphere composed of ozone, a substance with the chemical formula O₃. First discovered in 1913 by two French physicists, the ozone layer absorbs the vast majority (up to 99%) of ultraviolet (UV) radiation as it enters our atmosphere. Thus, it protects humans and other life forms from exposure to the sun’s potentially damaging UV rays, which could otherwise cause physical and genetic damage to human skin, and facilitate cancer and premature aging.

The ozone layer is thus of vital importance to sustaining life on Earth. However, it has also been depleting steadily for years, as was first announced in a paper that appeared in Nature in May 1985. This is, in large part, due to the marked increase in atmospheric concentrations of chlorine and bromine — free radical catalysts that are classified as ozone-depleting substances (ODSs). Although they can be released naturally, they primarily arise when synthetic organohalogen compounds like chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) are emitted through human activities, rise to the stratosphere, and are broken into radicals by incoming UV light. Given that a single of these radicals can break down over 100,000 ozone molecules, and that increased amounts of them have been released in recent decades, it is not surprising that the ozone layer has dropped by about four percent since the late 1970s overall worldwide, with certain regions seeing much larger declines (described as ozone holes).

---

This depletion does not appear to be set to continue in the future. Efforts to enact CFC bans have been in place since the late 1970s. In 2003, scientists reported that the global depletion of the ozone layer appeared to be slowing down because of such efforts. More recently, in 2016, it was reported that there is, in fact, now a global trend towards “healing” observable in the case of the ozone layer. It is estimated that the world will be able to return to 1980s levels by the middle of the twenty-first century, largely because all of the world’s 197 countries have signed the treaty to ban CFC production in first developed countries and later developing countries. One of the international treaties perhaps most instrumental to phasing out ODSs was the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. This agreement, which was originally signed in 1987, has since been amended several times to phase out further ozone-depleting and climate-altering substances (CFCs, halons, carbon tetrachloride, methyl chloroform, HCFCs, methyl bromide and bromochloromethane), as has become necessary over time.

In order to ensure that the international community continues progressing well towards the preservation of the ozone layer, it is important to keep ozone- and climate-change-related discussions at the forefront of international communication, and to continue updating agreements like the Montreal Protocol. To this end, an amendment to the Montreal Protocol geared at reducing use of hydrofluorcarbons (HFCs) has been proposed by the international community. HFCs are greenhouse gases that can be hundreds to thousands of times more potent than carbon dioxide (CO₂) in contributing to climate change. At present, they represent only a very minor fraction of greenhouse gases, but their emissions are projected to increase up to 30-fold in the near future as developing countries began to demand certain products and services, to the point where HFC emissions, if not controlled, could detract significantly — and even potentially reverse — the benefits achieved by the Montreal Protocol thus far.

The Montreal Protocol HFC phase-down amendment referred to in this commitment is a response to this reality. Overall, this amendment is projected to assist the world in avoiding up to 0.5°C in warming by the end of the century. On 15 October 2016, all 197 countries adopted this amendment, committing to cut production and consumption of HFCs by more than 80 percent in the coming 30 years. Developed countries will be the first to reduce HFC consumption, beginning in 2019; most developing countries will follow by 2024.

**Commitment Features**

This commitment has several features. First, this commitment calls upon G7 members to “support adoption” of the Montreal Protocol HFC phase-down amendment. According to Article 9 of the Vienna Convention

---


for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, the process for the amendment of the Convention or its protocols first requires that it be “adopted at a meeting of the Parties to the protocol in question.” Following adoption, the amendment must be accepted, approved, or ratified. This indicates that the process of adoption is separate from that of ratification. Indeed, according to the United Nations Treaty Collection, the term adoption refers to “the formal act by which the form and content of a proposed treaty text are established. As a general rule, the adoption of the text of a treaty takes place through the expression of the consent of the states participating in the treaty-making process.” Thus, members can achieve compliance with this aspect of the amendment by indicating their support for an agreement to amend the Protocol in 2016. Compliance does not depend on ratification, since the treaty views these actions as separate, and the commitment refers only to the adoption of the amendment.

Secondly, this commitment outlines G7 members’ plans to “provide additional support through the Multilateral Fund following adoption of an amendment for its implementation.” G7 members may provide additional support in several ways. First, G7 members could contribute funds to the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol after the HFC amendment has been adopted. The Multilateral Fund is an organization that is geared at assisting developing countries in meeting the goals set by the amendment. However, G7 members could also demonstrate their intention to provide support for the Multilateral Fund by attending Multilateral Fund meetings, or raising awareness of the Multilateral Fund’s goals.

### Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>G7 member fails to support adoption of the HFC phase-down amendment in 2016 AND fails to express an intent to contribute funds to the Multilateral Fund following the adoption of the amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>G7 member supports adoption of the HFC phase-down amendment in 2016 OR expresses an intent to contribute funds to the Multilateral Fund following the adoption of the amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>G7 member supports adoption of the HFC phase-down amendment in 2016 AND contributes funds towards the Multilateral Fund following the adoption of the amendment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Canada:** 0

Canada has partially complied with its commitment to support adoption of the Montreal Protocol hydrofluorocarbon (HFC) phase-down amendment in 2016, and to provide additional support for developing countries’ pursuit of amendment implementation through the Multilateral Fund.

On 15 October 2016, the Office of the Minister of Environment and Climate Change announced that an international agreement had been reached to amend the Montreal Protocol to phase down HFCs. Canada

---


was one of 140 countries to adopt the amendment, and agreed to host the 29th Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol in 2017, in order to ensure the agreement’s implementation.

Canada also demonstrated strong support for an agreement in the lead-up to the amendment’s adoption.

Between 15 and 23 July 2016, Canada attended a series of meetings in Vienna to negotiate the amendment to the Montreal Protocol.

On 21 July 2016, the Canadian Environment and Climate Change Minister co-chaired the Climate and Clean Air Coalition (CCAC) High Level Assembly for the purpose of making progress towards the achievement of an HFC phase-down agreement. Following the meeting, the CCAC released a communiqué. In it, the ministers “re-iterate[d] that CCAC State Partners strongly support the adoption of an ambitious Montreal Protocol amendment in 2016 that includes an early freeze and rapid action to phase down HFCs.”

On 22 July 2016, Canadian Environment and Climate Change Minister Catherine McKenna participated in the Friends of Ambition Meeting, which occurred during the Third Extraordinary Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol. One of the priorities of the High Ambition Coalition, of which Canada is a member, is “securing radical HFC cuts.”

Between 22 and 23 July, representatives from Canada participated in the Third Extraordinary Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer.

In addition, Canada has taken steps to prepare for the implementation of the Kigali amendment, although it has not yet ratified the agreement.

On 26 November 2016, the Department of the Environment proposed the Regulations Amending the Ozone-Depleting Substances and Halocarbon Alternatives Regulations, which would put Canada in a position to ratify the Montreal Protocol amendment.

---
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On 29 December 2016, the Ozone-Depleting Substances and Halocarbon Alternatives Regulations came into force, which will facilitate the creation of permitting and reporting systems for hydrofluorocarbon use.\(^{422}\)

Canada also pledged to provide further support to the Multilateral Fund following adoption of the Kigali amendment. On 23 September 2016, Canada and 15 other states “announced their intent to provide $27 million in 2017 to the Montreal Protocol Multilateral Fund to provide fast-start support for implementation.”\(^{423}\) However, while the Multilateral Fund announced its decision to accept these intended contributions in December 2016,\(^{424}\) the Fund has not yet received this money.\(^{425}\) Instead, during 77th Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol, Canada was designated as the leader of a contact group “to discuss how the Committee should move forward in dealing with matters related to the Kigali Amendment and decision XXVIII/2 of the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties, as well as with the potential additional contributions from donor countries.”\(^{426}\) Following the 77th Meeting, the Multilateral Fund provided Canada with the information that it could contribute the USD1.3 million that it had promised through a letter of intent or an agreement with the United Nations Environment Programme.\(^{427}\) This information was publicly shared with participants of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol, which took place between 4 and 7 April 2017.\(^{428}\)

In addition to the aforementioned intended additional contributions, Canada also contributed USD6,030,558.90 during 2016.\(^{429}\) However, it is unclear if these contributions were made during the compliance period, and they do not seem to be specifically directed at the implementation of the Kigali Amendment.

Canada has adopted the Kigali amendment, and has announced its intention to provide additional funds to the Multilateral Fund. However, it does not appear that this additional money, which is separate from Canada’s regular contributions, have been paid to the Fund at this point. Thus, Canada receives a score of 0.

*Analyst: Ben Windeler*

---


France: 0

France has partially complied with its commitment to adopt the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer and to contribute additional money to the Multilateral Fund for the purpose of implementing this amendment.

Immediately following the adoption of the Kigali Amendment on 15 October 2016, France formally welcomed the outcome as aligning with the meeting of the targets outlined in the Paris Agreement: specifically, limiting global warming to between 1.5°C and 2°C, and achieving carbon neutrality by the end of the century.430

Calling the outcome “historical,” French Minister of the Environment Ségolène Royal expressed strong support for the Kigali Amendment, and encouraged Parties to the amendment to endorse the review clause — which enables a more ambitious timeline in view of technological innovations — as a push to accelerate the global phase-down drive.431 Research Director at French Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS) Didier Hauglustaine regards the adopted amendment as the “link between the Montreal Protocol and the Paris Agreement, between the protection of the ozone and the climate,” and he thinks the transition from hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) will not be difficult because of previous experiences in phasing down chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs).432

France also demonstrated strong support for the agreement in the lead-up to the adoption of the amendment.

Between 15 and 23 July 2016, a series of meetings were held in Vienna to negotiate the content of the amendment.433

On 21 July 2016, France participated in the Climate and Clean Air Coalition (CCAC) Special High Level Assembly.434 During this meeting, CCAC members released a joint communiqué calling for the adoption of an amendment of the Montreal Protocol to phase-out HFCs.435

Between 22 and 23 July, representatives from France participated in the Third Extraordinary Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer.436

In view of the successful collective agreement, France plans to follow through with its pledge alongside 16 other countries to contribute to USD27 million investment to the Montreal Protocol Multilateral Fund in

---

order to provide financing for developing countries transitioning to minimal or no HFC consumption and production.\textsuperscript{437} However, while the Multilateral Fund announced its decision to accept these intended contributions in December 2016,\textsuperscript{438} it has not yet received this money.\textsuperscript{439} Following the 77th meeting, the fund provided France with the information that it could contribute the USD2.5 million that it had promised through a letter of intent or an agreement with the United Nations Environment Programme.\textsuperscript{440} This information was publicly shared with participants of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol, which took place between 4 and 7 April 2017.\textsuperscript{441}

In addition to the aforementioned intended additional contributions, France agreed to contribute USD11,303,256 to the Multilateral Fund in 2016.\textsuperscript{442} However, as of 2 December 2016, USD11,284,195 of this money was outstanding.\textsuperscript{443} Moreover, it does not appear that these funds are to be directly provided for implementation of the Kigali Amendment.

France has thus been awarded a score of 0 for its partial compliance with its commitment to the adoption of the Kigali Amendment and contributing to the Multilateral Fund. It has adopted the Kigali amendment, has pledged to make an additional contribution to the Multilateral Fund to implement this amendment, and, as a member of the European Union, it has already implemented regulations to phase down the use of HFCs.\textsuperscript{444}

\textit{Analyst: Marko Kljajic}

\textbf{Germany: 0}

Germany has partially complied with its commitment to support the adoption of the Montreal Protocol hydrofluorocarbon (HFC) phase-down amendment and contribute funds to the Multilateral Fund for the amendment’s implementation.

Germany agreed to the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol at the 28th Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol in October 2016, which addresses greenhouse gas emissions through phasing down HFC
refrigerants.\textsuperscript{445} Germany, categorized as a Non-A5 developed country, will begin making reductions to its HFC use in 2019.\textsuperscript{446}

Germany has not yet ratified the Kigali Amendment, but on 2 February 2017, the European Union published a draft decision from a European Union executive that paves the way for European Union countries to start the process of ratification, so it is likely that Germany will pursue ratification in the future.\textsuperscript{447}

Germany also had regular attendance at Multilateral Fund meetings and Montreal Protocol meetings. Germany attended the 77th meeting of the Multilateral Fund Executive Committee,\textsuperscript{448} as well as the 28th Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol in Kigali.\textsuperscript{449}

Germany also pledged to provide further support to the Multilateral Fund following adoption of the Kigali amendment. On 23 September 2016, Germany and fifteen other states “announced their intent to provide $27 million in 2017 to the Montreal Protocol Multilateral Fund to provide fast-start support for implementation.”\textsuperscript{450} However, while the Multilateral Fund announced its decision to accept these intended contributions in December 2016,\textsuperscript{451} the Fund has not yet received this money.\textsuperscript{452} Following the 77th Meeting, the Multilateral Fund provided Germany with the information that it could contribute the USD3.2 million that it had promised through a letter of intent or an agreement with the United Nations Environment Programme.\textsuperscript{453} Germany and Italy are closer to making this contribution than other G7 states as they have already been in contact with the Treasurer of the Multilateral Fund “in the view of finalizing contractual arrangements as soon as possible.”\textsuperscript{454}

Germany has also provided monetary support to the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol. The report of the 77th meeting of the Executive Committee, which took place in Montreal, Canada from 28 November to 2 December 2016, stated that as of 2 December 2016, Germany had agreed to contribute USD14,431,709 to the Multilateral Fund; had successfully contributed USD5,772,684 in cash payments, USD1,772,067 in bilateral assistance, and USD5,772,684 in promissory


notes; and had USD1,114,275 in outstanding contributions. However, it is unclear if these funds were contributed during the compliance period, and they do not appear to be directed specifically towards the implementation of the amendment to the Montreal Protocol.

Thus, because of its agreement to the Kigali amendment, and its intention to provide additional funds to the Multilateral Fund for the implementation of the amendment, Germany receives a score of 0.

*Analyst: Camryn Pearson*

**Italy: 0**

Italy has partially complied with its commitment to support the adoption of the Montreal Protocol HFC phase-down amendment. Italy agreed to the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol at the 28th Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol in October 2016, which addresses greenhouse gas emissions through phasing down HFC refrigerants. Italy, categorized as a Non-A5 developed country, will begin making reductions to its HFC use in 2019. Italy has not yet ratified the Kigali Amendment, but on 2 February 2017, the European Union published a draft decision from a European Union executive that paves the way for European Union countries to start the process of ratification, so it is plausible that Italy may contemplate ratification in the future.

Italy also has regular attendance at Multilateral Fund meetings and Montreal Protocol meetings. Italy attended the 77th meeting of the Multilateral Fund Executive Committee, as well as the 28th Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol in Kigali.

Italy also pledged to provide further support to the Multilateral Fund following adoption of the Kigali amendment. On 23 September 2016, Italy and 15 other states “announced their intent to provide $27 million in 2017 to the Montreal Protocol Multilateral Fund to provide fast-start support for implementation.” However, while the Multilateral Fund announced its decision to accept these intended contributions in December 2016, the Fund has not yet received this money. Following the 77th Meeting, the Multilateral Fund provided Italy with the information that it could contribute the USD2 million that it had promised through a letter of intent or an agreement with the United Nations Environment Programme.

Italy and Germany are closer to making this contribution than other G7 states as they have already been in contact with the Treasurer of the Multilateral Fund “in the view of finalizing contractual arrangements as soon as possible.”\(^{(465)}\)

Italy has also provided monetary support to the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol. The report of the 77th meeting of the Executive Committee, which took place in Montreal, Canada from 28 November to 2 December 2016, stated that as of 2 December 2016, Italy had agreed to contribute USD8,989,251 to the Multilateral Fund; had successfully contributed USD8,989,251 in cash payments, USD73,450 in bilateral assistance, and USD5,772,684 in promissory notes; and had USD1,114,275 in outstanding contributions.\(^{(466)}\) However, it is unclear if these funds were contributed during the compliance period, and they do not appear to be directed specifically towards the implementation of the amendment to the Montreal Protocol.

Thus, because of its agreement to the Kigali amendment, and its intention to provide additional funds to the Multilateral Fund for the implementation of the amendment, Italy receives a score of 0.

**Analyst: Camryn Pearson**

### Japan: 0

Japan has partially complied with its commitment to adopt the Montreal Protocol hydrofluorocarbon (HFC) phase-down amendment and to contribute to the Multilateral Fund.

On 15 October 2016, Japan was one of 197 countries to reach an international agreement to phase down HFCs at the 28th Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol in Kigali, Rwanda. The agreement includes cutting the production and consumption of HFCs by more than 80 percent over the next 30 years.\(^{(467)}\)

On 16 November 2016, at 22nd Conference of the Parties in Marrakech, Morocco, Japanese Minister of the Environment Kouichi Yamamoto made a verbal commitment that Japan would support developing countries in their efforts to reduce emissions throughout the lifecycle of products, which are fundamental to their fluorocarbon measures.\(^{(468)}\)

From 28 November 2016 to 2 December 2016, Japan attended the 77th meeting of the Multilateral Fund Executive Committee in Montreal.\(^{(469)}\)

Japan also pledged to provide further support to the Multilateral Fund following adoption of the Kigali amendment. On 23 September 2016, Japan and 15 other states “announced their intent to provide $27 million in 2017 to the Montreal Protocol Multilateral Fund to provide fast-start support for implementation.”\(^{(470)}\) However, while the Multilateral Fund announced its decision to accept these intended

---


contributions in December 2016, it has not yet received this money. Following the 77th Meeting, the fund provided Japan with the information that it could contribute the USD4.8 million that it had promised through a letter of intent or an agreement with the United Nations Environment Programme. This information was publicly shared with participants of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol, which took place between 4 and 7 April 2017.

Japan has also made regular contributions to the Multilateral Fund, though these are not directly related to implementing the Kigali amendment. In 2016, Japan’s agreed contribution was USD21,893,111. As of 2 December 2016, it had made cash payments to the Multilateral Fund for this amount.

Further, Japan is currently in its ninth period of contributions to the Montreal Protocol Multilateral Fund; between 2015-2017, Japan will have contributed USD66 million, totalling USD508 million in contributions since 1991.

In sum, Japan has adopted the HFC phase-down amendment and has indicated its intention to provide additional funds to the Multilateral Fund for the implementation of this amendment. Thus, Japan has received a score of 0.

**Analyst: Andrew Hakes**

**United Kingdom: 0**

The United Kingdom has partially complied with its commitment to adopt the Montreal Protocol hydrofluorocarbon (HFC) phase-down amendment and contribute additional funding through the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol for the purpose of implementing this amendment.

The UK was among the 197 countries to adopt the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol at the 28th Meeting of Parties to the Montreal Protocol in Kigali, Rwanda, on 15 October 2016. Under the Kigali Amendment, the UK committed to cutting its production and consumption of HFCs by 80 percent over the next 30 years. For developed countries like the UK, reduction of HFC consumption will commence in

---


2019,\textsuperscript{480} after the Amendment comes into force on 1 January 2019, provided it has been ratified by at least 20 of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.\textsuperscript{481}

The UK is also the member of a group of 16 donor countries that have stated their intention to provide USD27 million in 2017, for purposes of a “fast-start support for implementation if an ambitious amendment with a sufficient early freeze date is adopted this year.”\textsuperscript{482} This statement, published after a gathering in New York presided over by the United States, constitutes partial compliance with the UK’s commitment to provide additional funding through the Multilateral Fund, as it is a direct declaration of intent to contribute funding.\textsuperscript{483} However, while the fund announced its decision to accept these intended contributions in December 2016,\textsuperscript{484} it has not yet received this money.\textsuperscript{485} Following the 77th Meeting, the Multilateral Fund provided the UK with the information that it could contribute the USD2.3 million that it had promised through a letter of intent or an agreement with the United Nations Environment Programme.\textsuperscript{486} This information was publicly shared with participants of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol, which took place between 4 and 7 April 2017.\textsuperscript{487}

As of 2 December 2016, the UK had contributed over USD10 million for the 2016 year to the Multilateral Fund, as it had in the 2015 year.\textsuperscript{488} As the commitment for these ongoing payments was not made during the compliance period for 2016-2017, however, these payments do not count towards the UK’s compliance score. However, these payments are demonstrative of the strong existing commitment the UK has to compliance with the Montreal Protocol.

Thus, the United Kingdom has been awarded a score of 0 for partial compliance with the commitments to adopt the Montreal Protocol HFC phase-down amendment, and to provide additional funding through the Multilateral Fund for the 2016-2017 year.

\textit{Analyst: Benjamin MacLean-Max}


\textsuperscript{481} Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, United Nations Treaty Collection (New York, NY) 15 October 2016. Date of Access: 1 March 2017.


United States: 0

The United States has partially complied with its commitment to adopt the Montreal Protocol hydrofluorocarbon (HFC) phase-down amendment and to make additional contributions to the Multilateral Fund to help developing states implement the amendment.

On 15 October 2016, around 197 countries including the US adopted an amendment to phase down HFCs under the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer in Kigali, Rwanda, committing to cutting the production and consumption of HFCs by over 80 percent over the course of the next 30 years.\(^{489}\)

The US also demonstrated its strong support for phasing out HFCs in the lead-up to the amendment’s adoption.

Between 15 and 23 July 2016, a round of negotiations was held in Vienna to discuss the content of the Kigali amendment.\(^{490}\) This included the 37th and 37th Meetings of the Open-Ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, and the Third Extraordinary Meeting of the Parties.\(^{491}\)

On 21 July 2016, the Climate and Clean Air Coalition, of which the US is a member, released a communiqué in support of the adoption of an HFC phase-down amendment.\(^{492}\) The Administrator for the United States Environmental Protection Agency said that “We urge all countries to join us in taking the next major step forward after Paris to fight climate change.”\(^{493}\)

On 22 July 2016, former Secretary of State John Kerry attended the High-Level Segment of the Third Extraordinary Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.\(^{494}\) While there, Kerry stated that “amending the Montreal Protocol to phase down HFCs — is one of the single most important unitary steps that we could possibly take at this moment to stave off the worst impacts of climate change.” He also reiterated that “The United States and our G7 partners...have already stated our intent, our promise — publicly — to provide additional funding to help developing countries implementing an HFC amendment.”\(^{495}\)

---


On 22 September 2016, former US Secretary of State John Kerry held a meeting where “high-level leaders from over 100 countries convened to announce the formation of a coalition for the adoption of an ambitious amendment on HFCs.”

In addition, the US has announced its intention to contribute additional funding to the Multilateral Fund to help developing states implement the Kigali amendment.

On 22 September 2016, the US held a meeting to raise support for an HFC phase-down amendment, and announced that it, along with fifteen other states, would be contributing USD27 million in 2017 to the Multilateral Fund “to provide fast-start support for implementation if an ambitious amendment with a sufficient early freeze date is adopted this year [in 2016].”

In view of the successful collective agreement, the US plans to follow through with its pledge alongside fifteen other donor countries to contribute to USD27 million investment to the Montreal Protocol Multilateral Fund in order to provide financing for developing countries transitioning to minimal or no HFC consumption and production. However, while the Multilateral Fund announced its decision to accept these intended contributions in December 2016, the Fund has not yet received this money. From 28 November 2016 to 2 December 2016, the United States attended the 77th meeting of the Multilateral Fund Executive Committee in Montreal, Canada. Following the meeting, the Multilateral Fund provided the US with the information that it could contribute the USD7 million that it had promised through a letter of intent or an agreement with the United Nations Environment Programme. This information was publicly shared with participants of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol, which took place between 4 and 7 April 2017.

As of 2 December 2016, the United States has contributed USD87 million to their 2015-2016 commitment to the Multilateral Fund for the implementation of the Montreal Protocol. USD32,083,335 of this amount was contributed during 2016, although it is unclear whether these payments were made during the compliance period.

---

In sum, the US has adopted the HFC phase-down amendment, and has noted its intention to provide additional funding to the Multilateral Fund for the purpose of implementing the amendment. Thus, the United States receives a score of 0.

*Analyst: Andrew Hakes*

**European Union: 0**

The European Union has partially complied with its commitment to adopt the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, and contribute funds for the implementation of the amendment through the Multilateral Fund. It took a leading role in proposing a phase-down of hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), and has already taken robust regulations to phase down the use of HFCs.

At the 28th meeting of parties to the Montreal Protocol on 13 October 2016, the EU agreed to adopt the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. EU Commissioner for Climate Action and Energy Arias Cañete hailed the amendment as a major concrete step in delivering on the commitments of the Montreal Protocol, and in mitigating the consequences of climate change outlined by the Paris Agreement: “This is a huge win for the climate. We have taken the first concrete step in delivering on the promises we made in Paris last December.”

The EU also demonstrated its strong support for phasing out HFCs in the lead-up to the amendment’s adoption.

The EU participated in a series of high-level meetings on the Montreal Protocol in Vienna from 15 to 23 July 2016. One of these was the Third Extraordinary Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol, which ran between 22 and 23 July 2016, where progress was made towards achieving the HFC phase-out amendment. EU Commissioner for Climate Action and Energy Miguel Arias Cañete also met with officials from forty states in a special meeting “to mobilize political support from countries who share the common goal of adopting an ambitious Montreal Protocol amendment.” They worked to produce a proposal for an amendment to phase down HFCs in October 2016.

To stimulate further action on the phasing down of HFCs, the EU announced at the meeting that it would provide EUR3 million for capacity-building and action to replace HFCs in Latin America and the Caribbean. The main purpose of the project will be to “promote climate-friendly solutions for phasing out ozone-depleting substances,” and to facilitate “effective mitigation on HFCs” among seven countries: Mexico, Colombia, Paraguay, Costa Rica, Venezuela, Cuba, and Grenada.

---


On 10 October 2016, to mark the opening of MOP 28, the EU made a contribution of EUR250,000 to the Ozone Secretariat to support and facilitate its activities related to HFCs up until the end of 2017. Executive Secretary of the Ozone Secretariat Tina Birmpili stated that “This contribution to the Secretariat facilitates important work on HFCs. It also demonstrates a sincere commitment by the European Commission to ensure a transparent and inclusive process.”

The EU also took actions to support the amendment outside of the compliance period.

On 30 April 2015, the EU initiated negotiations to limit the use and production of HFCs with a proposal to amend the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. These negotiations culminated in the November 2015 Dubai Pathway for controlling climate-change-inducing HFCs, which set out a roadmap towards an HFC amendment in 2016 by first resolving challenges and generating solutions on the feasibility and methods of managing HFCs.

Additionally, in the year leading up to the Kigali Amendment, the EU undertook a unilateral initiative to regulate HFC consumption and production among its Member States, played an instrumental role in proposing a phase-down of HFCs globally, and was key in facilitating collective action among states around the world.

In January 2015, the EU implemented regulations to curb fluorinated greenhouse gases (F-gases). The 2015 F-gas Regulation strengthens existing measures to control emissions from F-gases by: 1) limiting the total amount of F-gases that can be sold in EU markets from 2015 onwards, and phasing them down gradually to one-fifth of 2014 sales by 2030; 2) banning the use of F-gases in various types of appliances and equipment were less harmful alternatives are available; and 3) preventing the emission of F-gases from existing equipment through proper review, service, and repair. The F-gas Regulation aims to cut F-gas emissions by 66 percent by 2030 compared to 2014 levels. Although the EU has already achieved its treaty targets ahead of schedule, these measures have shown that the EU is dedicated to the phase-down and phase-out of ozone-depleting substances in the long-term. As of 2015, the EU’s consumption of ozone-depleting substances was –53.48 MT below the global limit of 822.81 MT.

However, the EU has not contributed additional funds to the Multilateral Fund for the purpose of implementing the amendment. At the 70th Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol, the Executive Committee discussed the EU’s proposed EUR3 million donation “to maximize the climate benefits from the HCFC phase-out,” but reached no agreement because of “concerns … about the conditions associated with

---

receiving such a grant.” At the 78th Meeting of the Executive Committee, which took place between 4 and 7 April 2017, the Chief Officer noted that this funding had not been accepted.

The EU has thus been awarded a score of 0 for its commitment to adopting the Kigali Amendment and contributing to the Multilateral Fund for the implementation of this amendment.

*Analyst: Marko Kljajic*

---


6. Climate Change: Paris Agreement

“The G7, continuing to take a leadership role, commits to taking the necessary steps to secure ratification, acceptance or approval of the agreement as soon as possible and calls on all Parties to do so striving for a goal of entry into force in 2016.”

G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ 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></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

Cooperation to combat climate change is one of the key challenges for policymakers in the 21st century. In 2014, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reported that the increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions that have resulted from “economic and population growth are … extremely likely to have been the dominant cause of the observed warming since the mid-20th century.” The expected consequences of climate change include, but are not limited to: species extinction, the disruption of ecosystems, increased food insecurity, increases in the number of extreme weather events, forced displacement, and reductions in economic growth. The IPCC argues that “Without additional mitigation efforts … warming by the end of the 21st century will lead to high to very high risk of severe, widespread, and irreversible impacts globally.” As such, it has recommended that states take action to mitigate climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and to adopt adaptation strategies to increase international resilience against the effects of global warming.

Climate change has long been an issue of concern for the G7. Ella Kokotsis, Director of Accountability for the G7 Research Group, has noted that the G7 first addressed the problem in 1979, and has since undergone three phases in its “role in governing global climate change.” During the third stage, between 2005 and 2014, the G7 and G20 attempted to “respond to the failure of the UN’s approach [the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol] by returning to global leadership with a now expanded regime that placed the environment first and broadened its membership to include all major countries.”

528 Ella Kokotsis, G7 and G20 Contributions to Mitigating Climate Change – Then and Now, G7 Information Centre (Toronto) 1 December 2015. Date of Access: 9 November 2016. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/blogs/151201-kokotsis.html#ella.
529 Ella Kokotsis, G7 and G20 Contributions to Mitigating Climate Change – Then and Now, G7 Information Centre (Toronto) 1 December 2015. Date of Access: 9 November 2016. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/blogs/151201-kokotsis.html#ella.
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carbon-producing powers." 530 During this time, the G8 committed to undertaking robust aggregate and individual mid-term reductions in carbon emissions. 531 At the 2012 Camp David Summit, G8 leaders reiterated their commitment to the reduction and mitigation of carbon emissions and other particulate air pollution. 532 These normative declarations were reinforced by disbursements of climate financing, with the 2013 Lough Erne Summit committing to jointly mobilize USD100 billion by 2020 towards carbon emissions mitigation. 533

In 2015, the G7 expressed support for the IPCC’s Fifth Assessment Report, and committed to work towards the adoption of a binding international agreement to combat climate change at the Paris Climate Change Conference. 534 The Paris Agreement was adopted at this Conference of Parties, and requires states to formulate adaptation and mitigation strategies in order to achieve goals including the target of “holding the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels.” 535 The 2016 G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration explicitly characterized the 21st Conference of the Parties at Paris and the Paris Agreement as key to the post-2016 development agenda and the G7 efforts to reach climate-related targets. 536 For this reason, they have committed to ratifying the accord.

**Commitment Features**

In the Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration, the G7 “commits to taking the necessary steps to secure ratification, acceptance or approval of the agreement as soon as possible,” and members indicate that they are “striving for a goal of entry into force in 2016.” 537

The process of ratification is the second step in becoming a party to an agreement. The UN notes that a state must first sign an agreement to indicate its “intention to take steps to express its consent to be bound by the treaty at a later date.” 538 However, it is only by ratifying, accepting, or approving an agreement that a state becomes a party to the treaty, and is “legally bound” by it. 539

Thus, a G7 member can be considered to have fully complied with this commitment if they have ratified, approved, or accepted the agreement. If they have expressed an intent to ratify, approve, or accept the Paris Agreement before the end of 2016, but have not yet done so, they will receive a score of 0. Finally, if the G7 member has neither expressed an intent to ratify the agreement, nor done so, they will be considered non-compliant with the agreement.

---

530 Ella Kokotsis, G7 and G20 Contributions to Mitigating Climate Change – Then and Now, G7 Information Centre (Toronto) 1 December 2015. Date of Access: 9 November 2016. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/blogs/151201kokotsis.html#ella.

2016 G7 Ise-Shima Final Compliance Report
25 May 2017
85
Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>The G7 member has not ratified, accepted, or approved the Paris Agreement AND has not expressed an intent to secure ratification, acceptance, or approval of the Paris Agreement by the end of 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The G7 member has expressed an intent to ratify, accept, or approve the Paris Agreement by the end of 2016, but has not yet done so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>The G7 member has ratified, accepted, or approved the Paris Agreement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada: +1

Canada has fully complied with its commitment to taking the necessary steps to secure ratification, acceptance, or approval of the Paris Agreement. It has also called on other states to do the same, and has made an effort to begin to fulfill its obligations under the agreement.

On 22 April 2016, Canada signed the Paris Agreement. 540 It ratified the document in parliament on 5 October 2016. 541 On the same date that the government ratified the agreement, Minister for Environment and Climate Change Catherine McKenna issued a statement emphasizing that Canada’s ratification was important because it would “bring the world over the threshold of 55 countries accounting for 55 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions needed to bring the Paris Agreement into force.” 542

In order to fulfill its obligations under the treaty, the Government of Canada has taken a number of steps. On 9 December 2016, most of the country’s First Ministers committed to the Pan-Canadian Framework on Clean Growth and Climate Change. 543 The framework details how the Government of Canada will meet its commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, 544 and is a follow-up to the previous First Ministers’ meeting, which was held on 3 March 2016. At that time, the government released the Vancouver Declaration on Clean Growth and Climate Change, which affirmed that the country would “build on the momentum of the Paris Agreement by developing a concrete plan to achieve Canada’s international commitments through a pan-Canadian framework for clean growth and climate change.” 545 The ministers also agreed to adopt policies that would help reduce greenhouse gases so that Canada can fulfill its obligations under the agreement. 546 The Pan-Canadian Framework emphasizes the use of carbon pricing and transitioning to clean energy as the most important means by which Canada can meet the targets set by the Paris Agreement. 547

---

541 Minister of Environment and Climate Change Marks Canada’s Ratification of the Paris Agreement, Government of Canada (Ottawa) 5 October 2016. Date of Access: 7 December 2016. http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do;jsessionid=62da77cbb1ceeb6fa660e6816e24a9e3c2a81ab15a8a159eb4f02ba57ea85f3.e344C3Mb-xOai0Tbx05AxuRb3n0?mthd=advSrch&crtr.page=1&crtr.dtpID=6672&nid=1133599&crtr.tpID=980.
542 Minister of Environment and Climate Change Marks Canada’s Ratification of the Paris Agreement, Government of Canada (Ottawa) 5 October 2016. Date of Access: 7 December 2016. http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do;jsessionid=62da77cbb1ceeb6fa660e6816e24a9e3c2a81ab15a8a159eb4f02ba57ea85f3.e344C3Mb-xOai0Tbx05AxuRb3n0?mthd=advSrch&crtr.page=1&crtr.dtpID=6672&nid=1133599&crtr.tpID=980.
Between 7 and 18 November 2016, a Canadian delegation of 225 members attended the 22nd Conference of the Parties (COP) in Marrakech. At the conference, Canada was one of six countries to fulfill its Paris Agreement commitment “to formulate and communicate long-term low greenhouse gas emission development strategies” by submitting such a strategy to the secretariat. It should be noted, however, that the document presented does not introduce any novel policies not previously addressed in the Pan-Canadian Framework. Instead, Canada argues that it “outlines potential GHG [greenhouse gas] abatement opportunities … and identifies areas where emissions reductions will be more challenging.”

During her address at COP22 on 16 November 2016, Minister McKenna also reaffirmed the government’s commitment to fulfilling its 2015 CAD2.65 billion pledge to help developing states mitigate and adapt to climate change. As a part of this funding, she revealed that the government was releasing CAD1.8 billion to “leverage private-sector investment focused on clean and renewable energy solutions” for developing states.

These efforts follow previous commitments by the government to develop a cleaner domestic economy by reducing Canada’s carbon footprint, and by promoting carbon market policies to encourage investment in cleaner technology and infrastructure.

Therefore, Canada receives a score of +1 for its commitment to securing ratification, acceptance, and approval of the Paris, along with its global entry into force by 2016.

**Analyst: Aaishah Karim**

### France: +1

France has fully complied with its commitment to taking the necessary steps to secure ratification, acceptance, or approval of the Paris Agreement. It has also made efforts to ensure the Paris Agreement entered into force in 2016.

France signed the Paris Agreement on 22 April 2016. Following this, it took quick action to ratify the convention. On 17 May 2016, the French parliament voted to ratify the Paris Agreement, and the Senate soon followed on 8 June 2016. On 15 June 2016, President François Hollande ratified the Paris Agreement on behalf of the French government.

---


Agreement, making France the first G7 member to adopt the historic treaty. Ségolène Royal, Minister of Ecology, Sustainable Development and Energy and President of the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP), opened the ceremony and emphasized the fact that France was the “first industrialized country” to ratify the Paris Agreement. Parties in attendance included parliamentarians and politicians, European Union ambassadors, representatives of non-governmental organization, leaders from the private sector, and scientists.

France has also taken steps to urge the rest of the international community to ratify the agreements in a timely manner. As an illustration, France sought to ensure the Paris Agreement entered into force before COP22 in Morocco, and did so by leading by example.

During the ratification ceremony, President Hollande and Minister Royal encouraged the other European states in attendance to ratify the agreement as fast as possible.

The Government of France continued to urge other parties to sign and ratify the Paris Agreement during the 22nd COP in Marrakesh. In a speech made at the welcoming ceremony, Royal called upon the 97 countries who had not yet ratified the Agreement to do so by the end of the year.

Furthermore, on 16 November 2016, President Hollande made a speech at COP22 in the wake of the United States’ election, where he noted that France would speak with the new administration to ensure that they were aware of the importance of maintaining the previous administration’s commitment to the agreement.

Therefore, France receives a score of +1 for its leadership and commitment to securing the ratification, acceptance, and approval of the Paris Agreement, as well as ensuring its global entry into force in 2016.

**Analyst: Esmé Lafleur**

**Germany: +1**

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to taking the necessary steps to secure ratification, acceptance, or approval of the Paris Agreement. It has also made a considerable number of diplomatic efforts to ensure that the Paris Agreement enters into force, and has begun to develop plans to fulfill its obligations under the treaty.

On 22 April 2016, Germany signed the Paris Agreement. On 6 July 2016, it became “one of the first European Union member states to formally begin the ratification process.” This ratification process was
completed on 5 October 2016. After submitting its ratification along with other members of the European Union, the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety noted that enough participants had ratified the document to trigger its entry into force.

Germany has also worked to directly bring about a quick entry into force of the Paris Agreement. On 21 September 2016, German Federal Environment Minister Barbara Hendricks called for the adoption of new legal strategies that would allow the European Union to ratify the Paris Agreement quickly. She said that Germany’s “goal is to be able to make a start on implementing the agreement at the next Climate Change Conference in Marrakesh in November.”

In addition, Germany has begun to develop plans to fulfill its obligations under the Paris Agreement during the compliance period.

On 14 November 2016, the German government adopted a new strategy that “shows what implementing the Paris Agreement means for Germany.” The Climate Action Plan provides sector-specific targets for greenhouse gas emission reductions that will allow Germany to achieve its goal of decreasing levels by “at least 55 percent compared to 1990 [levels]” by 2030. The plan also aims to help the country meet the European Union’s agreement to cut GHG emissions by 80 to 95 percent compared to 1990 levels by 2050. Federal Environment Minister Hendricks noted that “This will provide orientation for strategic measures in all sectors and security for investors … it is also a question of a step-by-step phase-out of coal, oil, and gas.”

---

Between 4 and 5 July 2016, Germany held the 7th Petersburg Climate Dialogue, which engaged representatives of thirty-five countries in discussions of how to implement the Paris Agreement.\(^{574}\) At this time, the German government committed to working with the World Resources Institute to help developing states create plans to meet their obligations under the Paris Agreement.\(^{575}\)

A German delegation also attended the Marrakesh climate change conference, which was held between 7 and 18 November 2016.\(^{576}\) During the meetings, Germany committed EUR50 million to help developing countries that are suffering the effects of climate change to adapt.\(^{577}\)

Germany thus receives a +1 score for its leadership and commitment to securing the ratification, acceptance, and approval of the Paris Agreement, and its global entry into force by 2016. It has also taken steps to begin implementing the agreement.

**Analyst: Rhys Williams**

**Italy: +1**

Italy has fully complied with its commitment to taking the necessary steps to secure ratification, acceptance, or approval of the Paris Agreement. It has also made considerable diplomatic efforts to ensure the Paris Agreement enters into force.

Italy signed the Paris Agreement on 22 April 2016, the first day it opened for signatures.\(^{578}\) Italy ratified the agreement on 11 November 2016.

Italy has also taken steps to begin to help implement the Paris Agreement.

On 16 November 2016, Italy released a Joint Statement with other developed states in which it pledged to contribute to the Capacity-Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT).\(^{579}\) The CBIT was created to provide support to developing states and enable them to "monitor and report progress [towards the Paris Agreement] in a transparent manner."\(^{580}\) Italy committed EUR4 million to support the efforts of the CBIT.\(^{581}\)

---


Additionally, on 12 April 2016, a conference titled “Fighting Climate Change: Sharing Italy’s Innovative Technology” took place in Italy to address solutions to the problems associated with using new technology. Companies proposed techniques that would mitigate the impacts of climate change. There was an increased effort to conduct research and to document the effects of climate change, notably through the Italian National Agency for New Technologies, Energy and Sustainable Economic Development. The agency is implementing underwater robots that monitor the ecosystem, providing a measure of marine biodiversity.

On 22 April 2016, Italy — specifically through the Ministry of Environment — signed an agreement with Morocco to address and ameliorate the regulations and economics of climate change. The agreement focused on managing solid waste and coastal areas, preventing carbon pollution, and promoting sustainable development.

Italy has not yet provided a long-term strategy following the Paris Agreement. However, information from its National Energy Strategy elaborates on the short- and long-term goals of the country. The document, published in March 2013, outlines that “about EUR170 to 180 billion will be invested by 2020, both in white and green economy, and in traditional sectors (electricity and gas networks, LNG [liquified natural gas] terminals, storage facilities, hydrocarbons development).” The goals for 2020 include: reducing fuel consumption by 24 percent in primary consumption (as compared to four percent in 2010), investing in renewable energy, and reducing energy costs to positively impact the economy and the environment.

Italy also states several long-term goals that it seeks to achieve by 2050 in order to successfully decarbonize the country. These energy goals include: decreasing primary consumption by up to 26 percent (compared to 2010), a 60 per cent gross final consumption in renewable energy (compared to a goal of 20 per cent for 2020), increasing electrification to reach 38 percent, and closely monitoring the role of gas for the energy transition to take place.

Italy is thus in full compliance and receives a +1 score for its leadership and commitment to securing ratification, acceptance, and approval of the Paris Agreement, and supporting global entry into force by 2016.

**Analyst: Hanu Chaudhari**

**Japan: +1**

Japan has complied with its commitment to take the necessary steps to secure ratification, acceptance, or approval of the Paris Agreement, and to assist in bringing the agreement into global entry by 2016.

---


584 Climate change: Italy signs cooperation agreement with Morocco, Connect 4 Climate (Italy) 22 April 2016. Date of Access: 30 November 2016. https://www.connect4climate.org/article/climate-change-italy-signs-cooperation-agreement-morocco

585 Climate change: Italy signs cooperation agreement with Morocco, Connect 4 Climate (Italy) 22 April 2016. Date of Access: 30 November 2016. https://www.connect4climate.org/article/climate-change-italy-signs-cooperation-agreement-morocco


On 8 November 2016, Japan officially accepted the 2015 Paris Climate Change Agreement to cut emissions and prevent climate change.589

Japan has also taken actions to combat climate change and begin to fulfill its obligations under the Paris Agreement during the compliance period.

On 8 November 2016, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe noted that Japan was committed to helping to develop the Paris Agreement’s implementation guidelines “so that the transparency of emission reduction by countries will be enhanced, thus achieving the objectives of the Paris Agreement.”590

A delegation from Japan attended the Marrakesh climate change conference, which was held between 7 November and 18 November 2016.591 During the conference, Japan released a joint statement with other developed states regarding the Capacity-Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT). The CBIT was created to provide support to developing states and enable them to “monitor and report progress [towards the Paris Agreement] in a transparent manner.”592 However, while the majority of states in the G7 made financial contributions to the project, Japan simply stated that it “is seriously considering contributing to the initiative.”593

On 11 April 2017, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe ordered ministers to formulate a strategy by the end of the year to transform Japan into an emissions-free “hydrogen society.” The government is expected to speed up the construction of hydrogen plants which will potentially bring in 40,000 hydrogen fuelled vehicles by 2020. A team within the ministry has also set out to introduce more solar and biomass generators. Even though Japan has already set out a target to raise the ratio of renewable energy from 22% to 24%, the ministry will consider raising the target under the new strategy.594

Japan has taken other measures to combat climate change outside of the compliance period.

Japan submitted its Intended Nationally Determined Contributions in July 2015, which includes a commitment to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by 26 percent compared to its 2013 levels by 2030.595

On 13 December 2015, the Environment Minister Tamayo Marukawa and State Minister for Foreign Affairs Seiji Kihara actively participated in the negotiations pertaining to the Paris Agreement and emphasized the importance of a new framework that is both fair and applicable to all countries.596 They also announced their intent to contribute to various discussions regarding the agreement and to make specific proposals for the

---

draft text of the agreement. Moreover, Environment Minister Marukwa committed Japan to formulating a Global Warming Measures Plan as soon as possible “while steadily implementing features for reducing emissions, as well as implementing steady adaptation measures based on the National Adaptation Plan.”

Japan has fully complied with this commitment. It was assigned a +1 for its commitment to securing ratification, acceptance, and approval of the agreement and its global entry into force by 2016.

**Analyst: Kymone Fletcher**

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to taking the necessary steps to secure ratification, acceptance, or approval of the Paris Agreement. It has also made some diplomatic efforts to ensure the Paris Agreement enters into force.

On 22 April 2016, the UK signed the Paris Agreement. However, it was the last G7 member to ratify the Agreement on 18 November 2016. In reaction to news of the ratification, Minister of State for Climate Change and Industry Nick Hurd emphasized the importance of focusing on the implementation of the agreement. He stated that the government would “use this positive momentum to grow the UK low-carbon sector,” which is currently estimated to be worth around GBP46 billion.

In addition, during the 22nd Conference of the Parties (COP22), the British government declared its support for several climate change-mitigation initiatives, including a national carbon reduction strategy, global clean energy innovation, increased transparency, and scale-up of climate financing regimes. These declarations have nevertheless been followed with little substantive policy or regulatory action.

In conclusion, the United Kingdom is in full compliance and receives a score of +1 for its commitment to supporting the climate change initiative set forth in the Paris Agreement, given its signing of the agreement on 22 April 2016, and ratification of the agreement by the British parliament on 18 November 2016.

**Analyst: Aaishah Karim**

**United States: +1**

The United States has complied with its commitment to taking the necessary steps to secure ratification, acceptance, or approval of the Paris Agreement. During the administration of President Barack Obama, the US also made diplomatic efforts to ensure that the Paris Agreement entered into force. However, the election of new President Donald Trump has brought the US commitment to the Paris Agreement into question.

---


The US signed the Paris Agreement on 22 April 2016, the first day it opened for signatures.⁶⁰² The country ratified the agreement on 3 September 2016.

Additionally, President Barack Obama and his administration lobbied for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Clean Power Act, a proposal that seeks to regulate and reduce carbon pollution from power plants across the country.⁶⁰³ The US committed to working with Canada and Mexico to achieve a sustainable, low-carbon solution to climate change. Moreover, the US released a mid-century strategy to significantly decarbonize and reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 80 percent by 2050, as compared to levels in 2005.⁶⁰⁴

President Barack Obama first proposed the EPA Clean Power Act on 3 August 2015.⁶⁰⁵ States submitted their plans in accordance with the act as of 6 September 2016.⁶⁰⁶ As of October 2016, the administration was in the midst of getting the approval for this plan through the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.⁶⁰⁷ There are currently 18 states for the implementation of the plan, while 28 states are against it.⁶⁰⁸ The act strives to achieve several goals by 2030, which include “carbon pollution from the power sector will be 32 percent below 2005 levels … climate benefits of USD20 billion … [avoiding] 3600 premature deaths and 90 000 asthma attacks [each year].”⁶⁰⁹ Newly elected US President Donald Trump has since ordered the EPA to “start the complex and lengthy legal process of withdrawing and rewriting the Obama-era Clean Power Plan, which would have closed hundreds of coal-fired power plants, frozen construction of new plants, and replaced them with vast new wind and solar farms.”⁶¹⁰

On 29 June 2016, President Obama met with Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau and Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto in order to develop strategies for North America to target climate change through the North American Climate, Clean Energy, and Environment Partnership Action Plan.⁶¹¹ This plan aims to “achieve a goal for North America of 50 per cent clean power generation by 2025.”⁶¹² The countries have also agreed to work together to promote other G20 countries to ratify the Paris Agreement.⁶¹³ The plan

---
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included a further reduction of the use of hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) via the Montreal Protocol alongside a “phase out [of] inefficient fossil fuel subsidies by 2025.”

On 16 November 2016, the US proposed a mid-century strategy to combat climate change. The US is currently the world’s second-largest greenhouse gas emitter. With this in mind, the proposed strategy aims to reduce emissions by 17 percent by 2020, 28 percent by 2025, and 80 percent by 2050, all in comparison to levels in 2005. The US’s mid-century strategy outlines several key features that the country plans to implement in order to achieve this goal. These features include: transitioning to a low-carbon energy system, sequestering carbons through forests, soils, and carbon removal technologies, and reducing non-carbon emissions.

The strategy seeks to establish a low-carbon energy system by improving energy efficiency, using alternative forms of energy to replace fossil fuel electricity generation, and switching to fossil-fuel-free electricity in the sectors of transportation, buildings, and industry. These goals are set to be achieved by increasing the regulation and funding of low-carbon generation for electricity, modernizing the electricity grid to lower costs and improve efficiency, and improving methods of electricity storage. The report also analyzes non-carbon emissions such as methane, nitrous oxide and hydrofluorocarbons. The strategy contextualizes and builds upon the newly-implemented EPA regulations from July 2016, which aim to reduce methane emissions from landfills by eight million metric tons annually as of 2025.

On 20 January 2017, US President Donald Trump took office. During his campaign, Trump pledged to remove the US from the Paris Accord. However, his administration has not made a formal announcement on this issue since his inauguration as president. On 30 January 2017, former EPA transition team leader Myron Ebell stated that “Trump has made it clear he will withdraw from the Paris Agreement.” Trump has also announced a plan to reduce the EPA’s budget from USD8.1 billion to USD5.7 billion, and get rid of 25 percent of the agency’s employees. Despite this, on 18 April 2017 the New York Times suggested that key US policy advisers were encouraging Trump to keep the country’s commitment regarding the Paris Accord.

---

626
For these reasons, the United States is currently in full compliance and has received a +1 score for its former leadership and commitment to securing ratification, acceptance, and approval of the agreement and global entry into force by 2016.

**Analyst: Hanu Chaudhari**

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to taking the necessary steps to secure ratification, acceptance, or approval of the Paris agreements. It has also made considerable international diplomacy efforts to ensure the Paris Agreement enters into force.

The EU ratified the Paris Agreement on 5 October 2016, ensuring that the agreement successfully passed its legal threshold and entered into force.\(^{627}\) The decision was reached at a meeting of the Environment Council in Brussels, Belgium, and was subsequently submitted for approval to the European parliament. The European parliament voted on 4 October 2016 for the European Union to ratify the agreement.\(^{628}\) It was approved with 610 votes in favour, 38 against, and 31 abstentions.\(^{629}\)

Concurrently, the EU had already brought forward its main legislative proposals to deliver on its commitment to cut emissions by 40 per cent by 2030, relative to 1990 levels.\(^{630}\)

There had been fears among several observers that a lack of consensus among EU member states with regards to their respective share of EU-wide reduction targets might delay ratification of the Paris Agreement well into 2017. There were also concerns in relation to the United Kingdom’s referendum on EU membership, and that a vote to leave would cause further delay.

However, in a surprise move, EU environment ministers agreed to speed up the bloc’s ratification of the agreement.\(^{631}\)

For these reasons, the European Union is in full compliance and receives a +1 score for its leadership and commitment to securing ratification, acceptance, and approval of the agreement and global entry into force by 2016.

**Analyst: Rhys Williams**


7. Gender: Strengthening Women’s Engagement in Emergency Response Situations

“We are committed to support refugee and internally displaced women and girls as well as for those affected by conflicts and disasters, by providing assistance to empower them and develop their resilience and to prevent and respond to sexual and gender-based violence.”

_G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ 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>–1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>–1</td>
<td></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>–1</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>–1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>–0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

Female refugees and internally displaced persons are at a unique intersection of two extremely vulnerable groups. Consideration of female refugees and internally displaced persons is often neglected in the peace-making process, resulting in the increased vulnerability of women and the decreased attainability of peace as a whole. The G7 has long recognized the correlation between the prosperity of women and the prosperity of a broader society. The _G7’s Guiding Principles for Capacity Building of Women and Girls_, published at the 2016 G7 Ise-Shima Summit, recognizes this principle and aims to implement it within the context of conflict and post-conflict states.632

The numbers of refugees, asylum seekers, vulnerable migrants and internally displaced persons are at their highest levels since the Second World War.633 Almost half of these individuals are women and girls, and women and girls are often the first to lose their rights and independence as conflicts develop and social conventions are neglected.634 Living conditions in refugee camps particularly exacerbate the vulnerability of women and girls. In these close and unorganized living environments, traditional behavioural norms break down and rules for communal living are difficult to enforce.635 As a result, women face health and security

634 Remarks by UN Women Deputy Executive Director Lakshmi Puri at the UN General Assembly side event “Investing in Adolescent Girls and Young Women in Refugee Crisis”, UN Women (New York) 19 September 2016. Date of Access: 1 October 2016. http://www.unwomen.org/en/news/stories/2016/9/lakshmi-puri-speech-at-adolescent-girls-and-young-women-refugee-event. have their own voices heard.females - les to be their own ke - isplaced persons, but also support international action that address
issues, including instances of gender-based violence perpetrated by other refugees, camp staff, and humanitarian workers.\textsuperscript{636} 

Furthermore, female refugees are at a greater risk of discrimination in their host countries.\textsuperscript{637} Women and girls often lack access to mechanisms to prevent or gain restitution for sexual and gender-based violence, and are often excluded from the development of necessary infrastructure and programs.\textsuperscript{638} The G7 commitment to empower this vulnerable group is an important step in creating a space in which women and girls can take leadership roles in ensuring their personal freedoms and rights, while giving them the agency to participate in peace processes.

Previous G7 commitments have recognized the importance of women in creating a prosperous society. The majority of these gendered commitments have focused specifically on women’s economic independence and the protection of women’s health.\textsuperscript{639} The G7 first formally acknowledged the importance of female economic empowerment at the 1990 Houston Summit.\textsuperscript{640} This trend of focusing on economic empowerment largely continued through to the 2002 Kananaskis Summit, held in Canada, during which G8 members (including Russia) committed to improving education for girls worldwide.\textsuperscript{641} The overarching goal of the 2002 commitments was to achieve the Millennium Development Goal of universal primary education by 2015.\textsuperscript{642}

At the 2004 Sea Island Summit, G8 members committed to “increasing financing opportunities for female entrepreneurs, support for vocational training for women and internship opportunities,” particularly pertaining to women in the Middle East and North Africa.\textsuperscript{643} After 2005, the G8 largely shifted its focus to women’s health issues worldwide. The battle against HIV/AIDS and maternal health being two predominant issues of attention.\textsuperscript{644}

Female economic empowerment was discussed in detail at the 2015 Schloss Elmau Summit\textsuperscript{645} (Germany), at which time, G7 members committed to “increase the number of women and girls who receive technical and

\textsuperscript{642} Julia Kulik, Gender Still High on the G7 Agenda, G7/ G8 Information Centre (Toronto) 27 April 2016. Date of Access: 14 January 2017. http://www.g7g20.com/articles/julia-kulik-gender-still-high-on-the-g7-agenda.
\textsuperscript{643} Julia Kulik, Gender still high on the G7 agenda, G7/ G8 Information Centre (Toronto) 27 April 2016. Date of Access: 14 January 2017. http://www.g7g20.com/articles/julia-kulik-gender-still-high-on-the-g7-agenda.
\textsuperscript{644} Julia Kulik, Gender still high on the G7 agenda, G7/ G8 Information Centre (Toronto) 27 April 2016. Date of Access: 14 January 2017. http://www.g7g20.com/articles/julia-kulik-gender-still-high-on-the-g7-agenda.
vocational training in developing countries by one-third by 2030.\textsuperscript{646} In addition, G7 members agreed to promote female enrolment in STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics).\textsuperscript{647}

The 2016 Ise-Shima Summit, which occurred during the global refugee crisis, discussed many of the aforementioned issues in relation to the ongoing realities of refugees and internally displaced persons. As discussed above, women and girls are unduly affected in times of war and displacement. As such, the G7 members committed to improving the situation on the ground for women and girls.

**Commitment Features**

The G7 remains committed to combatting gender inequality. With this goal in mind, member states adopted the *G7 Guiding Principles for Capacity Building of Women and Girls: Towards Sustainable, Inclusive and Equitable Growth and Peace* at the 2016 Ise-Shima Summit. Broadly speaking, these principles emphasize the importance of enabling women and girls to actively participate in all levels of society. This includes encouraging female participation in the building of “sustainable, inclusive and equitable” economic systems and in all aspects of the peacebuilding process.\textsuperscript{648} In addition, G7 members remain committed to preventing and combatting “all forms of gender-based violence and discrimination against women and girls.”\textsuperscript{649} These principles are perhaps most vital in relation to the ongoing refugee crisis, and the consequent impact on internally displaced and refugee women and girls.

This specific commitment is framed in fairly broad terms and indicates four welfare targets to support refugee and internally displaced women and girls: 1) to empower them; 2) to develop their resilience; 3) to prevent sexual and gender-based violence; and 4) to respond to sexual and gender-based violence.\textsuperscript{650} More specifically, G7 members agreed to concentrate their efforts in three areas: 1) to increase “access to protection and to justice for those affected by sexual and gender-based violence”; 2) to enhance “the full range of medical, legal and psychosocial and livelihood services” for women; and 3) to strengthen “their abilities and economic self-reliance through education and training” for women and girls.\textsuperscript{651}

The first element of this commitment recognizes that displaced women and girls are often the victims of sexual and gender-based violence, and that they do not regularly have access to mechanisms to prevent or gain restitution for these abuses. As such, the G7 commits to increasing access to preventative mechanisms, in the form of protection, and restitutive mechanisms, in the form of justice, to refugee and internally displaced women and girls.\textsuperscript{652}

The second element of this commitment recognizes that women and girls are unduly affected by the ongoing refugee crisis and that they do not have dependable access to services that would help to mitigate their

\textsuperscript{646} Julia Kulik, Gender Still High on the G7 Agenda, G7/G8 Information Centre (Toronto) 27 April 2016. Date of Access: 14 January 2017. http://www.g7g20.com/articles/julia-kulik-gender-still-high-on-the-g7-agenda.

\textsuperscript{647} Julia Kulik, Gender Still High on the G7 Agenda, G7/G8 Information Centre (Toronto) 27 April 2016. Date of Access: 14 January 2017. http://www.g7g20.com/articles/julia-kulik-gender-still-high-on-the-g7-agenda.


suffering. Furthermore, G7 members acknowledge that this suffering pervades every aspect of life — physical welfare, mental health, socio-political standing, community, employment — which necessarily requires a multifaceted solution. As such, G7 members commit to enhancing the availability of “medical, legal and psychosocial and livelihood services” for women and girls.

The final element of this commitment recognizes that refugee and internally displaced women and girls largely lack access to education and job-training. It further acknowledges that there is a strong correlation between the economic prosperity of women and the economic prosperity of a society as a whole. As such, G7 members commit to enhancing the “economic self-reliance” of women by providing access to “education and training” for women and girls.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>G7 member takes action in one area outlined in the G7 Guiding Principles for Capacity Building of Women and Girls OR fails to take action on any of the three areas outlined in the abovementioned principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>G7 member takes action in AT LEAST TWO of the areas outlined by the G7 Guiding Principles for Capacity Building of Women and Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>G7 member takes action in ALL THREE AREAS outlined by the G7 Guiding Principles for Capacity Building of Women and Girls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada: –1**

Canada has not complied with its commitment to support refugee and internally displaced women and girls as well as those affected by conflicts and disasters by providing assistance to empower them, develop their resilience, and prevent and respond to sexual and gender-based violence.

In October 2016, the Government of Canada revised its country chapter in the United Nations Refugee Agency (UNCHR) Resettlement Handbook. The chapter details the entire process of claiming resettling in Canada as a refugee, and states that upon arriving in Canada, after processing, overseas refugees will obtain permanent resident status. The chapter states that all resettled refugees, like other permanent residents, are eligible to work in Canada, and to be covered by provincial health care schemes. The chapter also describes the Canadian Women-at-Risk program, which recognizes that refugee women without the normal protection of a family require additional assistance to establish successfully in Canada. However, there are no further details available on the additional assistance available, and whether any action was taken to empower these women during the compliance period in any tangible sense.

---

On 25 October 2016, the Canadian House of Commons passed a motion to receive 400 survivors of Daesh from Iraq before 22 February 2017, and 1200 before 31 December 2017.660 This would include especially vulnerable female and child internally displaced persons identified by the UNCHR.661 The Government of Canada stated that it would provide special support for these individuals, including psychological, physical, and social supports.662 Still, the motion made no mention of empowering the women economically, or addressing the issues of gender-based and sexual violence.

On 31 October 2016, the Government of Canada published its immigration plan for the year 2017.663 This included a target of granting permanent residency to 40,000 refugees.664 There were no further details on any special protections put in place for female refugees or internally displaced persons.

On 22 November 2016, the Government of Canada released its final expenditures on the Syrian resettlement initiative of 2015-2016.665 The funds for resettling 25,000 Syrian refugees were broken down into five phases of the resettlement process.666 The total expenditure was CAD 384.7 million CAD 1.7 million of which was spent by the Ministry of Employment and Social Development.667 There are no further details on the specific initiatives created, whether they worked to empower female refugees specifically, and whether they took place during the compliance period. As such, these funds cannot count towards compliance.

In sum, Canada has continued to accept refugees, but has not taken any new initiatives to help empower female refugees or internally displaced persons in any of the three areas of the G7 Guiding Principles for Capacity Building of Women and Girls. Thus, Canada receives a score of -1.

Analyst: Claire Robbins

France: −1

France has not complied with its commitment to support refugee and internally displaced women and girls as well as those affected by conflicts and disasters by providing assistance to empower them, develop their resilience, and prevent and respond to sexual and gender-based violence.

On 19 September 2016, France signed the United Nations New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants. The Declaration’s commitments address the need for refugee and migrant protection, particularly in the recent context of large movements of refugees and migrants. By signing the Declaration, member states also agree to cooperating around and sharing the burden of protecting and hospitably hosting incoming refugees and migrants. The Declaration mentions the protection of “human rights of all refugees and migrants, regardless of status” and “the rights of women and girls and promoting their full, equal and meaningful participation in finding solutions.” Following the Declaration, member states will engage in further negotiations in an international conference to set guidelines on the commitments.

On 31 October 2000, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Development adopted Resolution 1325 as part of the United Nation’s Security Council’s “Femmes, paix et sécurité,” an agenda committed to the protection of refugees and internally displaced women and girls amidst armed conflicts, and to the vital participation of women in their own protection and empowerment. France adopted a first plan of action for “Femmes, paix et sécurité” in 2010, put in place in 2011, and ended in 2013.

In 2015, France adopted a second plan of action as a continuation and renewal of the first plan of action, lasting from 2015 to 2018. This plan of action calls specifically for the participation of women in finding solutions to armed conflicts, for the protection of women and girls against sexual violence, and the protection of women’s rights during and after conflicts. Furthermore, funding was made available for non-governmental organizations, both national and international, to ensure the protection of women and girls against sexual violence, and to go towards medical assistance of victims of sexual violence. However, these initiatives do not count towards compliance, because they took place outside of the compliance period.

In sum, France did not make any new efforts during the compliance period to support refugees and internally displaced women and girls by implementing policies to empower them and to prevent and respond to sexual and gender-based violence. Thus, France receives a score of −1.

*Analyst: Elisha Bauer-Maison*

Germany: +1

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to support refugee and internally displaced women and girls by implementing policies to empower them and to prevent and respond to sexual and gender-based violence.

On 21 June 2016, the Ministry of Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth launched a new joint initiative with the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) and the German Red Cross to address the issue of inequality facing women and girls in refugee accommodation centres. The initiative provides additional support from trained educators and social workers to women and girls in refugee shelters and camps specialized to their physical and mental health needs. Service workers create a separate space for women and girls to develop a sense of security, community and mutual empowerment.

---


On 5 July 2016, the German Federal Employment Service launched an initiative called Perspectives for Female Refugees or PerF-W. The programme has been adapted from a vocational training project aimed at enhancing the ability of refugees to join the German workforce in a way that directly addresses issues facing women refugees. It provides them with “vocational language training, site visits at companies and counselling” to give greater employment and economic self-reliance opportunities to women. Furthermore, PerF-W provides childcare services, child-friendly classrooms, and course flexibility for enrolled mothers. The part-time training programme requires trainees to complete 20 hours of instruction per week over the course of four months.

On 7 July 2016, German parliament passed a “No Means No” law in response to increasing sexual and gender-based violence against refugee women and girls to expand the definition of sexual violence and rape, and to enforce harsher punishments on those who commit sex crimes. Previously, victims of rape and sexual violence had to present evidence that they had defended themselves physically against their aggressor. Under the new law, any physical, verbal, or non-verbal signs of aggression can constitute a rape charge. Additionally, crimes of sexual nature that were considered minor in the past will now be punishable under German law. For example, an individual who has been part of a group committing sexual crimes may be subject to legal consequences, and groping an individual can now result in up to two years of prison time. In order to directly address the issue of sexual and gender-based violence in refugee accommodation centres, harsher punishments have been put in place to deter acts of violence against women and girls; these punishments include deportation.

The implementation of these initiatives shows that Germany has been compliant in all three areas of the commitment to support refugee and internally displaced women. The German government has addressed the issue of sexual and gender-based violence among refugee and internally displaced women and girls by increasing access to preventative mechanisms in the form of protection, restorative mechanisms, and justice through the implementation of the “No Means No” law. As well, it has fulfilled its commitment to combat the problem of unequal access to services by enhancing the availability of “medical, legal and psychosocial and

livelihood services for women and girls in launching the joint initiative with UNICEF and the German Red Cross. Finally, Germany has fulfilled its commitment to enhance "economic self-reliance" by providing access to "education and training" with the introduction of the PerF-W programme. As a result, Germany receives a compliance score of +1 in this commitment area.

Analyst: Sydney Piggott

Italy: −1

Italy has not complied with its commitment to support refugee and internally displaced women and girls as well as those affected by conflicts and disasters by providing assistance to empower them, develop their resilience, and prevent and respond to sexual and gender-based violence.

On 18 August 2016, it was reported that the Italian government began setting up shelters for asylum seekers who had been denied entrance to Switzerland on Italy’s northern border. At the shelters, legal aid was provided to help asylum seekers with Italy’s asylum process. There was no mention of legal aid or other services meant to help empower female migrants and address gender-based and sexual violence.

On 19 September 2016, at the United Nations Summit for Refugees and Migrants, Matteo Renzi, Prime Minister of Italy, made a statement about Italy’s efforts in the refugee crisis. Renzi commented on how Italy is at the forefront of the flows of migrants across the Mediterranean, and promoted a resettlement program aimed at protecting the most vulnerable refugees: women and children. There are no details available on this resettlement project and whether it includes measures to empower women and address gender-based and sexual violence.

Overall, therefore, despite the fact that Italy is providing shelter and services to many refugees and asylum seekers, there are no publicly available details on Italy’s efforts to empower female migrants and prevent and respond to gender-based and sexual violence. Thus, Italy receives a score of −1.

Analyst: Emma Fleetham

Japan: −1

Japan has not complied with its commitment to support refugee and internally displaced women and girls as well as those affected by conflicts and disasters by providing assistance to empower them and develop their resilience and to prevent and respond to sexual and gender-based violence.

On 28 March 2016, Japan committed USD12.3 million to several United Nations agencies working towards mainstreaming gender into the humanitarian response and protection of women and girls affected by Boko


Haram in Cameroon. The funds would go to projects that would especially address the needs of internally displaced and refugee women and girls, with a focus on survivors of gender-based and sexual violence. Efforts included training 150 police officers to effectively protect women and children during humanitarian crises, and setting up call centres for victims of gender-based violence. However, these initiatives were taken before the compliance period began, and as such cannot count towards compliance.

On 25 April 2016, Japan also committed to providing USD1.45 million in assistance to internally displaced women and for purposes of combating gender-based violence in Nigeria over the course of a year. In a press release, the Japanese embassy reiterated its commitment to protecting and assisting women and girl survivors of gender-based violence and internally displaced persons. They also committed to developing women’s and girls’ economic capabilities, accessibility to rehabilitation services, and humanitarian response and intervention during crises.

On 19 September 2016, Shinzo Abe, Prime Minister of Japan, pledged USD2.8 billion in aid for refugees and migrants over the following three years. Abe stated that the aid was meant to promote self-reliance among refugees, and increase economic development in host countries.

In summation, Japan has committed funding to empowering and protecting female refugees and internally displaced persons, but has not formalized any additional programs to prevent violence and protect these demographics. Thus, Japan receives a score of −1.

*Analyst: Sahdia Arshad Sandhu*

**United Kingdom: 0**

The United Kingdom has partially complied with its commitment to support refugee and internally displaced women and girls as well as those affected by conflicts and disasters by providing assistance to empower them, develop their resilience, prevent and respond to sexual and gender-based violence.

On 21 September 2016, Theresa May, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, announced a new jobs compact between the UK, the European Union, the World Bank, and Ethiopia. In exchange for a total of

---

GBP385 million, Ethiopia would be required to grant employment rights to 30,000 refugees. There are no details on whether any of these refugees would be women, or if any other efforts would be included to economically empower refugee women and girls, and therefore these efforts do not count towards compliance.

On 25 October 2016, Priti Patel, Secretary of State for International Development, pledged GBP35 million to create trading opportunities and sustainable livelihoods for refugees across Africa. This aid would also support the host community to encourage better integration of refugees and displaced persons. There were not, however, any details on whether any of this aid would be targeted at empowering women and girls specifically, and thus, these efforts cannot count towards compliance.

On 2 December 2016, Secretary Patel announced that the United Kingdom would double the UK’s investment in the Mediterranean region to GBP8 million. These funds will be used to set up a special protection fund to keep women and girl refugees in the Mediterranean region safe from trafficking and exploitation. The fund would provide shelters as alternatives to dangerous camp environments, and would strengthen anti-trafficking mechanisms in Greece and the Balkans.

On 3 February 2017, Prime Minister May announced a new package of more than GBP30 million to provide assistance to refugees across Greece, the Balkans, Libya, Egypt, Tunisia, Morocco, Algeria, and Sudan. This would include providing 60,000 refugees and migrants with legal support, and training workers to better identify and protect vulnerable women and girls from violence and trafficking in camps and in transit.

Through these actions, the United Kingdom addressed two of the three areas of the G7 Guiding Principles for Capacity Building of Women and Girls, but failed to address the component of this commitment that involves resilience-building. Thus, the United Kingdom receives a score of 0.

**Analyst: Natasha Rizwan**

---


United States: –1
The United States has not complied with its commitment to support refugee and internally displaced women and girls as well as those affected by conflicts and disasters by providing assistance to empower them, develop their resilience, and prevent and respond to sexual and gender-based violence.

On 27 September 2016, Anne Richard, Assistant Secretary for the Bureau of Population, Migration and Refugees, announced that the United States would pledge more than USD364 million in humanitarian aid for those affected by the war in Syria. This made the total American humanitarian assistance over USD5.9 billion since the beginning of the crisis in Syria. The new additional aid was for food, shelter, water, and medical care. There was no mention, however, if any of this aid would go towards empowering women and girls and responding to gender-based and sexual violence, so this does not count towards compliance.

On 6 March 2017, an executive order made by Donald Trump, President of the United States, temporarily suspended the United States Refugee Admittance Program (USRAP) and suspended right of entry into the United States for citizens of seven countries. This executive order also reduced the quota for refugees allowed to enter the United States upon reinstatement of USRAP, from 110,000 to 50,000 individuals. There was no mention of efforts to help refugees in other countries, or any specific measures geared towards women and girls.

In sum, the United States has not made any efforts specifically designed to empower women and girls and internally displaced persons and to protect them from gender-based and sexual violence. Thus, the United States receives a score of –1.

Analyst: Jane Tien

European Union: –1
The European Union has not complied with its commitment to support refugee and internally displaced women and girls as well as those affected by conflicts and disasters by providing assistance to empower them, develop their resilience, and prevent and respond to sexual and gender-based violence.

In February 2016, the Directorate General for Internal Policies published a study entitled “Female Refugees and Asylum Seekers: the issue of integration.” The study was requested by the European Parliament’s Committee on Women’s Rights and Gender Equality (FEMM). It was found that the European Union did not have any specific legislation resulting in competency in integrating refugees and asylum seekers, although migrants in the EU do have the protection of the EU’s general gender equality measures combating gender-

---

based and sexual violence. It was also found that the EU was not funding specific measures to support the integration of female refugees and asylum seekers.

In March 2016, the European Parliament adopted a resolution containing several recommendations to member states to increase protection for female refugees and asylum seekers. These included ensuring there are separate shower, bathroom, and sleeping facilities in reception and transit throughout the EU, as well as increasing the number of female staff and creating stronger legal asylum routes. Reports state that many EU countries have not implemented these recommendations and are unclear on which countries have. These recommendations were made outside the one-year compliance window covered by this report.

In September 2016, the United Nations organized training to further the skills of partners in developing, implementing, and monitoring gender sensitive support programs. This was organized through the EU-funded project “Gender sensitive socio-economic empowerment of vulnerable IDPs [internally displaced people],” implemented by UN Women and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. This program sought specifically to support the socio-economic integration of internally displaced persons, with a focus on women.

In sum, the European Union has not made significant efforts to empower female refugees and internally displaced persons, or to respond to and prevent gender-based and sexual violence. Thus, the EU receives a score of –1.

Analyst: Emma Woodbeck

---

8. Gender: Women’s Initiative in Developing STEM Careers

“In order to encourage the active role of women in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) careers, we strive to remove gender bias in careers, through promoting institutional change and creating legal and policy environments which effectively advance gender equality, and thereby increase the number of female students in STEM fields, and broaden the participation of women in research, engineering and entrepreneurial careers. Such efforts will be promoted through our collective and individual efforts including the G7’s ‘Women’s Initiative in Developing STEM Career (WINDS).’

G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration

Assessment

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

Background

STEM (science, technology, engineering and math) careers are generally male-dominated globally. However, an increasing number of national and international initiatives have been established to promote female education and participation in STEM fields. The G7 has continuously recognized the connection between the prosperity of women and the prosperity of a society as a whole. The G7’s Guiding Principles for Capacity Building of Women and Girls, published at the 2016 G7 Ise-Shima Summit, and the G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration, recognize this principle, and aim to implement it worldwide.

Previous G7 commitments have acknowledged the importance of female participation in creating a thriving society. The preponderance of these gendered commitments have focused specifically on female economic independence and the defense of women’s health. The first formal recognition of the significance of female economic empowerment was elucidated at the 1990 Houston Summit. The G7 continued to reiterate the importance of economic empowerment through to the 2002 Kananaskis Summit in Canada, at which point

---

the G8 committed to ameliorating female education worldwide in conjunction with the Millennium Development Goal of achieving universal primary education by 2015.\textsuperscript{720}

At the 2004 Sea Island Summit in the United States, G8 members committed to “increasing financing opportunities for female entrepreneurs, support for vocational training for women and internship opportunities,” particularly pertaining to women in the Middle East and North Africa.\textsuperscript{721}

The economic empowerment of women was discussed in detail at the 2015 Schloss Elmau Summit in Germany,\textsuperscript{722} where G7 members committed to “increase the number of women and girls who receive technical and vocational training in developing countries by one-third by 2030.”\textsuperscript{723} G7 members recognized that, “women regularly face discrimination which impedes economic potential, jeopardizes investment in development, and constitutes a violation of their human rights.”\textsuperscript{724} As such, G7 members committed to, “support our partners in developing countries and within our own countries to overcome discrimination, sexual harassment, violence against women and girls and other cultural, social, economic and legal barriers to women’s economic participation.”\textsuperscript{725}

During the 2016 G7 Ise-Shima Summit, G7 members recognized that promoting the active role of women in STEM fields would be beneficial to society as a whole.\textsuperscript{726} The G7 leaders emphasized the importance of removing the gender biases that women encounter, promoting institutional change, and creating legal and policy environments which effectively advance gender equality in STEM careers.\textsuperscript{726} Accordingly, the G7 has launched an initiative, the Women’s Initiative in Developing STEM Career (WINDS), to catalyze global promotion of the advancement of women in STEM fields and careers, in partnership with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), UNWomen, and other international agencies and stakeholders.\textsuperscript{728}

**Commitment Features**

At Ise-Shima, the G7 members reiterated their commitment to empowering women and girls globally. G7 members emphasized the importance of increasing female involvement in STEM fields and careers, in order to instigate “economic growth and productivity.”\textsuperscript{729} The G7 recognized the fact that “while the number of

---


\textsuperscript{723} Julia Kulik, Gender still high on the G7 agenda, G7/ G20 Research Groups (Toronto) 27 April 2016. Date of Access: 30 January 2017. http://www.g7g20.com/articles/julia-kulik-gender-still-high-on-the-g7-agenda.


women graduates in STEM fields is increasing, the share of women employed in STEM careers has shown little change in the last decade. G7 members adopted the *G7 Guiding Principles for Capacity Building of Women and Girls: Towards Sustainable, Inclusive and Equitable Growth and Peace*, which outlines potential actions that members can take to facilitate women’s education and employment in STEM fields. Such avenues include: i) “eliminate gender disparities and reduce gender stereotypes and biases in education at all levels”; ii) “support building the capacity of educational administrators and teachers to deepen their understanding of gender equality, to provide education that addresses gender stereotypes, and to implement gender-sensitive policies and teaching techniques”; iii) support the G7’s “Women’s Initiative in Developing STEM Career (WINDS)” to facilitate “institutional change” to create “legal and policy environments which effectively advance gender equality, and thereby increase the number of female students in STEM fields, and broaden the participation of women in research, engineering and entrepreneurial careers”; and finally iv) expand access to scholarships for women and girls to pursue STEM careers. The commitment evaluated in this report relates to most directly to priorities i) and iii).

Specifically, the commitment under analysis pledges member states to “to remove gender bias in careers, through promoting institutional change and creating legal and policy environments which effectively advance gender equality, and thereby increase the number of female students in STEM fields, and broaden the participation of women in research, engineering and entrepreneurial careers.” G7 members committed to working to achieve these goals both collectively and individually.

In order to understand this commitment, it is important to define “institutional change” and the meaning of “creating legal and policy environments.” The United Nations Development Programme defines institutional arrangements as “the policies, practices and systems that allow for effective functioning of an organization or group. These may include ‘hard’ rules such as laws or the terms of a contract, or ‘soft’ rules like codes of conduct or generally accepted values.” Where an “institution” is a body established by a series of legal mechanisms and the culture created by general policies, the “institutional change” should be managed by changes in laws and formal policies that encourage gender equality in STEM careers. States, as large institutions, wield influence over a number of areas that are important to aiding women in STEM careers (whether it be a business or educational initiative). Thus, there are multiple areas in which action may be taken in to support women’s entry into STEM careers: from encouragement in education leading up to STEM careers to support for women in, and stepping into leadership roles within STEM careers.

In terms of education, the OECD recommends that states “adopt practices that promote gender equality in education by: 1. ensuring that boys and girls have equal access to good-quality education, equal rights and opportunities to successfully complete schooling and in making educational choices; 2. reviewing and where necessary adapting school and early childhood education curricula, teaching and school practices to eliminate gender discrimination and stereotyping; 3. making the study of science, technology, engineering, mathematics (STEM) financial and entrepreneurship issues, as well as education, arts and the humanities, equally inclusive and attractive for both boys and girls; promoting the development of stronger reading habits among boys and girls; 4. campaigning and raising awareness among young men and women, parents, teachers and employers about gender-stereotypical attitudes towards academic performances and the likely consequences of overall educational choices for employment and entrepreneurship opportunities, career progression and earnings; 5.

---

encouraging more women who have completed STEM studies to pursue professional careers in these areas, for example by means of career counselling, adult education, internships, apprenticeships and targeted financial.”

Policies within this area also include “invest[ing] in teachers who are critical role players, both to motivate them and to provide quality teaching, so that we can produce the appropriately educated girls that are needed.”

In order to support women currently engaged in STEM careers, it is important to ensure that they have access to equal opportunities. For example, the United Nations Secretary General’s High Panel on Women’s Economic Empowerment called on states to, “ensure legal protection” and “reform discriminatory laws and regulation” for women within the workplace. The OECD has asked states to start by “introducing mechanisms to improve the gender balance in leadership positions in the public sector, such as disclosure requirements, target setting or quotas for women in senior management positions; strengthening the flexibility, transparency and fairness of public sector employment systems and policies; and monitoring progress of female representation in the public sector.” UN Women has advocated for similar efforts, acknowledging the helpfulness of Japan’s 2016 “Act on Promotion of Women’s Participation and Advancement in the Workplace … which requires large companies and public entities to create their own action plans with specific targets and to disclose relevant information” towards gender equality in workplaces including those in STEM careers.

In addition to encouraging women to pursue STEM education, and entering the STEM career place, UN Women has highlighted the importance of female role-models for girls to look up to in the STEM sectors.

Finally, in order to facilitate this commitment, the G7 launched the Women’s Initiative in Developing STEM Career (WINDS) in conjunction with the OECD, UN Women and other partners. WINDS has three primary objectives: 1) “Offering the positive vision of women’s STEM career and fostering an enabling environment for promoting such career in the G7 and around the world”; 2) “Diminishing gender disparity in economic status”; and 3) “Contributing to growth strategies by promoting women’s STEM career[s].” In order to attain these goals, G7 WINDS specifically emphasizes the importance of creating, sustaining, and enlarging networks amongst women, girls, and allies in STEM fields. The G7 has identified three primary ways in which it intends to enable this networking: 1) “Facilitating exchanges across generations in each G7 and among G7”; 2) “Setting up a WINDS page on the G7’s relevant HPs/ OECD” in order to coordinate and showcase the G7’s STEM related activities; and 3) appointing WINDS Ambassadors who will act as role models for women and girls in STEM fields. Given the centrality of WINDS, to achieve either partial or

full compliance with this commitment, member states would need to take substantive actions towards supporting this initiative with the overarching purpose of “promoting institutional change and creating legal and policy environments which effectively advance gender equality.”

### Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>G7 Member State does not take collective OR individual steps to remove gender bias in careers by promoting institutional change and creating policy environments that advance gender equality in STEM careers. The G7 member state may also receive a −1 if it does not give support to the G7’s Women’s Initiative in Developing STEM Careers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>G7 Member State takes collective OR individual steps to remove gender bias in careers by promoting institutional change and creating policy environments that advance gender equality in STEM careers. However, to achieve partial compliance, support must be given to the G7’s Women’s Initiative in Developing STEM Careers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>G7 Member State takes collective AND individual steps to remove gender bias in careers by promoting institutional change and creating policy environments that advance gender equality in STEM careers, including through contributions to the G7’s Women’s Initiative in Developing STEM Careers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written by: Eimi Harris and Sonia Arora

### Canada: +1

Canada has fully complied with its commitment to remove gender bias from careers by promoting institutional change and creating environments that advance gender equality in STEM (science, technology, engineering and math).

As a result of low representation and recruitment of women in top-tier academic STEM fields, the Government of Canada effected requiring all universities to formulate proposals to enhance the number of Research Chair positions awarded to women, including those from visible minorities and disabilities, within two years in order to receive federal funding. Currently, women hold just 17 percent of tier-one and 30 percent of tier-two research positions, a percentage the Canadian government believes must be increased in order to enhance the active role of women in STEM fields.

In February 2017, Minister of Science Kristy Duncan launched a nationwide campaign to motivate young women to pursue STEM fields. Through the use of social media platforms and educational materials, the government hopes to support teachers and mentors to encourage young girls to enter STEM fields.

In October 2016, during the International Day of the Girl Ceremony at the United Nations, Minister of the Status of Women Patty Hajdu re-affirmed Canada’s commitment to gender equity issues, and especially the empowerment of women and girls. In addition to being a key player in issues pertaining to women empowerment, which translates to the enhancement of women in STEM fields, Canada will continue to be

---

an advocate for policy formulation on gender equality both nationally and internationally as a member of the
United Nations Commission of the Status of Women for the 2017-2020 term.\textsuperscript{748}

The commitment of Canada to advancing women in STEM is also reflected in the government’s 2017 budget
policies, which contain several provisions to enhance women participating in STEM fields and programs.
With focuses on grants for adult women returning to school, and the introduction of a new affordable-access
program to provide internet access to low-income families which consists mainly of women, Canada aims to
stimulate the interest of women and young girls in education and technology as a whole.\textsuperscript{749,750} While not all
these policies are explicitly STEM-targeted, advancing women’s education is a precursor to advancing
women’s participation in STEM.

As a result of the steps it has taken to remove gender bias from research fields and its affirmation of its
commitment to women and girls at relevant events, as well as its nationwide campaign to motivate young
women to pursue STEM, Canada has been awarded a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Andy Afenu Edem}

\textbf{France: +1}

France has complied with its commitment to promote the active role of women in STEM (science,
technology, engineering and math) to a degree. Since 2012, France has implemented important regulatory
legislature with the aim of ensuring effective equality between men and women in all societal sectors, with a
focus in Higher education and Research.

The research on gender equality and women in academia particularly has developed considerably in France in
the past ten years.\textsuperscript{751} According to the World Economic Forum, France “improves on labour force
participation and female professional and technical workers. It is one of two countries in the region to have
fully closed its gender gap on the Educational Attainment and Health and Survival subindexes.”\textsuperscript{752}

From 2 to 14 September 2016, the 9th European Conference on Gender Equality in Higher Education took
place in Paris, France.\textsuperscript{753} The event was hosted by the French National Center for Scientific Research (CNRS)
along with the Université Paris Diderot, Université Sorbonne Nouvelle- Paris 3 and the Université Sorbonne
Paris Cité (USPC), with strong support from the French Ministry for National Education, Higher Education
and Research.\textsuperscript{754} Researchers, professors, administrators, policy-makers, practitioners and students were
invited to attend.\textsuperscript{755} The European Conferences on Gender Equality have brought together hundreds of
gender equality proponents from Europe and beyond since 1998, in order to provide a forum of international
scale to discuss challenges and solutions concerning gender equality in academia.\textsuperscript{756}

\textsuperscript{751} European Conference on Gender Equality in Higher Education and Research. Date of Access: 13 May 2017.
https://9euconfgender.sciencesconf.org/.
\textsuperscript{753} European Conference on Gender Equality in Higher Education and Research. Date of Access: 13 May 2017.
https://9euconfgender.sciencesconf.org/.
\textsuperscript{754} European Conference on Gender Equality in Higher Education and Research. Date of Access: 13 May 2017.
https://9euconfgender.sciencesconf.org/.
https://9euconfgender.sciencesconf.org/.
\textsuperscript{756} European Conference on Gender Equality in Higher Education and Research. Date of Access: 13 May 2017.
https://9euconfgender.sciencesconf.org/.
On January 31, 2017, the Minister of National Education, Higher Education and Research, Najat Vallaud-Belkacem, the Minister of Families, Children and Women’s Rights, Laurence Rossignol, and the Secretary of Digital and Innovation, Axelle Lemaire signed the Digital Diversity Sector Plan. The new initiative set forth by the French Government aims to promote gender equality in the tech industry in France, along with fifteen organizations also working to tackle the issue. Mobilized alongside the digital representatives, the plan commits each of the signatories to implement concrete actions so that women and girls orient themselves towards traditionally male-dominated professions such as digital or technical work in this sector. By combining the work of important digital and government representatives, this plan will promote gender mainstreaming by addressing sexist stereotypes and acting at every stage of women’s career paths. And continuing education, in access to employment and entrepreneurship.

On the International Day of Women and Girls in Science, on 9 February, an official celebration took place at the UNESCO Headquarters in Paris, France. Held were round table discussion focusing on the theme of gender equality in science, which called for the analysis “of women and girls in science and engineering, their empowerment and their visibility as scientists and researchers, as well as the current data and trends on women and girls in in STEM."

In accordance to its steps taken for advancing gender equality in STEM careers and in higher education, France is awarded with a score of +1.

Analyst: Lisa Wang

Germany: +1

Germany has taken specific steps to address gender inequality in the workplace, and to increase women’s access to jobs in STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math).

On 7 October 2016, the media reported that the ruling coalition and its allies in the Bundestag had agreed on the concept of new regulations requiring large companies to “publish reports on gender pay parity every five years” and “in principle on rules under which employees at businesses with more than 200 staff will have a right to see anonymized data on the wages of men and women in comparable positions.

On 13 December 2016, an event titled “Shining Future of Women in STEM fields” was held in Japan as part of the G7 Ise-Shima Summit’s Women’s Initiative in Developing STEM careers (WINDS). The purpose of the event was to show the importance of fostering an “enabling environment” for women’s to enter into

---

http://www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco/events/natural-sciences-events/?tx_browser_pi1%5BshowUid%5D=41708&cHash=6fca5525dc
STEM careers, and to contribute to a discussion on growth strategies to promote this.\textsuperscript{766} Germany was represented by one WINDS ambassador, the Japan Representative from the Leibniz Association, Iris Wieczorek.\textsuperscript{767}

On 11 January 2017, the German government proposed the Draft Act to Promote Transparency in Pay Structures.\textsuperscript{768} In addition to setting out the rules on transparency that had been agreed upon in October, the proposed act would also create several other structural changes that aim to promote transparency in wage structures and decrease the gender wage gap.\textsuperscript{769} The act would create a prohibition of direct or indirect pay discrimination based on gender through new legal definitions of “equal work or work of equal value” and several other concepts related to pay equity.\textsuperscript{770} Furthermore, it would expand the powers of the Worker’s Council to enforce an employee’s right to information.

Germany has also taken other steps outside of the compliance period, although these do not count against its compliance score.

In 2008, Germany adopted the Implementation Agreement on the Joint Science Conference Agreement on the Equality of Women and Men in Joint Funding Activities for Research and the national Mathematics, Computer Science, Nature Sciences, and Technology (MINT) Pact.\textsuperscript{772} The German government provides approximately EUR3 million annually to the MINT Pact, which is “supported nationwide by companies, associations, trade unions, scientific institutions, media, social partners and public institutions.”\textsuperscript{773} In the implementation agreement, the federal and Länder governments committed themselves to supporting gender equality in their jointly funded research institutions.

In 2008, Germany also launched “Go MINT” – the National Pact for Women in MINT (STEM) Careers, which brings together politics, business, science, and the media in the interests of changing societal perceptions of the STEM professions as male-centric.

In summary, Germany has taken specific steps to address gender inequality in the workplace and particularly with respect to STEM fields, earning it a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Jeffrey Li}

---


Italy: 0

Italy has partially complied with its commitment to take collective and individual steps to remove gender bias in careers by promoting institutional change and creating policy environments that advance gender equality in careers in STEM (science, technology, engineering and math), including through contributions to the G7’s Women’s Initiative in Developing STEM Careers.

On 21 October 2016, the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, in collaboration with WE-Women Empower the World, the Organisation for Cooperation and Economic Development, and the Aspen Institute, hosted an event titled “Why Women Matter — Promoting Gender Balance in Public Life and Economic Strategies.”774 The event featured female delegates from the political, academic, entrepreneurial, and institutional sectors around the world to debate on “the leadership women can provide in politics, in the economy and in institutional public life at a national and international level.”775 A presentation by OECD Chief of Staff Gabriela Ramos focused in part on the low level of women graduating from STEM programs, in addition to other aspects of the gender gap.776 She suggested several ways to reduce the gender gap in education, including by taking steps to “raise the profile of career opportunities and role models” for women.777 She also suggested that states could develop programs similar to that of the United States’ Department of Education’s “Race to the Top” project, which “prioritizes improving STEM achievement overall and within under-represented groups — including women and girls — in awarding grants to states.”778

On 13 December 2016, an event titled “Shining Future of Women in STEM fields” was held in Japan as part of the G7 Ise-Shima Summit’s Women’s Initiative in Developing STEM careers (WINDS).779 The purpose of the event was to show the importance of fostering an “enabling environment”780 for women’s to enter into STEM careers, and to contribute to a discussion on growth strategies to promote this.781 Italy sent two representatives to participate in the conference. Professor Simona Settepanella of Hokkaido University attended the event as a WINDS ambassador on behalf of Italy, while Italian Marta Marmiroli of the Mitsubishi Electric Corporation also attended the event.782

On 23 December 2016, L’ORÉAL Italia, in collaboration with the Italian National Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization launched the call for applications for its “Women in Science” award with a deadline set on 16 January 2017. The purpose of the award is to encourage the professional training of female researchers working in STEM fields. The award consists of six 10-month fellowships worth EUR20,000 each to young and talented female researchers that will be used to help the researchers conduct scientific research at various Italian research institutions.

On 15 March 2017, the Permanent Mission of Italy to the UN held a side event during the United Nation's 61st Session of the Commission on the Status of Women titled “Promoting STEM as an Essential Factor for Women’s Labour Inclusion and Career Advancement.” The Director General for the Department for Equal Opportunities and President of the Council of Ministers, Monica Parrella, delivered the introductory speech. This was followed by statements from participants including: 1) world renowned European Space Agency astronaut and Captain of the Italian Air Force, Samantha Cristoforetti; 2) Director of the Gender Mainstreaming Division from the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs Kyoko Hokugo; 3) the Deputy Head of the Gender Equality Unit of the European Commission, Sarah-Jane King; and 4) distinguished US Professor of Psychology and Linguistics from Hunter College, Virginia Valian. The Italian hosts of the event also provided information on Italy’s efforts to encourage women to enter into STEM careers.

On 7 to 8 April 2017, the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, in collaboration with WE-Women Empower the World and the ASPEN Institute organized the Women’s G7 Forum (W7) “Starting from Girls” in order to advance dialogue among academia, business, civil society and G7 institutional representatives on key issues regarding gender equality, eliminating gender stereotypes and discriminations, the growing need and role of women in STEM fields and women’s economic empowerment. The hosting of the W7 Forum by Italy is “the first official convening of a formally recognised G7 women’s engagement group.” and W7 officials stated that they will be formulating policy recommendations over the duration of the forum to convey to the Heads of State in the upcoming G7 summit in Taormina, Italy.

Italy also took an important step to tackle this issue prior to the compliance period, although it does not count toward its compliance score.

In February 2016, the Italian Ministry of Education, University, and Research and the Italian Department for Equal Opportunities created a new educational initiative called “STEM Month — Women Want to Count,” “which is a set of dedicated initiatives to combat gender stereotypes and discrimination in schools.” Thus, Italy has scored a 0 for partial compliance.

**Analyst: Bryan Roh**

---


Japan: +1

Japan has fully complied with its commitment to promote the active role of women in fields in STEM (science, technology, engineering and math). It has promoted institutional change and has taken steps to create policy environments for the advancement of gender equality in STEM careers, including through contributions to the G7’s Women’s Initiative in Developing STEM Careers (WINDS).

From 27 to 30 June 2016, the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) held the Policy Partnership Women and the Economy meetings in Lima, Peru.790 As a member economy, Japan adopted the APEC Women and the Economy 2016 Forum Statement which includes the APEC Women in STEM initiative.791 With the overarching goal of facilitating the economic integration of women in the global economy, this initiative is “aimed at strengthening the presence of women in STEM educational programs and careers” by focusing on four key areas: the enabling environment, education, employment, and entrepreneurship.792

In October 2016, the Cabinet Office of Japan and the Japan Association of Technology Executives co-organized a symposium on promoting “the active participation of women engineers.”795 The symposium comprised of women and men in managerial positions, young female engineers, and female STEM students.794 It included discussions led by female engineers who have been appointed or recruited to management positions.795

In adherence to the WINDS initiative, the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs appointed 3 women as Japan’s WINDS ambassadors.796 Reiko Kuroda, Naoko Yamazaki and Emi Tamaki were appointed with the objective of “[showing] the positive vision of women’s career in STEM fields as role models.”797

On 13 and 14 December 2016, the Government of Japan hosted the World Assembly for Women (WAW!) with the aim of fostering an active role of women in society “both in Japan and across the world.”798 A G7 WINDS special event, “Shining Future of Women in STEM fields,” was held on the first day of the conference.799 The event was marked by proposals to feature female role models in STEM fields, to “strengthen STEM career networks for women and girls,” to implement “institutional reforms [in order to] make systems more women-friendly,” to organize “STEM-related seminars and programs,” and to take “further actions for more women in STEM fields to appear in the media.”800 These proposals, among others.

---


In cooperation with the Science Council of Japan, the Japan Science and Technology Agency has organized the Gender Summit 10 to be held in Japan on 25 and 26 May 2017.\footnote{Welcome Message, Gender Summit 10. Date of Access: 2 April 2017. http://www.gender-summit10.jp/message.html.} Embodying the theme, “Better Science and Innovation through Gender, Diversity and Inclusive Engagement,” the summit seeks to discuss science and gender, including the equal prospects for women and men in STEM education.\footnote{Program & Presentations (Tentative), Gender Summit 10. Date of Access: 2 April 2017. http://www.gender-summit10.jp/program.html.}

As a result of its collective and individual steps to remove gender bias in STEM careers, Japan has been awarded a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Sharika Khan}

\textbf{United Kingdom: 0}

The United Kingdom has partially complied with its commitment to facilitate women’s active education and employment in fields in STEM (science, technology, engineering and math). The UK’s support for the Women’s Initiative in the Development of STEM Careers (WINDS), education reform, and funding employment infrastructure partly arranges a foundational framework of legal and policy environments empowering women in STEM; however it requires further sustained action to qualify for full compliance.

On 8 July 2016, the Government of the UK Department for Business, Innovation & Skills and Department for Education published the Post-16 Skills Plan as a part of the Technical and Further Education Bill to reform the skills education system. The document explicitly calls for the need to increase women in STEM occupations stating, “The lack of women within STEM occupations is a significant factor contributing to the gender pay gap, which we want to eliminate within a generation.”\footnote{Department for Education, Department for Business Innovation and Skills, and Nick Boles MP, Post-16 Skills Plan, Gov.uk, July 2016. Date of Access: 23 April 2017. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/536043/Post-16_Skills_Plan.pdf, 33.} Furthermore, the Post-16 skills plan re-affirms the “ambition for 20 per cent of new entrants to engineering and technical apprenticeships in the transport sector to be women by 2020, and gender parity in the working population by 2030 at the latest.”\footnote{Department for Education, Department for Business Innovation and Skills, and Nick Boles MP, Post-16 Skills Plan, Gov.uk, July 2016. Date of Access: 23 April 2017. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/536043/Post-16_Skills_Plan.pdf, 33.} This illustrates compliance to the commitment to further institutional change to advance gender equality as it transparently acknowledges the goal to further women’s’ involvement in STEM fields and establishes a quantitative target for women entering apprenticeships by a set timeline.

100 are a part of STEM industries. These aspects of the single departmental plan denote partial compliance in the implementation of general institutional changes that target women’s greater access to higher wages and upper-level positions without specifically targeting women in STEM fields.

On 23 November 2016, Her Majesty’s Treasury (HM Treasury) released a policy paper entitled “Autumn 2016 Statement” outlining the policies to support the nation’s economy during the transition of exiting the European Union. The document stipulates that the government will allocate GBP4.7 billion towards science research and development through the Northern Powerhouse Investment Fund (NPIF). The policy paper specifies that government funded research council Innovate UK will manage the Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund, the grant funding of Innovation, Applied Science and Research, and the transfer of GBP100 billion to “extend and enhance” the Biomedical Catalyst competition for healthcare research funding. Innovate UK published the Diversity and Inclusion Statement of Intent in May 2016, where the organization stated the intent to “publish a strategy and action plan for diversity and inclusion by the end of March 2017.” As of 5 April 2017, Innovate UK has yet to publish this plan. This partially complies with the commitment to increasing women’s opportunities in STEM fields by supporting STEM field funding through an organization that has articulated intent to foster gender equality, but has yet to fully satisfy its commitments.

On 13 December 2016, WINDS Ambassador for the UK Dr. Averil Macdonald attended the G7 WINDS: Shining Future of Women in STEM Fields event in Tokyo to present and deliberate on future visions of women’s careers in STEM fields and the efforts in each country to comply with the commitment. Macdonald presented a quiz built to connect girls with possible career options in STEM. This illustrates compliance with the commitment of the UK to support the WINDS initiative and supplementing a network for a positive view of women in STEM careers.

On 8 March 2017, HM Treasury published the Spring Budget for 2017. The document confirmed the creation of the Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund and its mediation between the UK’s business and science bases. The document specifies, “An initial investment of £270 million in 2017-18 will kick-start the development of disruptive technologies that have the potential to transform the UK economy.” Furthermore, Spring Budget 2017 outlines government spending of GBP90 million for the purpose of providing 1,000 new PhD places in areas aligned with the Industrial Strategy. According to the document, “Around 85% will be in STEM disciplines, and 40% will directly help strengthen collaboration between business and academia through industrial partnerships.” This funding allocation partially complies with diminishing gender disparity in economic status in conjunction with the above methods of integrating women in STEM.

In conclusion, the UK has partially complied with its commitment to support WINDS through legislative action such as the Post-16 Skills Plan, the Department of Education Single Department Plan, the Autumn 2016 Statement and the Spring Budget 2017. With a focus on creating a legal and policy framework to diminish wage gaps between genders, introduce target percentages of women in STEM for future years, and

---

foster communication regarding the gender disparity in STEM and its need for role models, the UK enacts a work in progress with WINDS.

**Analyst: Aisha Albiz**

**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to take both collective and individual steps to remove gender bias in fields in STEM (science, technology, engineering and math), and to promote institutional change and create policy environments that will advance gender equality in STEM careers.

On 14 June 2016, the White House hosted the first United State of Women Summit in Washington DC in order to both highlight the achievements of women from all fields and further advance women’s rights and gender equality in the United States. The summit was attended by more than 5,000 participants, and key speakers included President Barack Obama, First Lady Michelle Obama, and various high-level female leaders from across the world. STEM was a particularly emphasized issue in the summit, with organizations such as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and the US Department of Energy pushing forward the debate on STEM in the summit. The summit resulted in the attending government, private-sector businesses, foundations, and organizations pledging USD 50 million in commitments to expand equal economic opportunity and improve the lives of women and girls globally.813

On 8 August 2016 to 9 August 2016, NASA hosted its first MissionSTEM Summit at the agency’s headquarters in Washington DC, bringing together over 300 stakeholders from government, academia, industry and the non-profit sector to discuss challenges and innovative practices and solutions to diversifying the STEM workforce in the United States in order to advance equal opportunity access to STEM.814 Women of colour in STEM led panel discussions and advocated for more inclusive STEM program environments. NASA stated that they will develop a publication that highlights the key points made regarding equal opportunity access in STEM that were discussed over the two-day summit.815

On 17 October 2016, President Obama made a speech on education at the Benjamin Banneker Academic High School in Washington DC that highlighted the importance of advancing STEM opportunities for women and girls. As Obama stated, “we’re investing more in getting girls and young women and young people of colour and low-income students into science and engineering and technology and math.” 816

On 28 October 2016, the White House Council on Women and Girls together with the White House’s My Brother’s Keeper Initiative and the Office of Science and Technology Policy collaborated with the US Department of Energy and the National Math and Science Initiative to host a conference on inclusive STEM education for youths.817 The conference brought together 200 representatives from academia, government, advocacy organizations, and the non-profit sector committed to advancing diversity, equity and inclusion in STEM fields for all youths regardless of gender or colour. In the end, the conference “allowed key players to

---

assess the critical gaps in the STEM ecosystem, and formulate calls-to-action to bring back to their communities and institutions.⁸¹⁸

In December 2016, NASA worked in collaboration with Twentieth Century Fox to “highlight women pioneers in STEM past and present with the release of the movie, Hidden Figures.”⁸¹⁹ The movie chronicles the lives of former female African-American NASA mathematicians who were vital in contributing towards the success of the United State’s 20th century Space Race but whose work has not been publicly recognised until recently. NASA officials participated as advisors offering historical guidance during the filmmaking process⁸²⁰ and also organized a publicity campaign to provide educational content that hopes to “[inspire] students, including girls of color, to envision the opportunities that exist in pursuing a STEM career.”⁸²¹

On 9 December 2016, the US Department of Energy (DOE) launched the Girls of Energy e-book and an interactive website accompanying it to both advance efforts to build an inclusive STEM environment and also encourage young women to pursue careers in STEM fields in the United States.⁸²² Specifically, the DOE states that its Girls of Energy initiative is designed to allow “young women to see just how amazing a STEM career can be” for it is important for “young women of all ages […] to realize] that they have a place in STEM and Energy fields.”⁸²³ Both the e-book and the website highlights the importance of energy, the “cutting-edge energy research and technology”⁸²⁴ being developed in DOE’s National Laboratories, and examples of some of the world’s most renowned women working in STEM fields today.⁸²⁵

On 13 December 2016, an event titled “Shining Future of Women in STEM fields” was held in Japan as part of the G7 Ise-Shima Summit’s Women’s Initiative in Developing STEM careers (WINDS).⁸²⁶ The purpose of the event was to show the importance of fostering an “enabling environment”⁸²⁷ for women’s to enter into STEM careers, and to contribute to a discussion on growth strategies to promote this.⁸²⁸ Senior Advisor and Counselor Stephanie Foster from the US Department of State participated in the meeting.⁸²⁹ The Director of

---


the US National Science Foundation’s Tokyo Region Office Elizabeth E. Lyons also attended as the US WINDS ambassador.830

On 16 December 2016, the White House Council on Women and Girls released an official report titled “Advancing Equity for Women and Girls of Color: 2016 Updated Report.”831 The report serves as an annual follow-up to the previous two versions which also focused on improving gender and racial equality in the United States, and outlines five “core objectives”832 that the US government considers to be imperative in this effort. These core objectives of the US government include the importance of expanding access to “inclusive STEM education” for women and girls of colour. The Council hosted a forum shortly after the release of the report to both discuss the Obama administration’s contributions in addressing the gender and racial disparities apparent in STEM, and also highlight the spectrum of initiatives being done to advance equity issues across the country.833

On 28 February 2017, US President Donald Trump signed two new laws authorizing NASA and the National Science Foundation (NSF) to promote career opportunities in STEM for women and girls.834 Specifically, the first law titled “Inspiring the Next Space Pioneers, Innovators, Researchers and Explorers (INSPIRE) Women Act” “directs [NASA] to encourage women and girls to study [STEM]”835 while also promoting promising careers for women in aerospace.836 The act calls on NASA to present to Congress a specified plan within 90 days on how both former and current employees at NASA can engage with K-12 female students to help inspire the next generation of women to consider going into career fields in STEM and aerospace.837 The second law titled “Promoting Women in Entrepreneurship Act” authorizes the NSF to encourage women that have or are pursuing degrees in STEM to also consider entering the commercial world afterwards.838 According to the press release on the new law, the bill “encourages the [NSF] to tackle the problem that only 26 percent of women who attain degrees in STEM fields work in STEM jobs.”839

On 28 March 2017, the US Department of Education and NASA collaborated with the Smithsonian museum to hold an event “to celebrate Women’s History Month and offer encouragement to female students

interested in STEM.\textsuperscript{840} Ivanka Trump and Minister of Education Betsy DeVos attended the event for students, with Trump noting that “Women’s participation in STEM … is critical in the fight for wage equality and for the empowerment of women in the economy.”\textsuperscript{841}

Thus, the United States has scored +1 for full compliance.

\textit{Analyst: Bryan Roh}

\textbf{European Union: 0}

The European Union has partially complied with its commitment to take both collective and individuals steps to remove gender bias in fields in STEM (science, technology, engineering and math) and promote institutional change and create policy environments that will advance gender equality in STEM careers, including through the Women’s Initiative in Developing STEM careers.

On 13 December 2016, an event titled “Shining Future of Women in STEM fields” was held in Japan as part of the G7 Ise-Shima Summit’s Women’s Initiative in Developing STEM careers (WINDS).\textsuperscript{842} The purpose of the event was to show the importance of fostering an “enabling environment”\textsuperscript{843} for women’s to enter into STEM careers, and to contribute to a discussion on growth strategies to promote this.\textsuperscript{844} Mara Marinaki, the Principal Advisor on Gender from the European External Action Service, and Viviane Willis-Mazzichi, Head of Sector Gender and Directorate General of Research and Innovation from the European Commission, were both key speakers and WINDS ambassadors at the event.\textsuperscript{845}

On 8 March 2017, the European Parliament highlighted the importance of equal opportunity access for women interested in STEM, work-life balance, and the gender pay gap in a series of public awareness events on the occasion of International Women’s Day. Events included the Parliament organizing a public seminar regarding equal gender economic equality hosted by members from the EU’s gender equality committee for journalists to attend, and a live questions and answers session on social media with Ernest Urtasun who is a Member of European Parliament and also the author of the author the Parliament’s resolution on equality between women and men in the EU in 2014-2015.\textsuperscript{846}

On 8 March 2017, the European Commission published the 2017 Report on Equality Between Women and Men in the EU.\textsuperscript{847} This document reports on progress made by the EU with the plan for Strategic Engagement for Gender Equality, 2016-2019.\textsuperscript{848} Efforts to encourage women to enter into STEM careers are

\begin{itemize}
mentioned in two of the five priorities of the strategy. Under the priority of “increasing female labour-market participation and the equal economic independence of women and men,” the EU committed to action “promoting institutional change in research organisations to remove barriers to gender equality and engage all research organisations to implement gender equality plans (2016-2017).” Under the priority of “reducing gender pay, earnings and pension gaps and thus fighting poverty among women,” the EU committed to “promoting gender equality in all levels and types of education, including in relation to gendered study subject choices and careers.”

On 13 and 14 March 2017, the European Commissioner for International Cooperation and Development, Neven Mimica, attended the 61st United Nation’s session of the Commission on the Status of Women held in New York to promote the empowerment of women in the global labour market. Mimica also attended several high-level events such as on “Women and the future of work — delivering decent employment and access to the labour market” and stressed the importance in empowering female role models in STEM for the next generation of women in education.

On 3 April 2017, SYSTEMIC, Scientix, and the STEM Alliance launched a massive open online course (MOOC) entitled “Opening Minds to STEM Careers,” with funding from the European Commission. The course is targeted at teachers across the EU, and “is meant to train and empower…[teachers] in successfully introducing and attracting young people to STEM careers from an early age” One of the key issues that is addressed by the course is gender stereotypes in STEM education.

Thus, the EU has scored a 0 for partial compliance with this commitment.

Analyst: Bryan Roh

---


“[We recognize that strengthening capacity of developing countries in tax policy and administration is indispensable to level the global playing field.] To enhance both quantity and quality of assistances in this area, we are committed to the principles of the Addis Tax Initiative along with encouraging other countries to make a similar commitment, and we request that the Platform for Collaboration on Tax be actively utilized to provide an opportunity where developing and developed countries and relevant organizations can share information and knowledge on a regular basis.”

G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ 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>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>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>+0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

The Addis Ababa Action Agenda, which was launched at the Third International Conference on Financing for Development in July 2015, outlines the means by which countries will finance sustainable development, and, in particular, the actions needed to achieve the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. While the agenda argues that economic growth should be the primary means by which states finance sustainable development at the domestic level, it also “notes the need to strengthen tax administration.” This builds specifically on Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 17.1, which commits states to “strengthen domestic resource mobilization, including through international support to developing countries, to improve domestic capacity for tax and other revenue collection.”

The Addis Tax Initiative (ATI) was also launched at the same conference to meet this objective. It was noted that this represented a re-focusing of international attention on domestic resource mobilization, which had “been out of the spotlight for many years.” Despite this, the ATI declaration argues that it is in step with previous actions on domestic resource mobilization, beginning with the 2002 Monterrey Consensus of the

International Conference on Financing for Development. Furthermore at the 2014 High Level Meeting of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation, attending representatives placed a key focus on domestic resource mobilization to stimulate economic development and self-reliance.

The ATI was initiated by Germany, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States and has since grown to over 30 countries and is supported by 10 international and regional organizations, including the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. It is an effort by subscribing countries to enhance the mobilisation and effective use of their domestic resources to improve fairness, transparency, and efficiency in their tax systems. The Initiative aims to enable members to more effectively finance economic development projects through expanding domestic revenue, and to prevent misuse of funds through greater transparency.

There are three main commitments made in the ATI Declaration. First, the donors agreed to “double our support for technical cooperation in the area of taxation/domestic revenue mobilization by 2020.” While this “technical cooperation” could include many types of efforts to increase tax compliance in developing countries, partners also agreed to work to combat base erosion and profit sharing (BEPS), which refers to tax avoidance strategies wherein profits are shifted to low- or no-tax locations. Secondly, the partner countries recognized the importance of political will for success in improving domestic resource mobilization, and committed to a set of key principles for achieving this goal. One of these is to “embrace policies and practices that foster fair, efficient and transparent tax systems.” Finally, all involved states promised “to pursue policy coherence for development.”

While the ATI is a new initiative, the issue of tax transparency is one that has been discussed at previous G7/8 summits. For example, at the 2004 Sea Island G8 Summit, commitments were made to fight corruption and to improve transparency and accountability in the public and private sectors. At the 2013 Lough Erne G8 Summit, commitments were made to tackle BEPS, and the G8 leaders welcomed cooperation with the

---
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Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and G20 to support the OECD Action Plan to combat BEPS issues.\textsuperscript{869} Despite these efforts, tax evasion remains a serious issue.

**Commitment Features**

The key feature of the G7’s declaration on this issue is their commitment “to the principles of the Addis Tax Initiative” in addition to their promise to advise “other countries to make a similar commitment.”\textsuperscript{870}

This commitment specifically focuses on applying the fundamental principles of the Addis Tax Initiative to develop tax policy and administration to encourage domestic resource mobilization in developing countries, thus spurring development. Therefore, it can be divided into two areas of action: 1) efforts to increase financial or technical support to help developing countries improve their capacity in the area of taxation; and 2) efforts to encourage developing countries to join ATI or similar initiatives to encourage collaboration on tax and support principles of transparency, efficiency, effectiveness and fairness.

G7 members could achieve compliance with principle 1) by providing financial support or technical expertise in order to develop the tax infrastructures of developing countries, including (but not limited to) tackling base erosion and profit shifting. G7 members could achieve compliance with principle 2) by encouraging other states to join or commit to ATI or similar initiatives that promote collaboration and apply to the principles above in delivering a tax policy that is transparent, efficient, and effective. Statements or conferences where G7 members illustrate their support for the ATI will provide evidence of efforts made in this area.

Full compliance with this commitment requires that both these objectives be met. A G7 member will have partially complied if it takes action in only one of these areas. The G7 member will receive a score of -1 if it takes no action in these areas.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>G7 member makes no efforts to increase financial or technical support to help developing countries to build their capacity for domestic resource mobilization AND takes no action to encourage other countries to commit to the Addis Tax Initiative or similar initiatives that increase cooperation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>G7 member makes efforts to increase financial or technical support to help developing countries to build their capacity for domestic resource mobilization OR takes action to encourage other countries to commit to the Addis Tax Initiative or similar initiatives that increase cooperation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>G7 member makes efforts to increase financial or technical support to help developing countries to build their capacity for domestic resource mobilization AND takes action to encourage other countries to commit to the Addis Tax Initiative or similar initiatives that increase cooperation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada: 0**

Canada has partially complied with its commitment to the Addis Tax Initiative (ATI). Although it has not made efforts to increase financial or technical support to help developing countries build their capacity for domestic resource mobilization during the compliance period, it has encouraged states to commit to the ATI.

Canada has encouraged other states to take part in the initiative by co-hosting a workshop on the ATI. The 2016-2017 Work Plan of the ATI suggests that these side events are a means by which ATI members can publicize the project.\textsuperscript{871} On 18 July 2016, Canada co-hosted a workshop to discuss “recent developments in


the ATI, as well as partner countries’ needs in the area of domestic resource mobilization.\(^872\) While there, Karina Gould, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, emphasized “the need for … political support to overcome barriers to change.”\(^873\)

At the 19 October 2016 ATI meeting, Canada expressed its interest in continuing to be a member of the ATI Steering Council, and volunteered to take over the donor nation co-chair position from the Netherlands starting in December 2016.\(^874\) This shows that Canada is committed to ensuring that other nations within the ATI framework continue to achieve their commitments. However, it does not necessarily show an effort on the part of the Canadian government to bring new members into the ATI. Mentions of this leadership position are absent from Global Affairs Canada public announcements.

On 30 November 2016 at the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation HLM2, a side-event relating to the ATI was organized by the International Tax Compact on behalf of Canada and the other secretariat nations.\(^875\) The Nairobi Outcome Document, produced at this meeting by Canada and other member states of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation, also stated that “[the member states] recognize the Addis Tax Initiative as a way to boost domestic resource mobilization.”\(^876\)

In previous years, Canada has participated in projects to combat base erosion and profit shifting (BEPS) and has included provisions for that in its budget.\(^877\) Documents published after the Ise-Shima Summit show further action has been taken. In its 2017 Budget Plan, Canada re-affirmed their commitment to combat BEPS. The plan further outlines measures to be taken in relation to information access and ease of international policy implementation.\(^878\) However, it makes no reference to the improvement of Domestic Resource Mobilization in developing countries, and the measures mentioned at the Summit generally approach BEPS as an issue of Canadian foreign relations and tax policy, and not an issue of increasing domestic resource mobilization in developing countries.\(^879\) Despite this, on 26 October 2016, the Canadian Revenue Agency stated that it is “sharing information with international partners,” to prevent tax evasion relating to BEPS.\(^880\) Although this information sharing is not directly related to the ATI, it does show adherence to the goals of the ATI.

Canada has not taken steps to increase technical and financial co-operation with developing countries to boost domestic resource mobilization during the compliance period. However, it has taken on a leadership role in the ATI and encouraged others to become involved in the group. Thus, it receives a score of 0.

*Analyst: Matthew Dunbar*

---


France: 0

France has partially complied with its commitment to help strengthen developing economies’ engagement in the international tax agenda.

France has taken action to increase cooperation between states on the ATI and raise awareness of the group. On 19 October 2016, France hosted the Second Meeting of the Signatories of the Addis Tax Initiative (ATI) in Paris.\(^881\) While there, states outlined the plans of the ATI for 2017, and “agreed that both raising the number of ATI partner countries as well as their active involvement in the ATI activities should be given a priority … [and that] The benefits for joining the ATI must be clearly communicated.”\(^882\)

France also co-hosted a “Meeting on Strengthening External Support for Building Tax Capacity in Developing Countries” with the Platform for Collaboration on Tax.\(^883\) During this conference, participants spoke about ways of increasing the effectiveness of aid to strengthen domestic resource mobilization, and included members of organizations involved in the ATI.\(^884\) Thus, this meeting was a means by which the ATI could raise awareness about its efforts.

On 1 June 2016 at the Cabinet meeting, Michel Sapin, French Minister of Finance and Public Accounts, and Christian Eckert, French Secretary of State for the Budget and Public Accounts, reaffirmed the Government’s commitment to the fight against tax fraud.\(^885\)

On 29 June 2016, as a member of the Organization for the Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), France took a new step in its continuing efforts to boost transparency in international tax matters with the release of the Guidance on the Implementation of Country-by-Country Reporting. France will require multinational enterprises to provide aggregate information annually in each jurisdiction where they do business.\(^886\)

On 11 July 2016, as a member of the OECD, France released a discussion draft which deals with the design and operation of the group ratio rule under Action 4 of the Action Plan on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) and a standardized format for the exchange of tax rulings between jurisdictions under BEPS Action 5.\(^887\)

---

On 26 July 2016, as a member of the Global Forum, France published ten new peer review reports demonstrating continuing progress toward implementation of the international standard for exchange of information on request.888

On 25 August 2016, Christian Eckert visited Lisbon to sign an amendment to the tax treaty of 14 January 1971, which links Portugal and France. This will help to resolve the practical difficulties of hundreds of French citizens resident in Portugal who receive public remuneration by ensuring that double taxation will no longer occur. These citizens will now only be taxable in France and will not have to pay tax in both countries before making a request for avoidance of double taxation. This amendment also includes a new mechanism of assistance in recovery of taxes and an anti-abuse clause in line with the principles of the OECD so as to avoid the advantages of the Convention being diverted from their objective by means of arrangements designed exclusively to avoid tax.889

On 25 November 2016, as an OECD member, France attended the first regional meeting of the Inclusive Framework on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting in Tunis, after its launch in Kyoto on 30 June–1 July 2016. This meeting is the first of a series of events offering participants from different regions an opportunity to provide views and input on the Inclusive Framework on BEPS.890

On 25 November 2016, as members of the OECD, France and 100 other jurisdictions concluded negotiations on the Multilateral Convention to Implement Tax Treaty Related Measures to Prevent BEPS, which will implement a series of tax treaty measures to update international tax rules and lessen the opportunity for tax avoidance by multinational enterprises. It will implement minimum standards to country treaty abuse and improve dispute resolution mechanisms while providing flexibility to accommodate specific tax treaty policies. It will also allow governments to strengthen their tax treaties with other tax treaty measures developed in the OECD/G20 BEPS Project.891

On 30 November 2016, as a member of the Addis Tax Initiative, France participated in an ATI event in Nairobi on synchronizing efforts for domestic resource mobilization. It provided a brief update on the progress of ATI and discussed effective development cooperation focusing on coordinated cooperation efforts in the field of domestic revenue mobilization (DRM). The ATI is working on a new DRM database which will serve as an important coordination tool for support to partner countries in the field of DRM. As a member of the ATI, France announced that in Spring 2017, the first ATI monitoring report will be released, setting the baseline against which the commitment to doubling support to DRM will be measured. This will be complemented by the DRM Database.892

On 5 December 2016, as a member of the OECD, France released further BEPS guidance to support the global implementation of Country-by-Country Reporting as apart of BEPS Action 13. The two new documents provide information about key details of jurisdictions’ domestic legal frameworks for Country-by-

Country reporting and additional interpretive guidance on the Country-by-Country reporting standard. These documents will give certainty to tax administrations and Multinational Enterprise Groups on the implementation of Country-by-Country reporting.\textsuperscript{893}

On 22 December 2016, as a member of the OECD, France released an updated version of the BEPS Action 4 Report which includes further guidance on the design and operation of the group ratio rule and approaches to deal with risks posed by the banking and insurance sectors.\textsuperscript{894}

France has supported efforts that promote tax transparency indirectly through the OECD, and has hosted events that raise awareness about the ATI and encourage cooperation between its members. However, it has made no further efforts during the compliance period to provide technical or financial assistance to developing countries or to encourage developing countries to collaborate on tax. Thus, France has received a score of 0.

\textit{Analyst: Sonja Dobson}

\textbf{Germany: +1}

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to promoting the principles of the Addis Tax Initiative (ATI). The government has engaged in technical cooperation with developing countries to develop tax infrastructure, but it has failed to promote initiatives that promote tax collaboration among developing countries.

On 18 October 2016, German Chancellor Angela Merkel and Panamanian President Juan Carlos Varela ended talks that discussed joint collaboration on taxes. Following the release of the Panama Papers, Germany has engaged in a partnership with Panama to combat tax evasion. Germany’s use of an automatic exchange system, which passes on information regarding bank balances of tax evaders directly to the responsible tax authorities, will also be adopted by Panama as an effort to “achieve greater transparency in the financial system” by 2017.\textsuperscript{895}

Germany has also encouraged other states to take part in the ATI by participating in a workshop on the ATI. The 2016-2017 Work Plan of the ATI suggests that these side-events are a means by which ATI members can publicize the project.\textsuperscript{896} On 30 July 2016, the German Parliamentary State Secretary to the Federal Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development, Thomas Silberhorn, spoke at the ATI side event entitled “Synchronizing Efforts for Domestic Resource Mobilization — the Role of the Addis Tax Initiative.”\textsuperscript{897} This event was organized by the International Tax Compact.

On 24 February 2017, Chancellor Merkel’s in talks with IMF Managing Director Christine Lagarde regarding investment in Greece called for evidence regarding reform projects. Reforms regarding the pension system, as well “the degree to which income tax is levied” has been highlighted as key sectors requiring


structural reforms.\textsuperscript{998} The provision of further disbursements to Greece under the third rescue programme are contingent on implementation of such reforms.

Germany has collaborated to provide technical expertise with a developing country and has promoted the ATI. For this reason, it receives a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Sakitbyan Logabalandran}

\textbf{Italy: 0}

Italy has partially complied with its commitment to improving domestic resource mobilization in developing countries and encouraging tax collaboration in line with the principles of the Addis Tax Initiative (ATI).

On 14 December 2016, Italy signed a double taxation agreement with Ecuador.\textsuperscript{999} The purpose of this agreement was to avoid double taxation on income and equity and to prevent tax evasion, and was thus in line with improving the fairness, transparency, efficiency, and effectiveness of tax systems, and with increasing cooperation with partner countries. Given that Ecuador is a developing country, this collaboration is in line with the notion of strengthening the capacity of developing countries in the global tax space, and with the general Ise-Shima Summit goal of having developed and developing countries share information, if not via the Platform for Collaboration on Tax.

On 11 November 2016, the Italian Development Cooperation published an article highlighting the importance of equality in taxation. Director General of the Development Cooperation Pietro Sebastiani stated in his closing speech at a conference organized by Oxfam Italy at the Chamber of Deputies that the greater importance being placed on capacity-building activities for developing countries is one of the most important aspects of both the Agenda 2030 and the Addis Tax Initiative (ATI). While this does not represent direction action on the part of Italy, it does showcase that Italy is committed to advancing developing nations’ taxation equality.

On 20 October 2016, Italy and Andorra announced the start of preliminary talks for negotiations of a double tax agreement.\textsuperscript{900} The purpose of these talks was to strengthen economic bilateral ties between the two countries and create an agreement that complements the goals of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development and the G20 on base erosion and profit shifting. While these talks are only preliminary, they do constitute an announcement of a program that may support technical development of tax infrastructures supporting domestic resource mobilization. They do not, however, target a developing country, as Andorra is developed.

Italy has provided technical expertise in the form of collaborating with a developing country via information sharing to address tax evasion. Italy is a member of the ATI. However, it has not encouraged other developing countries to commit to join another similar initiative, including the Platform for Collaboration on Tax as a medium for information-sharing. As such, Italy received a score of 0 for partial compliance.

\textit{Analyst: Maryam Saleem}

\textbf{Japan: 0}

Japan has partially complied with its commitment to promoting the Addis Tax Initiative (ATI). It has provided technical expertise to help developing countries improve domestic resource mobilization.


On 25 August 2016, Japan signed an agreement with the Government of Panama for the Exchange of Information relating to Tax Matters in Panama City. The agreement “provides for the effective exchange of information regarding tax matters between the tax authorities including automatic exchange of information which is necessary for the exchange of financial account information.” This exchange of information is based on the “international standards formulated by the OECD” and aims to prevent international tax evasion and tax abuse.

As of 10 February 2017, the Japanese government was informed by the government of Panama that all internal procedures needed in order to formally enter the tax agreement with Japan were complete. The agreement will “enter into force” on 12 March 2017.

According to the official website of the Addis Tax Initiative, Japan has not officially joined the program. Furthermore, there is no evidence of the country taking any action to encourage other states to join or commit to the ATI or similar initiatives that promote collaboration on tax and delivering tax policies that are transparent, efficient and effective.

Japan has fulfilled its commitment to providing technical expertise in order to develop tax infrastructure and thwart tax evasion and abuse in developing countries. However, Japan is not a formal member of the ATI, and has not undergone any effort to encourage other states to commit to another similar initiative. Thus, Japan has earned a score of 0 for partially complying with its commitment to the ATI.

**Analyst: Bradley Gould**

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to providing technical and/or financial support for Addis Tax Initiative (ATI) as well as encouraging developing nations to sign on to the ATI, specifically through continuous promotion of the Tax Inspectors Without Borders program (TIWB) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) as well as its Project to Tackle Base Erosion and Profit Sharing (BEPS).

In the 2016-2017 Work Plan for the ATI, members of the ATI recognized the UK as having been “especially active in reaching out to G20 countries to encourage them to sign up to the ATI.”

On 4 July 2016, Under-Secretary of State Baroness Verma affirmed the United Kingdom’s support for the Addis Tax Initiative, specifically the Tax Administration Diagnostic Assessment tool. Following the G20 in

---

September, Prime Minister Theresa May reaffirmed this in the House of Commons, stating that “initiatives such as the Addis tax initiative are also important. We have played a leading role in the G20 on this.”

On 27 September 2016, the Independent Commission on Aid Impact (ICAI) published a report on the United Kingdom’s contribution to tackling cross-border tax avoidance. The report assigned the UK a score of “amber red” on the basis that the program did not follow a clear set of objectives and failed to coherently monitor results. On 7 November 2016, the Department of International Development responded to the report agreeing with many of the criticisms and outlining a plan for implementing the recommendations given by the ICAI.

On 11 November 2016, the OECD announced that the TIWB program was expanding into five new countries as part of an ongoing effort to provide technical support to developing countries in preforming and maintaining the quality of taxation audits. Furthermore, the first South-South tax transparency agreement between Kenya and Botswana was announced on 1 December 2016.

On 24 November 2016, the OECD announced that a multilateral convention led by Director of Business at HM Treasury Mike Williams had concluded, with more than 100 new jurisdictions agreeing to implement new tax treaty measures. This convention was part of the BEPS program, which the United Kingdom had previously promoted and which implements technical assistance for dealing with international tax treaty disputes.

On 7 December 2016, Sir Eric Pickles of the Department of International Assistance announced the “Contracting 5” partnership at the Open Government Partnership meeting. The partnership is part of public spending transparency reforms meant to promote anti-tax avoidance reforms. This partnership is between the UK, Mexico, Colombia, France and Ukraine.

On 31 January 2017, the Department for International Development committed to a whole-of-government approach to building transparent institutions. It committed to improving the administration of developing countries’ tax authorities, scale-up support for anti-money laundering, and fund partnerships between UK specialist law enforcement teams and foreign counterparts.

---

The UK has complied with its commitment to providing technical and financial support for ATI as well as encouraging developing countries to sign on to the ATI. Thus, the United Kingdom has been given a score of +1.

*Analyst: Samir Silvestri*

**United States +1**

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to the principles of the Addis Tax Initiative (ATI) by providing technical support, and advising other countries to make a similar commitment.

On 20 July 2016, President Barack Obama signed a memorandum on good governance both for the United States and abroad that emphasized transparent participatory, and collaborative government. This memorandum is in line with the ATI call for collaboration and transparent tax policy.

On 29 June 2016, the United States issued a joint statement at the 2016 North American Leaders’ Summit, where President Obama along with Prime Minister Justin Trudeau of Canada and President Enrique Peña Nieto of Mexico agreed that “North America is committed to joint and coordinated actions to implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda.” In addition to development goals, the summit also supported transparency, with the joint declaration committing to “continue our work, as members of the OGP [Open Government Partnership] to promote the principles of openness, transparency, and accountability worldwide. Leaders call on all governments in the Americas to participate in the OGP.”

On 31 August 2016, the United States Agency for International Development released a statement on allocation of funds for domestic resource management in the budget for fiscal year 2017, which began 30 September 2016. This statement revealed that the department will be spending “approximately $20 million per year on DRM [domestic resource mobilization] assistance in around 11 countries.” This in an increase of USD178,602 from fiscal year 2016 and USD452,572 from fiscal year 2015.

On 31 August 2016, the United States Agency for International Development called upon potential collaborations with “the United Kingdom, Germany, the Netherlands and several other partner nations” to launch an “expanded effort to strengthen revenue systems in low- and lower middle-income countries that demonstrate a commitment to build capacity in their tax administrations.”

On 6 December 2016, senior Afghan government officials unveiled the Afghanistan Customs and Tax Academy, an institute geared at training customs officers to facilitate customs duties at borders and airports. USAID has provided technical support to the institute by “developing the curriculum, training modules on customs procedures, and short-term technical assistance.”

---


On 24 January 2017 US emissaries to a G20 meeting of finance ministers and central bankers in Chengdu, China signed on to a communiqué supporting the aims of the Addis Tax initiative. The communiqué stated that the G20 members “encourage countries and IOs [international organizations] to assist developing economies in building their tax capacity” in addition to explicitly stating “We support the principles of the Addis Tax Initiative.”

The United States has continued its longstanding federal funding and technical support of domestic resource management initiatives in developing countries, and has supported and encouraged all governments to join various initiatives with principles similar to the Addis Tax Initiative. Therefore, the United States receives a score of +1.

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to providing technical and/or financial support for Addis Tax Initiative (ATI) as well as encouraging developing countries to sign on to the ATI by actively engaging in the implementation of the Addis Tax Initiative and appealing for collaboration to build taxation capacity of developing countries.

In the 2017 Management Plan, the EU created the Domestic Revenue Mobilization (DRM) Initiative in order to support its commitments to the ATI. DRM initiative is aimed to promote a transparent and cooperative international tax environment to solve international problems such as tax evasion and illicit financial flows; enhance the participation of all countries and regions to help them build up effective and sustainable DRM systems; strengthen the role of civil society to improve accountability and effectiveness by supervision.

On 5 September 2016, the EU leaders attended the G20 Hangzhou Summit, where they called for contribution to a fair and modern global international tax system through advancing cooperation on base erosion and profits shifting (BEPS), exchange of tax information, tax capacity-building of developing countries, and tax policies to promote growth and tax certainty. The EU anticipates the launch of the new Platform for Collaboration on Taxation by the International Monetary Fund, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the United Nations, and the World Bank Group, and encourages China to make its own contribution by establishing an international tax policy research center for international tax policy design and research.

On 22 November 2016, in the “Proposal for a new European Consensus on Development,” the EU placed major emphasis on generating domestic resources for sustainable development in partner countries, including stimulating domestic resource mobilization and tackling illicit financial flows. The EU implemented the “Collect More, Spend Better” approach, corresponding to the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. Collect More, Spend Better aims to improve domestic resource mobilization, achieve effective and efficient public expenditure, and optimize debt management in developing countries. It also concentrates on tax evasion and tax avoidance as well as on the efficiency, effectiveness, and fairness of tax systems.
The EU has created plans to improve domestic resource mobilization in developing countries by combating tax evasion and tax avoidance. Furthermore, it reaffirmed its commitment to the Platform for Collaboration on Tax during the G20 summit in China. Thus, the EU receives a score of +1.

*Analyst: Zihan Wan*
10. Food and Agriculture: G7 Vision for Action on Food Security and Nutrition

“Building on the G7 Broad Food Security and Nutrition Development Approach, we endorse the G7 Vision for Action on Food Security and Nutrition, which outlines collective actions in the priority areas of: (i) empowering women; (ii) improving nutrition through a people-centered approach that recognizes the diverse food security challenges people face across the rural to urban spectrum; and (iii) ensuring sustainability and resilience within agriculture and food systems.”

G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></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>+0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

At the 2016 G7 Ise-Shima Summit leaders stated that global food security and adequate nutrition is a “fundamental element of the 2030 Agenda.” Specifically, the G7 aims to solve hunger and malnutrition for 500 million people by 2030.929 The G7 first declared this goal at the 2015 G7 Schloss Elmau Summit.930

The 2030 Agenda was also created in 2015. It comprises 17 Sustainable Development Goals and 169 targets.931 The agenda was created to add to the work of the Millennium Development Goals. The first item on the agenda is to end hunger, thus ensuring that “human beings can fulfill their potential in dignity and equality.”932 The G7 also agreed to ensure that their work endorses and supports the goals of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Paris Agreement on Climate Change.933

Recognizing that global food supply is heavily impacted by climate change, the G7 has ensured that its commitments also align with the Paris Agreement.934 The Paris Agreement was reached in 2015, and aims to ensure that global warming stays below 2°C.935

---

In May 2016, the G7 created and endorsed the G7 Vision for Action on Food Security and Nutrition (V4A). This document outlines the major actions that G7 members have affirmed to take with respect to eliminating hunger and improving nutrition.  

The document states that members will work to promote “agricultural growth, food security and nutrition,” as these are all items that encourage global sustainable development. Notably, the document identifies the collaborative approach that the G7 is looking to take by including agreements such as the 2030 Agenda, the Paris Agreement, and the 2016 Nutrition for Growth Summit output.

The Nutrition for Growth Summit was first held in London in 2013. The Summit in 2016 was held immediately before the Olympic Games in Rio de Janeiro, and it called for the next summit to be hosted in Italy in 2017 alongside the G7 summit.

The G7 V4A focuses on the same three areas that are outlined in the commitment: 1) “empowering women,”; 2) “improving nutrition through a people-centered approach,” and 3) “ensuring sustainability and resilience within agriculture and food systems.”

**Commitment Features**

This commitment describes a broad range of initiatives and areas that G7 members have endorsed, and thus pledged to support. Full compliance with this commitment requires that a G7 member have implemented measures that: 1) empower women to participate in food systems; 2) improve nutrition standards through a people-centred approach that recognizes the different challenges faced by both rural and urban communities; and 3) increase the durability of food systems in order to make them more sustainable in the long run.

The first element of this commitment involves the empowerment of women, which the G7 V4A defines as “giving women the same access to men as resources” by “1) promoting women’s equal rights and access to resources, particularly land; 2) increasing economic opportunities with higher and fair returns, both on- and off-farm; and 3) creating an enabling environment for women to participate in economic activities.” Examples of G7 action empowerment are provided in the plan, and include, but are not limited to: 1) efforts to “promote secure land tenure for women … including through existing G7 land partnerships”; 2) initiatives to create good jobs with fair pay for women in this sector, and provide them with skills training; and 3) attempts to “support the establishment, improvement and enforcement of legal, regulatory and social systems ensuring women’s equal rights and access to resources and productive assets … including through ongoing initiatives such as the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition.”

The UN World Food Programme defines malnutrition as “not getting enough food or not getting the right sort of food [because it lacks the needed amounts of micronutrients].” To reduce malnutrition, or “improve nutrition,” the G7 must implement one or more of the commitments that they have made in this area in the G7 V4A. Examples of these include efforts to: 1) help national governments create and implement nutrition

---


---
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policies; 2) “support multi-stakeholder initiatives to raise new … investments, and encourage innovative financing for nutrition, while aligning G7’s investments with partner governments’ priorities, and strengthening donor coordination, particularly by engaging with the SUN [Scaling Up Nutrition] Donor Network”; and 3) increasing aid to help governments, “including through training health, nutrition and extension workers, and enhancing food and nutrition education.”

To count towards full compliance in this area, these actions must also be “people-centred.” While the G7 defines this type of approach broadly in the V4A, the element that they focus on in this commitment is the importance of addressing the needs of people in rural and urban areas. Thus, the action would partially count for compliance if it addresses only the rural or the urban populations of a state. Meeting the needs of both populations is vital because improving nutrition is regarded as one of the most effective ways to help individuals lead healthy and productive lives.

Finally, the G7’s objective to ensure sustainable agricultural production and food systems derives from its recognition that climate change has a large impact on communities that rely on agriculture for subsistence. The G7 defines what support for this area means in the V4A. For example, they emphasize the importance of research and development into “sustainable agriculture practices,” with a focus on ensuring that agricultural crops and food resources are resilient to climate shocks and acute crises. The actions of the G7 include: support for national governments to formulate nutrition policies, encourage financing for nutrition through multi-stakeholder initiatives, promote healthy development and growth and to endorse the expansion of the Food Insecurity Experience Scale to improve data.

A G7 member must take steps to address all three of these areas in order to receive a compliance score of +1. If it implements measures that address only one or two of three priorities listed in the commitment, it has only partially complied, and will receive a score of 0. Lastly, a member will receive a score of −1 if it has failed to implement any measures to address these three focus areas OR if it has implemented policies that actively undermine the efforts of the G7 Vision for Action on Food Security and Nutrition.

### Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>−1</td>
<td>The G7 member fails to take action to address the three focus areas as outlined in the G7 Vision for Action on Food Security and Nutrition OR implements measures that actively undermine the efforts of the G7 Vision for Action on Food Security and Nutrition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The member country takes action to address one or two of the G7’s focus areas as outlined in the G7 Vision for Action on Food Security and Nutrition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>The member country has taken action to address all three of the focus areas in the G7 Vision for Action on Food Security and Nutrition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lead Analyst: Alessandra Harkness*

**Canada: 0**

Canada has partially complied with its commitment to the G7 Action Plan on Food Security and Nutrition. It has continued to build on G7 efforts through its support of global initiatives such as the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) movement and the Global Alliance for Climate Smart Agriculture, and through domestic policies including the Federal Sustainable Development Strategy.

---


Canada has recognized the need for empowering women within agricultural production and food systems through its leadership in the SUN movement, a global initiative to eradicate malnutrition across 57 countries particularly aimed at women and children under the age of five. Recognizing the importance of this project, Canada will disburse CAD2 million over the course of the next four years to the Scaling Up Nutrition Secretariat Project (2016-2020). On 21 September 2016, United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki-moon appointed Canadian Minister of International Development and La Francophonie Marie-Claude Bibeau as one of the 29 Global Leaders to spearhead this initiative.

Canada has recognized its commitment to ensuring sustainable agricultural production and food systems through its ongoing support for and membership in the Global Alliance for Climate Smart Agriculture. Further, Canada has remained strong in its commitment to sustainable agriculture through its domestic policies, including the 2016-2019 Federal Sustainable Development Strategy, which targets sustainable food as a key goal. Under this target, the federal government of Canada has committed to “encourage adoption of sustainable agricultural practices, and provide a stable or improved level of biodiversity and efficient management towards water and soil quality for food production by 2030.” Further, Canada has invested CAD3 billion in the Growing Forward 2 Initiative, an ongoing policy framework focused on innovation and helping farmers manage risk due to market volatility and disaster situations. The program is set to end in 2018.

On 25 January 2017, the federal government Minister of Agriculture Lawrence MacAulay announced CAD3.5 million in funding for 24 livestock and forage-related projects in Saskatchewan. This funding is provided as a part of the Growing Forward 2 Agreement.

On 27 January 2017, a statement was made on behalf of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada and the British Columbia Ministry of Agriculture announcing that the federal government was providing CAD2.3 million to develop innovative products also as a part of the Growing Forward 2 Initiative. This funding will be invested in local companies producing fresh and healthy produce.

Canada has acknowledged the importance of a people-centred approach to development, and the importance of urban and rural food security. These new investments as a part of the Growing Forward 2 program represent steps towards increased sustainability and resilience in agriculture and improving nutrition. However, because Canada has not taken any concrete steps during this compliance cycle to empower women

in the area of agriculture and food systems, they have only partially complied with its commitments. Thus, Canada has received a compliance score of 0.

**Analyst: Ayesha Bery**

France: 0

France has partially complied with its commitment to the G7 Vision for Action on Food Security and Nutrition (V4A) by promoting sustainability and resilience within agriculture and food systems and by improving nutrition through a people-centered approach.

France has complied with its commitment to improve nutrition through a people-centered approach by implementing a multifaceted nutrition guideline plan, the Programme national nutrition-santé (PNNS). France commenced the process of reviewing this plan and its objectives in late 2016. On 3 June 2016, the government also published the Action conjointe européenne sur la nutrition et l’activité physique (JANPA) with 25 European countries. This plan focuses specifically on working with families in Europe to decrease obesity in youth by 2020.

On 4 April 2017, Minister of Agriculture, Agri-Food and Forestry Stéphane Le Foll announced a new partnership with “Passeport Avenir” to combat students dropping out from educational institutions. The French government has committed EUR800,000 in funding for the program over the next 5 years, with the project scheduled to begin in 2018. The stated goal of the program is to assist to young people in completing their agricultural education, particularly at the 15 agricultural schools that will be initially targeted.

On 29 March 2017, the Minister of Social Affairs, Marisol Touraine, and Health and the Minister of Agriculture, Stéphane Le Foll, signed a national charter to encourage sustainable nutrition in health and social institutions. This charter is consistent with the National Food Program and the National Nutrition Program that aims to improve people’s diets, prevent food waste and guarantee a quality local food supply. This commitment particularly works to ensure that elderly people and disabled people have access to quality nutrition.

France has complied with its commitment to pursue sustainability and resilience within agriculture and food systems by continuing to spearhead the carbon soil-sink “4 per 1000” program that Agriculture Minister Stéphane Le Foll launched at the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP) in Paris in 2015. At the Marrakesh COP22 in November 2016, Minister Le Foll secured 200 signatures from delegates in support of the initiative, including those of 37 countries. France also participated in the follow-up G7 International

---

Symposium on Food Security and Nutrition in Tokyo in October 2016, choosing to present on its actions in this V4A area.965

Despite these efforts, France has not taken concrete and visible steps toward addressing the V4A’s first area of focus, empowering women within agriculture and food systems, and thus received a score of 0 for partial compliance.

Analyst: Bruce Cinnamon

Germany: +1

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to the G7 Vision for Action on Food Security and Nutrition. It has implemented programs aimed at increasing the inclusion and empowerment of women in food systems. Furthermore, it has made many substantial policy commitments in the areas of nutrition and agricultural sustainability through a multi-sectoral, people-centred approach.

On 31 May 2016, at the 16th annual conference of the German Council for Sustainable Development, Federal Development Minister Gerd Müller stated that the biggest policy challenge is to address world hunger in a sustainable manner.966 Chancellor Angela Merkel reiterated the importance of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals, notably including “action to tackle hunger and empower women.”967

On 22-24 June 2016, the German Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture (BMEL) hosted the 12th Policies Against Hunger conference in Berlin.968 It brought together representatives from various governments, international organizations, civil society, academia and think tanks from 35 countries. The focus was the development of sustainable food systems that meet the nutritional needs of the public. It recognized the importance of diversification, especially with the multi-sectoral approach embodied by the Scaling Up Nutrition movement. The conference also recognized the constraints on women in the agricultural sector, and stated the need to support women to achieve access to the same resources and rights available to men. German Federal Development Minister Gerd Müller also highlighted the continued work being done by Green Innovation Centres, centres geared at furthering local farming markets, in 12 African countries and India.969

On 11 July 2016, the United Nations World Food Programme announced the creation of the Innovation Accelerator, a Munich-based platform where WFP staff, experts, and entrepreneurs from the private sector and civil society could collaborate on ending hunger by 2030.970 The funds for the accelerator will be provided by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), the Federal Foreign Office of Germany, and the Bavarian State Ministry for Food, Agriculture and Forestry.

On 12 July 2016, the German government released a report that reaffirmed its commitment to gender equality and women’s economic empowerment both domestically and abroad.971 In the report, it was stated

that in 2016 alone, women empowerment projects were planned to a total cost of EUR2.3 billion. However, the report did not specify whether the funding would be put towards women’s economic empowerment in agriculture. The report also highlighted Germany’s commitment to an action plan for national nutrition, as well as a plan for organic farming on a minimum of 20 per cent of Germany’s land.

On 8 August 2016, the World Food Programme announced that the German government had confirmed its donation of EUR1 million to its food security and resilience programs in Pakistan. This contribution is intended to provide immediate food assistance for displaced families, as well as address future food security and nutrition needs in Pakistan.

In October 2016, BMZ published its report, Climate Change — Time to Act, which recognized the “water — energy — food security nexus.” It stated the need to develop policies that support this interconnection. Furthermore, it reiterated BMZ’s support for resilient and adaptive agricultural practices to the pressures of climate change.

On 7 October 2016, the German government announced a EUR47.6 million plan to support Nigerian programs and initiatives. This fund will support the One World, No Hunger program, in particular supporting the Green Innovation Centre located in Nigeria. Nigeria is one of 13 countries participating in this initiative, which seeks to connect entrepreneurs and researchers to share knowledge on agriculture and nutrition.

On 26 October 2016, at the International Symposium on Food Security and Nutrition hosted by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Germany reiterated its goal of improving the accountability of all stakeholders. BMZ demonstrated its application of the G7 V4A through its Responsible Land Policy program, as part of the broader initiative One World — No Hunger. This program operates in Benin, Uganda, Peru, and Laos with a projected budget of EUR15.5 million, and is forecasted to end in October 2019. It aims to enhance and maintain land ownership systems in these countries, especially for small-scale farmers and women, working directly with civil society organizations. It also outlined BMZ’s continued project Support to Responsible Agricultural Investments in Ethiopia, via which the BMZ provided EUR800,000 to support agricultural land investment and administration.

On 29 November 2016, BMZ released its ten-point plan of action for marine conservation and sustainable fisheries. Recognizing commitments made at the Paris Climate Agreement, BMZ pledged to support sustainable forms of fishing, including small-scale fisheries, artisanal fishing, and aquaculture farming.

On 19 January 2017, the Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture released a report celebrating the fifteenth anniversary of its collaboration with the FAO through the Bilateral Trust Fund (BTF). This partnership will continue to combat hunger, food insecurity, and malnutrition, and the German government will continue to contribute to the BTF with an annual budget of EUR10 million. One of the common thematic properties is the development of strategies for sustainable food security and general education in nutritional issues in rural and urban areas, with a particular focus to the important role of women. In September 2016, for example, an online course on nutrition and food systems was launched with BMEL’s support.

On 30 December 2016, Federal Minister of Food and Agriculture Christian Schmidt presented the Green Paper on Nutrition, Agriculture, and Rural Areas. The milestones and goals of the Green Paper include: (1) active engagement and support for farmers; (2) nutritional education initiatives with a special focus on childhood nutrition; and (3) support and collaboration with rural farmers.

From 19 to 21 January 2017, the BMEL hosted the Global Forum for Food and Agriculture which discussed the sustainable use of water in agricultural processes worldwide. This conference took a multi-sectoral approach to the challenge of food security and food supply in conjunction with sufficient clean water.

At the same time, the 9th Global Forum for Food and Agriculture (GFFA) — The Berlin World Food Conference was held in Berlin, with participants from more than 100 countries. The GFFA centred around the topic “Agriculture and Water — Key to Feeding the World,” with a particular focus on the sustainable use of water in agriculture systems. To this end, agriculture ministers from 83 countries took part in a sub-conference, the 9th Berlin Agriculture Ministers’ Conference, and produced a final communiqué. This communiqué highlighted the need for multi-sectoral research and action on the sustainable stewardship of water, especially in order to enhance access for smallholder farmers and women farmers.

On 22 January 2017, the G20 Agriculture Ministers Meeting took place in Berlin. The conference recognised the importance of water stewardship in agriculture, and developed an “Action Plan” with commitments from the G20 countries in technology and research. This “Action Plan” was largely informed by the
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communique from the GFFA held just a few days prior. The discussion on agriculture and water was structured along four issues. These were: access to water, sustainable use of water, resilience, and responsibility. The conference also committed to further promoting the implementation of ICT in agriculture, encouraging efforts towards a transparent, rules-based, and inclusive agricultural trading system (as well as investment that can improve food security and economic growth), declared to further strengthen the Agriculture Market Information System (AMIS) as a tool to address increasing price volatility in agricultural markets, and committed to a stock-taking by the Argentinian G20 presidency. This conference also addressed antimicrobial resistance, and the G20 countries agreed to implement a responsible level of antibiotics in their agricultural sectors in order to combat antimicrobial resistance in line with the one-health approach.

Thus, Germany has been awarded a score of +1 for taking action to address the empowerment of women in food systems, nutritional standards, and agricultural sustainability and resilience.

**Analyst: Cindy Wu**

**Italy: 0**

Italy has partially complied with its commitment to endorsing the G7 Vision for Action on Food Security and Nutrition.

On 31 May 2016, the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation established the Executive Committee of the “Women Empower the World” initiative. The initiative emphasizes the importance of “Empowering women to participate fully in economic life across all sectors.” One area of focus, in low income countries, is “Agriculture: access to food, adequate nutrition, access to appropriate agricultural technologies, and land tenure.” This recognition of the need to improve women’s access to agriculture and land is a significant step, but the October 2016 report does not outline specific strategies or actions to be taken in pursuance of this goal.

On 21 July 2016, Italian Prime Minister Matteo Renzi held a meeting in Rome with the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) centred on promoting nutrition, healthy diets and sustainable food systems. This meeting discussed aspects of hunger and violence, and initiatives that should be taken to address malnutrition and rural poverty.

On 2 August 2016, Italy passed a new law aimed at reducing food waste and carried out an initiative for removing sanctions for farmers and supermarkets from donating left over food to charity. This allowed the
emergence of an innovative method of financing for nutrition for those who could not otherwise afford it, and gave farmers the ability to donate unsold produce to charities without acquiring extra costs.

On 14 October 2016, Italian Minister of Agricultural Food and Forestry Policies Maurizio Martina signed a new Memorandum of Understanding with FAO Director-General José Graziano da Silva, to develop joint strategies to incorporate, identify and increase the number of ecosystems that play an important role as repositories of agricultural biodiversity, traditional knowledge and landscapes.996 These strategies will be incorporated in rural development policies and will help smallholder farmers contribute to boosting livelihood — and, by extension, food security — in rural areas.997 Within this framework, Italy and the FAO have agreed to work to increase recognition and promote better stewardship of traditional agricultural systems across member countries.998

On 27 January 2017, at the conference for “Investing in Inclusive Rural Transformation: Innovative Approaches to Financing” the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the Government of Italy jointly announced the establishment of the Smallholder Agriculture Finance and Investment Network (SAFIN).999 This partnership was aimed to meet Italy’s objectives of the 2030 Agenda and their corresponding Sustainable Development Goals.1000 SAFIN aims to increase to increase investment in smallholder agriculture and rural development which is fundamental for rural poverty reduction and improved living conditions among the poor.1001 In addition, creating a partnership between farmers and policy makers to create more inclusive policy processes that reflect the complex political economy of change in agriculture, natural resources management and food systems. This partnership supports Italy’s G7 Vision for Action on Food Security and Nutrition claims that encourage the investment of innovative methods to financing nutrition as well as aims to reduce poverty, increase food security, and improve food nutrition globally.1002

Italy has, however, neglected to promote the empowerment of women, has been unable to improve women’s opportunities to participate in food systems, and has neglected to create an environment for women to more effectively participate in economic activities.

Despite Italy’s efforts in promoting food security and nutrition through reducing food waste and food sustainability initiatives it has failed to support the empowerment of women promised in G7 Vision for Action on Food Security and Nutrition. Therefore, Italy is awarded a score of 0.

*Analyst: Joanna Ilunga-Kapinga*

Japan: +1

Japan has fully complied with its commitment to implement the G7 Vision for Action for Food Security and Nutrition. It has set out initiatives for the improvement of women’s participation in food systems, nutritional standards and the durability of food systems through a variety of policies.

In June 2016, the Japanese International Cooperation Agency, through the Scaling Up Nutrition Donor Network, sponsored a multi-sector partnership-training program aimed at improving knowledge of nutrition across Ghana and Japan. The program provided training for 11 participants representing various stakeholders on the successful practices of nutritional improvement. The training program formulated a nutrition improvement “action plan” based off the “Shokiku method” to be implemented in Ghana. The training program assisted in launching the National Nutritional Policy in Accra for the Ghanaian population.

On 5 July 2016, the Japanese government funded the Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management Project in Guyana; supervised by the United Nations Development Programme and the Food and Agriculture Organization. This funding of USD300,000 will create mechanisms to mitigate the effects of ”droughts and floods” and to ensure long-term sustainability of food resources in Guyana.

On 27 August 2016, at the Sixth Tokyo International on African Development (TICAD VI), the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA) launched the Initiative for Food and Nutrition Security in Africa (IFNA) to establish a framework of cooperation with African governments for nutritional security policies on the African Continent. The guiding principles of the IFNA are centered on “people-centered policies; empowerment of women; and to coordinate multiple sectors on the ground.” IFNA promotes V4A objectives to promote “resilience” and “sustainability” of communities in the African region through better “monitoring; and evaluation” of implementations of policies. At TICAD VI, Japan also reiterated its commitments to promoting “value addition” and “food value chains.”

---

In September 2016, Japan contributed USD21.5 million to the World Food Programme (WFP) for nutrition assistance to vulnerable people in 11 countries. This nutritional assistance included providing meals to 150,000 school children in Guinea and 160,000 children in Sri Lanka. In Uganda, Japanese contributions facilitated support of nutritional assistance, health educational programs, and nutritional education programs. Nutrition assistance of fortified blended food was provided to rural children aged “6-23 months; pregnant women; and breastfeeding women.”

On 20 September 2016, Japan and the WFP partnered to provide food processing equipment and entrepreneurial support to empower women in rural communities of the Kyrgyz republic. Japan pledged USD490,000 to empower over 2000 rural households through “enhancing agricultural knowledge, and skills,” “value chain development” to “boost women farmers’ incomes.” The Japanese Ambassador Yoshihito Yamamura affirmed the importance of women’s empowerment as “fundamental to local economic development.”

On 25-26 October 2016, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan hosted the International Symposium on Food Security and Nutrition as a follow-up to the G7 Ise-Shima Summit. The symposium brought together representatives from various international organisations, governments, civil society, research institutions and the private sector. The focus on the conference was to provide a platform for discussion on future food security and nutrition issues with various stakeholders. Japan presented new initiatives established in the TICAD VI and IFNA, and demonstrated its experiences in its Smallholder Horticulture Empowerment and Promotion (SHEP) program, “empowering women” through “gender awareness training” and “raising incomes” to benefit over 30,000 farmers. Japan introduced its initiatives of IFNA to improve “data collection” and measurement of nutrition and hunger to better evaluate and ensure accountability to G7 V4A.

---

On 30 March 2017, JICA and the Government of Indonesia concluded loan agreements worth JPY64 billion to provide financing for irrigation projects to “increase production”\textsuperscript{1027} of crops to contribute “higher incomes”\textsuperscript{1028} for farmers in rural areas, and to improve “food self-sufficiency”\textsuperscript{1029} in the country for improved food security.

On 31 March 2017, JICA and Rwanda concluded an agreement to provide JPY2.07 billion for irrigation projects to achieve “stable supply of water”\textsuperscript{1030} and “double cropping of paddy rice.”\textsuperscript{1031} Additionally, Japan plans to initiate the Project for Water Management and Capacity Building to maintain irrigation projects, to support “agricultural productivity” in Rwanda.\textsuperscript{1032}

The Japanese government has initiated measures for improving women’s participation in food systems, the durability of food systems, and nutritional standards as outlined by the G7 V4A. Therefore, Japan has been awarded a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Joe Zi Wu}

\textbf{United Kingdom: +1}

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to advancing food security and nutrition. The UK government restructured the Department for International Development (DFID) with a renewed focus on nutrition, and committed a significant amount of funding to improving women’s participation in economic activities, combating malnutrition and food insecurity, and investing in agricultural technology to promote resilience to future climate shocks.

The UK demonstrated a commitment to creating enabling environments for women to participate in economic activities by investing in programmes in developing nations that further integrate women into the workforce and improve the education of young girls. On 7 July 2016, International Development Secretary Justine Greening announced at the Girls’ Education Forum that DFID will provide GBP100 million to the Girl’s Education Challenge to “help girls who have dropped out or never attended school due to family crises, poverty, child marriage or early pregnancy” throughout the developing world.\textsuperscript{1033} Furthermore, DFID

\textsuperscript{1027} Signing of Japanese ODA Loan Agreements with Indonesia: Supporting food security and the promotion of the tourism industry Japan International Cooperation Agency (Tokyo) 30 March 2017. Date of Access: 3 April 2017

\url{https://www.jica.go.jp/english/news/press/2016/170330_03.html}
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dedicated USD6.7 million on 12 October 2016 to an 18-month project in collaboration with UNICEF to improve the secondary school completion rates of 200,000 girls in Sierra Leone.\(^{1034}\)

On 22 September 2016, International Development Secretary Priti Patel announced the UK government’s new “Work and Opportunities for Women (WOW)” programme at the United Nations General Assembly in New York. The WOW program will mobilize GBP12.8 million of new funding over the next five years to help 300,000 women in the world’s poorest countries attain more highly skilled and better-paid jobs by incentivizing businesses to improve women’s roles throughout the supply chain.\(^{1035}\)

On 29 November 2016, International Development Secretary Priti Patel presented the Commonwealth Development Corporation Bill to Parliament. This bill was geared at increasing the funding limit of the UK’s development finance institution from GBP1.5 billion to GBP6 billion.\(^{1036}\) The bill did not explicitly increase the amount of funding, but rather raised the limit to allow for more if necessary. Patel said “This Bill is fundamentally about people: improving life prospects by helping individuals find work and earn money so they can feed their families and send their children to school; empowering girls and women to determine their own future; and giving people hope so they don’t feel pressures to migrate or turn to extremism.”

The UK government has also committed a significant amount of funding to reducing malnutrition and improving nutritional standards in nations struggling with famine and food insecurity.

The UK government restructured DFID throughout 2016, announcing a revised set of funding priorities and opening a new set of funding rounds on 4 November 2016.\(^{1037}\) The organization doubled the amount of funding available from previous rounds, dedicating up to GBP40 million of funding to proposals focusing on family planning, nutrition, or ending modern slavery.\(^{1038}\) DFID’s renewed focus on nutrition is earmarked to “addressing the immediate and underlying causes of malnutrition among children under 5 years and adolescent girls and women of reproductive age.”\(^{1039}\)

On 22 September 2016, Patel announced an additional GBP37 million of support to Yemen to provide food, water, shelter and medical supplies to over a million Yemeni people threatened by famine.\(^{1040}\) This additional support boosts the UK’s aid to Yemen to GBP100 million this year. The funding will provide 400,000 people with access to safe water, over 11,000 with food assistance, 18,000 households with emergency food and
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shelter kits, over 114,200 with water and sanitation assistance, and over 9,000 families with their own livestock, increasing the stability of their livelihoods.\textsuperscript{1041}

On 26 December 2016, DFID provided a GBP16.9 million grant to UNICEF to address drought-related malnutrition and child illness in Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe.\textsuperscript{1042} In addition to preventing malnutrition, the grant money will be used to train health care workers, improve resiliency to further droughts, and “reach 3.25 million people with key information on nutrition, water and hygiene best practices, as well as HIV and disease prevention.”\textsuperscript{1043} UNICEF’s Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Director Leila Gharagozloo-Pakkala said, “We greatly appreciate — and applaud — DFID for leading the way in ensuring that communities are significantly supported to become further resilient to the recurrent climatic crises we are seeing across much of the region.”\textsuperscript{1044}

The UK also fulfilled their commitment to research and development of sustainable agricultural practices by dedicating funds to agricultural technological innovation and investing both money and expertise towards building agricultural resiliency in Malawi.

On 13 July 2016, DFID committed GBP6 billion to Innovate UK’s sixth round of funding for an agricultural technology competition for farmers in developing countries.\textsuperscript{1045} The competition seeks to fund innovations that reduce poverty and hunger for smallholder farmers, create sustainable agricultural expansion, improve dietary nutrition, increase rural food security, or further opportunities for agricultural trade.\textsuperscript{1046}

DFID also gave GBP24 million to Malawi’s National Disaster Response Plan on 29 June 2016.\textsuperscript{1047} The money will go towards assisting 6.5 million people vulnerable to food insecurity caused by widespread crop failure aggravated by El Nino. The funds will be used to nourish approximately 150,000 children, mothers, and vulnerable adults suffering from malnutrition.\textsuperscript{1048}

Furthermore, a portion of the funds is intended to build long-term agricultural resilience to climate shocks by improving winter cropping and irrigation techniques as well as purchasing and storing maize for emergency distribution.\textsuperscript{1049} On 15 November 2016, International Development Minister James Wharton announced an additional GBP8.1 million of support to provide maize for hundreds of thousands of people facing famine.\textsuperscript{1050}


The minister also “held talks with key stakeholders on how Malawi can break the cycle of food insecurity, adapt to climate change and continue with market reforms that encourage private sector-led economic growth.”\textsuperscript{1051}

Thus, the UK is awarded a score of +1 for its ongoing and increased investment in global nutrition and agricultural standards.

\textit{Analyst: Chadwick Meyers and Giorgia Ponti}

\textbf{United States: +1}

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to empower women in agriculture, improve nutrition through a people-centred approach, and ensure sustainability and resilience within agriculture and the food system.

On 23 June 2016, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) pledged more than USD38 million in investment to global entrepreneurs and innovators to help fight poverty. The investment will provide these individuals with the capital necessary to address issues of food security in developing countries through sustainable solutions.\textsuperscript{1052}

On 6 July 2016, the United States Congress passed the Global Food Security Act of 2016. The Act signifies President Barack Obama’s commitment to fighting poverty, child malnutrition, and global hunger. This adds on to what President Obama began through his signature initiatives of Feed the Future, Power Africa, and the Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative.\textsuperscript{1053} Most importantly, the Act empowers marginalized communities, small farmers, and women in agriculture.\textsuperscript{1054}

Furthermore, on 3 September 2016, the United States federal government announced the US Government Global Food Strategy (FY 2017-2021). The strategy is required by the Global Food Security Act. It helps integrate US strategies for achieving global food security and seek collaboration with the global community to achieve food security and adequate nutrition.\textsuperscript{1055}

On 7 September 2016, the US government expanded its vision for global food security and outlined its approach to global food security. The Food-Secure 2030 call by Feed the Future is a call to action to end hunger, malnutrition and poverty by 2030.\textsuperscript{1056}

On 12 October 2016, USAID pledged USD6.2 million toward 12 organizations with innovative ventures to fight extreme poverty. Two of the recipients, myAgro and Better Cotton Initiative, respectively promote small farmer businesses and sustainable farming in Africa.\textsuperscript{1057}

On 17 January 2017, the United States announced $76 million in humanitarian assistance for Yemen. As part of this funding, the US will also add US$68 million to the UN World Food Programme, to aid and support the needs of “six million vulnerable Yemenis.”

The US has fulfilled its commitment to global food security and nutrition by passing the Global Food Security Act, adopting a global food strategy, and investing in innovation and entrepreneurship. Thus, the US has been given a score of +1.

**Analysts: Sixbert Himbaza and Giorgia Ponti**

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to the G7 Vision for Action on Food Security and Nutrition. It has implemented programs aimed at improving nutrition and agricultural sustainability through a people-centred approach, and taken substantive actions to empower women to participate in food systems.

On 7 June 2016, the European Parliament adopted a resolution regarding the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition (NAFSN). The resolution called for the NAFSN to stop undermining the EU’s commitment to women’s rights, food security, and sustainable development. It called for the protection of women’s rights to land that the NAFSN marginalized, as well as the promotion of economic opportunities for women. Second, it called for all national governments in Africa to make nutrition programs a priority, while calling for the NAFSN to adopt a more multi-stakeholder decision-making processes, and encourage investments. Finally, this resolution urged the NAFSN to consider the environmental impacts and sustainability of its agricultural products.

On 15-16 June 2016, the 10th European Development Days (EDD) was held in Brussels, Belgium. The 2016 EDD focused mainly on the “2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development,” in particular food security, nutrition, and sustainable agriculture in developing countries. These initiatives, spearheaded by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), aim to be community-centered. The empowerment of women in agricultural food systems was also highlighted. At the EDD 2016, the European Union Development Cooperation met with other members of the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement Senior Donor Officials Group in Geneva, Switzerland, to review current engagement and develop future strategies to promote nutrition standards.

On 14 June 2016, the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission and the International Food Policy Research Institute announced a research initiative to analyze and develop new strategies to reach out to marginalized communities in rural areas, especially smallholder farmers in developing countries. This research program includes promoting opportunities for innovation amongst farmers in order to improve the food security, nutrition, and resilience of rural farmers.

---


On 6 July 2016, the European Union and Ministry of Health of Kenya held a two-day multi-stakeholder workshop to discuss strategies to target nutritional status in Kenya. Representatives included academia, USAID, UNICEF, FAO, civil society, and members of the Kenyan national government. This event reinforced the EU’s investment of EUR24.4 million in nutrition interventions in Kenya. These projects are headed by civil society organizations and local health authorities.5

On 4 August 2016, the European Commission proposed a multi-annual plan under the Common Fisheries Policy to promote sustainable fishing of demersal fish in the North Sea. Supported by research findings from the Scientific Technical and Economic Committee on Fisheries and the International Council for the Exploration of the Seas, this proposal targets more than 70 per cent of the EU’s fishing industry. Significant aspects of this plan include setting limitations on sustainable levels of fishing in the North Sea, as well as providing fisheries and fishermen with more decision-making power. When these conditions of sustainability are not respected, this plan obligates the EU to take corrective action. This proposal is awaiting discussion and possible implementation by the European Parliament and the Council of the EU.6

In August 2016, the EU began a three-year project to support the resilience of vulnerable populations in Senegal. The EU Emergency Trust Fund for Africa provided EUR8 million in relevant funding. This project mainly aims to improve food and nutrition security and resilience by engaging with poor households within local communities, especially those involving women.7

On 12-13 October 2016, the Food 2030 research conference was held in Brussels, Belgium. This conference was built on the commitments made at the COP21 Paris Climate Change Conference, as well as on the Sustainable Development Goals. The main areas of focus were research on nutrition, sustainable food systems, and the empowerment of communities. The conference also called for more cohesive global coordination and collaboration for research programs.8

On 28 November 2016, the European Commission’s Joint Research Centre and the Directorate-General for Health and Food Safety published their study “Delivering on EU Food Safety and Nutrition in 2050 — Future challenges and policy preparedness.”9 The study analyzed the efficacy of current EU food safety policy, nutrition policy, and regulatory frameworks in dealing with potential future scenarios until 2050. The study suggested possible policy amendments to help the EU cope with future challenges, such as changes in food values and global trade, economic growth, and climate change.10

On 29 November 2016, the Golden Thousand Days campaign began as part of the Poshanka Lagi Hatemalo (Partnership for Nutrition) project in Nepal. This program is aimed at improving the nutrition status of women and children through health check-ups, vaccinations, and nutritious food distribution. The EU
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provided over 80 per cent of funding for the project, in partnership with UNICEF, the Health, Research and Social Development Forum, and the District Health Office.  

On 5 December 2016, the EU approved eight development projects in Uganda as part of the Annual Action Plan 2016. One of the three key pillars of this plan focuses on food security and agriculture, in regards to sustainable development, gender mainstreaming, and responses to climate change. It also focuses on including the voices of all communities, including smallholder farmers, in agriculture discussions.  

On 16 December 2016, the European Commission, in partnership with the Slovak Presidency of the Council of the European Union, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the World Food Programme and UN Women, organized a high-level discussion called *Step It Up Together with Rural Women to End Hunger and Poverty.* The event expounded on “the critical role and contribution of rural women in increasing food security and eradicating rural poverty through agricultural and rural development.” The discussion produced recommendations pertaining to the empowerment of rural women in relation to strengthening food systems, fighting hunger and malnutrition, and improving rural lives and livelihoods more broadly.  

In December 2016, the European Union signed six grant contracts through the Pan-African Programme in order to promote civil society participation in African policy making. The grants totaled approximately EUR20 million and will go to fund a series of projects implemented by a partnership between the EU and African civil society organizations. One of the chosen projects seeks to “improve women’s access to and control over their land resources.”  

On 2 February 2017, the European Commission commenced its three-month public consultation on Europe’s Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), as part of a larger project to modernize and simplify the CAP. By taking a people-centred approach — consulting farmers, citizens, organizations, and any
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interested parties — the Commission aims to incorporate key concerns of the agriculture industry — including sustainability, food security, and support for rural areas — into the CAP.\textsuperscript{1077}

On 27 February 2017, the EU signed a financing agreement of EUR117 million to support Burkina Faso’s sustainable agriculture and nutrition security.\textsuperscript{1078} This is a portion of the EUR800 million promised by the European Commissioner for International Cooperation and Development, Neven Mimica, on 7 December 2016.\textsuperscript{1079} The EU and the Burkina Faso government determined several programme indicators that focus on women, including nutrition education to improve nutrition for women and children, as well as promoting access of women to irrigation.\textsuperscript{1080}

Thus, the EU has been awarded a score of +1 for taking action to address nutrition standards in rural and urban communities, facilitating agricultural sustainability and resilience within, and supporting the empowerment of women in food systems.

\textit{Analyst: Cindy Wu}


[Recognizing the seriousness of the global problem of corruption and that the fight against corruption in all its dimensions is an important aspect to realizing the whole of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, we, the leaders of the G7, renew our commitment to lead by example in moving the global anti-corruption agenda forward.] “Towards this end, the G7 will work individually and collectively to advance our shared priorities through relevant international fora including the Conference of State Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) and its subsidiary bodies, the OECD [Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development] as well as promoting implementation of the Declaration Against Corruption adopted at the Anti-Corruption Summit hosted by the United Kingdom on May 12, and the ministerial declaration adopted at the OECD Anti-Bribery Ministerial Meeting on March 16.”

G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration on G7 Action to Fight Corruption

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>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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

Corruption remains one of the greatest obstacles to global economic and social development. Defined in general terms as “the abuse of entrusted power for private gain,” the corrosive effects of corruption on the societal and institutional fabric of states are both widespread and destructive. Corruption damages the public’s trust in government, undermines the rule of law, leads to political and economic grievances that may “in conjunction with other factors, fuel violent extremism,” and depletes the national wealth of countries by wasting or inefficiently utilizing public resources and money intended for development. “Though no country has been immune to its effects, corruption has been particularly damaging to states in the developing world.” Consequently, the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC) notes that “Corruption hurts the poor disproportionately by diverting funds intended for development, undermining a government’s ability to provide basic services, feeding inequality and injustice, and discouraging foreign aid...

and investment." As World Bank President Jim Yong Kim once noted, corruption is “public enemy number one” in the developing world.

Though the international community has made significant strides in combating corruption over the last decade, recent studies on corruption show that there is still much more to be done in the global fight against corruption. The 2015 Corruption Perceptions Index published by Transparency International shows that public sector corruption is still rife amongst countries across the globe, with 68 per cent being classified as having a serious corruption problem, which amounts to an estimated total of more than six billion people living in corruption-ridden states. In terms of costs, the World Economic Forum estimated in 2014 that the cost of corruption equals more than five per cent of global gross domestic product or a staggering USD 2.6 trillion annually. In terms of public perception, crime and corruption easily topped the list of problems considered most pressing in emerging and developing economies in the Pew Research Centre’s 2014 Global Attitudes survey.

The need for an international legally-binding instrument targeting corruption was first expressed in 2003 when the United Nations General Assembly adopted the UNCAC, which entered into force on 14 December 2005. The Convention is widely considered a landmark achievement in the fight against corruption as it was the first comprehensive, multilateral anti-corruption agreement to be applied on a global level, and has since become the international anti-corruption standard. Under Chapter IV of the UNCAC, state parties are obliged to assist one another “in every aspect of the fight against corruption,” with cooperation in criminal matters pertaining to cooperation being mandatory. As of 21 September 2016, all but one of the G7 member states have signed and ratified the convention.

The issue of corruption first appeared on the G8 agenda at the 2003 G8 Evian Summit, the same year the UNCAC was created. At this time, the G8 declared that it would strive to “fight corruption and [the] mismanagement of public resources in both revenue raising and expenditures” by emphasizing the need for

---

increased transparency. Corruption has continued to appear in the majority of the G8’s agendas since the

In 2016, the G7 reframed their renewed commitment in pushing forward the global anti-corruption agenda by emphasizing its importance in helping the international community successfully reach the goals of the UN’s 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, a long-term global initiative. The G7 member states have thus stated that they will “work individually and collectively to advance [their] shared [anti-corruption] priorities [through multilateral channels].”\footnote{G7 Action to Fight Corruption, G7/G8 Information Centre (Toronto) 27 May 2016. Date of Access: 23 October 2016. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2016shima/action-plan-corruption.html.} The G7 not only reaffirmed their past commitments to abide by the standards set by the UNCAC, but have also committed themselves to promoting the implementation of recent landmark anti-corruption initiatives such as the Anti-Bribery Ministerial Declaration put forward at the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) Anti-Bribery Ministerial Meeting on 16 March 2016, and the Global Declaration Against Corruption introduced at the London Anti-Corruption Summit on 12 May 2016.\footnote{United Nations Convention Against Corruption, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (Geneva). Date of Access: 29 September 2016. https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CAC/.}

**Commitment Features**

This commitment can be broken down into four components. In order to move the global anti-corruption agenda forward G7 members agreed to work individually and collectively to advance their shared priorities through relevant international forums including through:

1. The UNCAC and its subsidiary bodies, which include the Conference of the States Parties and other instruments created to “review implementation and facilitate activities required by the Convention.”\footnote{G7 Action to Fight Corruption, G7/G8 Information Centre (Toronto) 27 May 2016. Date of Access: 23 October 2016. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2016shima/action-plan-corruption.html.}

2. The OECD. In the G7 Action to Fight Corruption, the G7 defines its shared priorities as:


   c) “enhancing anti-corruption capacity-building support”;\footnote{G7 Action to Fight Corruption, G7/G8 Information Centre (Toronto) 27 May 2016. Date of Access: 23 October 2016. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2016shima/action-plan-corruption.html.} and,

   d) “promoting the global effort to fight corruption.”\footnote{G7 Action to Fight Corruption, G7/G8 Information Centre (Toronto) 27 May 2016. Date of Access: 23 October 2016. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2016shima/action-plan-corruption.html.} Thus, these pillars will serve as a measure of how a G7 member performs in advancing its shared priorities through the global anti-corruption agenda. Examples of the ways in which these goals can be brought about are listed in the G7 Action to Fight Corruption, and include, but are not limited to: work on the Global Asset Recovery Forum and Stolen Asset Recovery Initiative, “enhancing transparency in the entire public procurement process,”\footnote{G7 Action to Fight Corruption, G7/G8 Information Centre (Toronto) 27 May 2016. Date of Access: 23 September 2016. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2016shima/action-plan-corruption.html.} and promoting the involvement of civil society members in anti-corruption efforts.\footnote{G7 Action to Fight Corruption, G7/G8 Information Centre (Toronto) 27 May 2016. Date of Access: 23 September 2016. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2016shima/action-plan-corruption.html.}
3. The Declaration Against Corruption adopted at the Anti-Corruption Summit; Examples of the ways in which pledge (3) can be brought about include but are not limited to: driving out actors in the private sector “who facilitate or are complicit in corruption and denying the corrupt the use of legitimate business channels”; “actively enforcing anti-corruption laws and working together to pursue the corrupt, prosecute and punish them”; and “encouraging and supporting the international organisations to increase their focus on fighting corruption and to coordinate their work more effectively.”\footnote{Global Declaration Against Corruption, Government of the United Kingdom (London) 12 May 2016. Date of Access: 15 November 2016. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/global-declaration-against-corruption/global-declaration-against-corruption}

4. The Ministerial Declaration adopted at the OECD Anti-Bribery Ministerial Meeting.\footnote{OECD Anti-Bribery Ministerial Meeting: Ministerial Declaration, the OECD (Paris) 16 March 2016. Date of Access: 15 November 2016. https://www.oecd.org/corruption/anti-bribery/OECD-Anti-Bribery-Ministerial-Declaration-2016.pdf.} Examples of the ways in which pledge (4) can be brought about include, but are not limited to: “[encouraging] all Parties to support each other’s law enforcement efforts and explore innovative methods to combat foreign bribery”; “appealing to non-Parties that are major exporters and foreign investors to accede to and implement the Anti-Bribery Convention”; and “[encouraging] the [OECD Working Group on Bribery in International Business Transactions] to continue to consult and collaborate with international organisations, business and civil society organisations active in the fight against foreign bribery and corruption.”\footnote{OECD Anti-Bribery Ministerial Meeting: Ministerial Declaration, the OECD (Paris) 16 March 2016. Date of Access: 15 November 2016. https://www.oecd.org/corruption/anti-bribery/OECD-Anti-Bribery-Ministerial-Declaration-2016.pdf.}

Thus, for full compliance, the G7 member must have worked individually and collectively to advance their shared priorities on global anti-corruption by complying with three of the four stated actions of:

1. Advancing shared priorities on global anti-corruption through the UNUNCAC and its subsidiary bodies;
2. Advancing shared priorities on global anti-corruption through the OECD;
3. Promoting implementation of the Declaration Against Corruption adopted at the Anti-corruption Summit; and,
4. Promoting implementation of the ministerial declaration adopted at the OECD Anti-Bribery Ministerial Meeting.

For a member to receive a score for partial compliance it must have complied with at least two of the listed criteria. Compliance with only one of the listed criteria or less will result in a score for non-compliance.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member has not worked with other G7 members or independently to advance any of their four shared priorities for combating corruption OR has complied with only one of these priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member has worked with other G7 members and independently to advance at least two of their four shared priorities for combating corruption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member has worked alone AND with other G7 members to advance three OR more of their four shared priorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada: 0**

Canada has partially complied with its commitment to fostering international cooperation where crime and corruption is concerned.

On 29 June 2016, Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau announced initiatives directed to bettering public tax administration and tackling corruption in Central America as part of a joint effort in the North
American Leader’s Summit. Prime Minister Trudeau announced an amount of CAD5 million to fund the Mission to Support the Fight against Corruption and Impunity in Honduras, and a further CAD4 million for the International Commission Against Impunity in Guatemala. These efforts are part of broader initiatives undertaken in collaboration with the United States and Mexico in reducing crime and corruption in developing countries within the Americas and aligns with the broader goals of the Declaration Against Corruption.

On 13 July 2016, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) presented a prototype of the Knowledge Sharing Platform (KSP) developed by Canada, which would allow various countries to increase their knowledge and expertise in tax administration. KSP is an online collaboration tool, developed by the Canadian Revenue Agency, that would improve taxation and allow broader access to training and support in many developing countries. The OECD presented this online tool live in a presentation, highlighting some of its features and projecting its success in aiding capacity-building in many regions across the world. When fully completed, the KSP is expected to enhance collaboration and information-sharing with other countries, promoting transparency.

On 29 July 2016, Canada’s Department of Finance, under the newly appointed Trudeau Administration, released legislative proposals regarding tax reforms. These reforms are part of the OECD’s Action Plan on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS). BEPS refers to the shifting of sales and profits from one jurisdiction to another by multinational companies, usually to avoid taxation. The legislative framework is being laid down to adopt the OECD Action Plan, and companies are expected to begin adhering to these standards as of 1 January 2017. The draft legislation will add the new Section 233.8 — Country-by-Country Reporting — to the Canadian Income Tax Act. In these proposals, Canada has announced that it intends to incorporate base standards for common reporting standards, promote the sharing of tax information, counter transfer mispricing, and implement country-by-country reporting. These measures are designed to help expose corruption and tackle harmful tax avoidance.

On 9 December 2016, Minister of International Development and La Francophonie the Honourable Marie-Claude Bibeau announced CAD13.6 million in funding over four years to combat corruption in Africa and the Americas. The Integrity, Mobilization, Participation, Accountability, Anti-Corruption and Transparency (IMPACT) project, implemented by Transparency International, will work with communities,
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civil society organizations, public institutions, and businesses to develop better anti-corruption policies and practices. The aim of the IMPACT project is to promote transparency and inclusive and accountable governance. The Honourable Marie-Claude Bibeau stated that this announcement “reaffirms Canada’s commitment to tackling corruption,” “Canada is taking a concrete step to reduce the scope and far reaching impact of corruption in Africa and the Americas.”

On 9 December 2016, the National Assembly of Quebec adopted Bill 87, entitled an Act to facilitate the disclosure of wrongdoings relating to public bodies. Article 3 of the bill defines wrongdoing within the meaning of the Anti-Corruption Act: “a contravention of Quebec law involving corruption, malfeasance, collusion, fraud or influence peddling, the misuse of public funds or public property or a gross mismanagement of contracts within the public sector, or ordering a person to commit such wrongdoing. The Act is the Quebec government’s response to the Charbonneau Commission, which found corruption in Quebec’s construction industry and recommended “stiffer penalties for companies and individuals who break the law.” Bill 87 was thus introduced as a measure to prevent and fight corruption in the public sector. The Act will come into effect on May 1, 2017.

Canada has worked individually and collaboratively through the OECD to counter corruption and promoted implementation of the goals outlined in the Declaration Against Corruption. Therefore, Canada has scored 0 for partial compliance with this commitment.

**Analyst: Duja Muhanna and Noor Fatima**

**France: +1**

France has fully complied with its commitment to strengthen anti-corruption legislation by working individually to deter corruption in French corporations and collectively to facilitated international discussion on transparency.

On 14 June 2016, the National Assembly of France adopted the Law on Transparency, the Fight against Corruption and Modernization of Economic Life, a bill that was proposed in an attempt to strengthen anti-corruption efforts within French corporations. The National Assembly began reviewing the content of the bill, more commonly known as “Sapin II,” on 6 June 2016, and the negotiations spanned nine days before the bill was passed. French Finance Minister Michel Sapin proposed the law in response to several recent criticisms of France’s lax anti-corruption legislation, particularly those expressed by the Organisation
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for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), which reproached “the authorities’ lack of initiative in cases involving French enterprises and proven or presumed instances of foreign bribery.”

On 8 July 2016, the French Senate revised and amended articles of the Sapin II bill that had previously been approved by the National Assembly on 14 June 2016. The Senate recommended that the National Assembly repeal some of the powers of the proposed Corruption Detection Agency (CDA), a new prosecution agency that would be established under the Sapin II law. In particular, the Senate recommended that the article giving the CDA the power to impose fines on both corporations and individuals who failed to comply with the conditions of the bill be removed.

On 29 September 2016, the French National Assembly passed the final revised version of the Sapin II bill. The final draft of the bill rejected the Senate’s recommendation that the CDA not have financial prosecution power. Additionally, the final draft included deferred prosecution agreements (DPA) that could be used by corporations who had been prosecuted for corruption to avoid imprisonment and instead pay a fine of up to 30% of the revenue of the company. The implementation of these DPAs applies only to corporations, not individuals. According to the new draft, individuals prosecuted for corruption will undergo criminal sanctions in accordance with the Criminal Code of France.

In October 2016, France took over as Lead Chair of the Open Government Partnership (OGP). OGP is an “international platform for domestic reformers committed to making their governments more open, accountable, and responsive to citizens.” The organization consists of seventy-five participating countries. France has indicated that it will focus on three key issues during its tenure as Lead Chair: Climate Change and Sustainable Development; Transparency, Integrity and Anti-Corruption; and Digital Commons.

---

OGP Global Summit 2016 was held in Paris on 7-9 December, with additional events on 5 and 6 December.\textsuperscript{1138}

On 8 November 2016, the final draft of the Sapin II bill was passed in the French Parliament with a majority vote of 308 to 171.\textsuperscript{1139} The new law includes protection for whistleblowers to ensure their safety and anonymity remains intact in the face of any possible retaliation attempts.\textsuperscript{1140} The Sapin II law also establishes the formation of a new prosecution agency to replace the Service Central de Repression de la Corruption.\textsuperscript{1141} This new agency will have more investigative power, and will also have the ability to prosecute those who do not abide by the new law.\textsuperscript{1142} Additionally, under the new Sapin II law, all companies with “more than 500 employees and annual revenue of at least 100 million”\textsuperscript{1143} are required to implement compliance programs for their employees. A company’s failure to abide by this program will result in a fine of up to EUR1,000,000 for the company, and up to EUR200,000 fine for individuals.\textsuperscript{1144}

On 9 December 2016, the French National Assembly enacted the “Sapin II” bill into law.\textsuperscript{1145} The new law significantly widens the prosecutorial power of French authorities regarding corruption offenses.\textsuperscript{1146} Prior to Sapin II, foreign corruption offenses committed by French nationals had to first be settled in the foreign nation and then face prosecution in France.\textsuperscript{1147} The new law gets rid of this prosecutorial restraint and ensures that both domestic and French-related foreign corruption offenses will be subject to legal action primarily by French authorities.\textsuperscript{1148} The majority of the measures specified by Sapin II came into effect immediately after the bill’s enactment, however some decrees of the new law, such as the implementation of compliance programmes in all companies totalling over 500 employees, will not be enforced until 9 June 2017.\textsuperscript{1149}

On 21 February 2017, the French National Assembly adopted the “Corporate Duty of Vigilance” law in an attempt to improve corporate accountability in the nation. The new legislation will require large French companies, defined as entities with at least 5,000 employees if their head office is in France, or 10,000 employees if their headquarters are located abroad, to enact annual vigilance plans to reduce any possible breaches on human rights and environmental well-being. The law will cover the full set of human rights as stated by the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. If a company fails to implement a vigilance plan, it can be sanctioned up to EUR10 million, or EUR30 million if the company is found liable for preventable damages as a result of the failure to implement.

On 14 March 2017, the French Council of State published a decree regarding the implementation of a French Anti-Corruption Agency as laid out by the recently enacted Sapin II law. This new agency will be under the joint control of the French Minister of Justice and Minister of Budget, whose primary role will be to aid authorities in the detection and prosecution of crimes relating to corruption. The introduced draft decree focuses on the role of interest representatives, whom the decree defines as individual(s) whose supervisor(s) and/or employer(s) that “dedicates more than half of their activity to interest representation activities … at least three times” over the past year. The decree will also require all interest representatives to register and inform the French High Authority for Transparency in Public Life of all personal and professional information pertaining to the organizations to which they belong. Furthermore, all revenue made and expenditures spent by the interest representatives must be disclosed to the high authority and will be made public information for five years.

France has worked individually to advance shared priorities through the OECD. Its actions are aligned with the Declaration Against Corruption and the OECD Anti-Bribery Ministerial Meeting communiqué. While France has taken action to combat corruption in three of the four pledges outlined in the commitment features, it has not worked collectively to do so. France has also taken on a leadership role in attempting to facilitate a global discussion on anti-corruption through the OGP. France has therefore fully complied with its commitment and, as such, has been awarded a score of +1.

Analyst: Nadine Ramadan
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Germany: +1

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to combat global anti-corruption.

On 4 June 2016, the German government expanded its anti-corruption efforts within the sphere of healthcare. The German Act on Fighting Corruption in the Healthcare Sector criminalizes acts of bribery among private healthcare practitioners in the German Criminal Code (StGB). The aim of the Act is to resolve the issue of private practitioners engaging in corrupt exchanges without legal liability following the German Federal Court’s decision on 29 March 2012 that such actors are neither “public officials nor employees or agents of a business.”1159

On 2 July 2016, the Federal Financial Supervisory Authority (BaFin) introduced a new whistleblower law that enables employees or other persons associated with a company or organization to inform BaFin of “any violations of existing supervisory rules.” This information may be submitted through various forums including mail, e-mail, telephone, or in person. This system also ensures the anonymity of whistleblowers and protects them from heavy repercussions from their employer for breach of confidentiality resulting in termination or criminal sanctions.1160

On 29 July 2016, German prosecutors announced their further investigation regarding bribery over sales made by the German unit of Rolls-Royce Holdings Plc within seven Asian countries. This continuing investigation concerns a corruption case over sales in Korea dating back to 2011. Tognum, an engines producer in which Rolls-Royce is invested, was found to have EUR23 million in commission paid in connection to sales of defence-related product in Korea by its MTU Friedrichshafen unit. A representative of the German authority stated that the investigation may result in further “profit seizures.”1161

On 22 February 2017, the German Economics Ministry revealed draft legislation which will disallow companies guilty of fraud and other violations from government contracts up to 5 years depending on the severity of charges incurred. The nationwide database would make it easier to identify and block those companies from receiving government contracts on local, state, and federal levels. According to the legislation, grounds for contract exclusion will include money laundering, fraud, creation of a terrorist cell, kidnapping, and tax evasion — possibly including violation of minimum wage laws and other labour violations. The legislation aims to create a fair playing ground for companies as the “blacklist” will make eligible only those who have no history of illegal practice. The legislation is currently under the review of the coalition government, and will eventually need to be passed by parliament as well.1162

On 10 March 2017, Germany adopted a new law concerning fraudulent betting and the manipulation of professional sporting events. The law institutes criminal punishments for these offenses.1163

On 24 March 2017, the ongoing fraud investigation regarding Mercedes-Benz maker, Daimler faced an inquiry on the company’s diesel-powered cars. The employees of Daimler are suspected to have committed fraud linked to sales of diesel vehicles by means of false emissions documentation. At this point, no employee
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has yet to be charged. The Daimler spokesman Jörg Howe maintains the denial of the company’s wrongdoing, stating that “[their] engines have been made according to current laws and they are in order.” Previous German government-led investigation by the Transport Ministry and the Federal Motor Vehicle Agency had determined that Daimler had not manipulated its vehicles though it is unclear now the extent to which prosecutors suspect there was wrongdoing. 1164

Finally, as a G20 Presidency, Co-Chair of the G20 Anti-Corruption Working Group (ACWG), and Co-Chair of the UNAC Conference of the States Parties, Germany is working towards anti-corruption policies, including by ratification and implementation of the UNAC as well as active participation and possible adherence with the OECD ABC. In January 2017, Germany together with the eCed organized a high-level anticorruption conference for G20 governments, business, and civil society. 1165 Further, in April 2017, Germany co-chaired the ACWG, and together with the OECD co-organized a seminar on international cooperation in civil and administrative proceedings relating to corruption. 1166

Germany has taken action individually that aligns with the goals of the Declaration Against Corruption and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) Anti-Bribery Ministerial Meeting declaration. Germany has also worked collectively to advance shared priorities through the United Nations Convention against Corruption and the OECD. It has therefore received a score of +1 for full compliance.

Analyst: Hiveda Ates

Italy: 0

Italy has partially complied with its commitment to advance the global anti-corruption agenda.

On 23 June 2016, Mayor of Rome Virginia Raggi pledged to crack down on corruption in the wake of new revelations about the extent to which organized crime takes place in the Roman city hall, a scandal now known as the Mafia Capitale scandal. Raggi became mayor on 20 June 2016, replacing a government commissioner who stepped in at the end of 2015 due to the previous mayor of Rome being forced to resign over a corruption scandal. Raggi, who promised to root out the corruption at city hall during her campaign, has guaranteed strict enforcement of the law on public tenders, stating that “[e]very company wanting to work for Rome in whatever sector will be given equal opportunity to propose their services and the best offer will get the contract,” and has expressed her desire to work closely with the ANAC. 1172

On 11 October 2016, the Italian government approved a decree-law that set aside EUR200 million in aid for economic recovery of areas devastated by the 24 August 2016 earthquake. The decree has taken steps to ensure standards of legality and transparency during reconstruction, including the creation of a “unique central purchasing body, a register of companies and professionals and constantly updated data.” The decree has also appointed the ANAC, Italy’s National Anti-Corruption Authority, to monitor the reconstruction to ensure compliance with anti-corruption commitments. The ANAC will also be analyzing how past public funds have been assigned and spent on post-quake construction processes since the 1997 earthquake. They will be working with Italy’s anti-corruption corps to carry out their goals.

On 11 October 2016, Chief of the ANAC Raffaele Cantone pledged to “wage war on nepotism and cronyism” in Italian universities by “introducing meritocracy and transparency and wiping out the ‘barons’,” who he describes as corrupt, well-networked scholars. In speaking with La Republicca, Rome’s daily newspaper, Cantone stated that the ANAC will be publishing proposals for universities in its 2017 programme of work and that he believes the solution to promoting anti-corruption in Italy is not to create new laws, but rather to apply existing laws effectively.

On 11 October 2016, ANAC Chief Raffaele Cantone met with Serbian Prime Minister Aleksandar Vucic to mark the launch of the EU Twinning project “Preventing and combatting corruption.” The project, worth EUR2 million, is meant to connect the Serbian Anti-corruption Agency with anti-corruption authorities in both Italy and Spain in order to “strengthen the prevention mechanism in Serbia and promote an active role of the Anti-corruption Agency, relevant authorities, CSOs [civil society organizations] and the media.”

---


Cantone stated his wish for the two agencies to work together given that “Italy is, unfortunately, very familiar with corruption.”

On 5 December 2016, the Head of Italy’s Anti-Corruption Authority, Raffaele Cantone, sat on a panel during the World Bank Group and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce’s second Annual Global Benchmarking Public Procurement Conference.

On 13 December 2016, the Italian Foreign Ministry hosted a high-level event entitled “Fighting corruption, economic growth and the activities of Italian companies abroad.” The purpose of the event was to discuss “the relationship between anti-corruption policies and the activities of Italian companies abroad with a view to promoting sustainable economic growth.” Several high ranking officials spoke at the event, including President of ANAC Raffaele Cantone, the Chief Prosecutor of Milan Francesco Greco, the Vice President of Confindustria Licia Mattioli, the correspondent of Il Corriere della Sera Fiorenza Sarzanini, the Director of UNICRI Cindy Smith, and the Foreign Ministry’s Secretary General Elisabetta Belloni. Representatives from the embassies accredited in Rome, Public Administrations, public agencies, legal practitioners, members of the press, and individuals from the private sector were invited to attend.

On 15 December 2016, the Italian Government announced a contribution of over USD110,000 to the International Commission against Impunity in Guatemala (CIGIG). The funding will be used to “promote the culture of legality in Guatemalan civil society, starting from children and young people … [through] specific political, social and cultural initiatives aimed at reinforcing the concept of rule of law in the country, improving the behaviour of younger generations by educating them to respect the law through the daily observance of shared rules.” Italian support for the project was announced on International Anti-Corruption Day.

On 16 December 2016, Virginia Raggi’s top aide Raffaele Marra was arrested in an investigation on his role as Rome’s housing commissioner in 2013. This arrest happened days after police seized documents from

---

city hall as part of a separate investigation into Raggi’s hiring practices. Marra had worked for former right-wing mayor Gianni Alemanno, who had been through numerous corruption investigations. In a press statement, Raggi expressed that she had made a mistake in trusting Marra and his experience as a former city official. Raggi herself has recently been accused by her former urban planning official Paolo Berdini of maintaining close ties with construction companies.

On 28 January 2017, former Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi was indicted by a Milan judge for corruption. According to prosecutors, Berlusconi paid off the witnesses in a previous investigation, in which he was accused of paying for sex with an underage prostitute, and he was acquitted as a result of the bribes. Karima El Mahroug, the woman at the center of the previous charges, and 22 other women including her former lawyer Luca Giuliani, journalist Carlo Rossella, and Senator Mariarosaria Rossi are currently being tried for corruption and perjury. Berlusconi, whose case is being handled separately for health reasons, has admitted to paying EUR2500 a month to several girls during the trial because he felt “responsible because they have committed the only crime of accepting an invitation to dinner at the home of the prime minister.” The trial started on 5 April.

On 9 February 2017, Italian prosecutors announced their intent to pursue a criminal trial against Royal Dutch Shell PLC and the chief executive of Eni SpA on corruption charges related to a Nigerian oil deal. The charges are an extension of decade-old bribery allegations, which hold that the roughly $1 billion paid out to the Nigerian government was transferred to bank accounts held by former Nigerian oil minister Dan Etete and then dispersed to numerous companies associated with Nigerian government officials. There exist clear ties between Eni and the Italian government; not only does the government own 30 percent of the company, but it also appoints the top management. While Eni has denied knowledge of how the money

---

filtered down to various parties, the prosecutors maintain that they were fully aware that the money was going to be paid out as kickbacks.\textsuperscript{1203}

Italy has taken steps to reaffirm its commitment to the global anti-corruption agenda and has also made an effort to help other countries do the same. Therefore, Italy has scored 0 for partial compliance.

\textit{Analyst: Saambavi Mano}

**Japan: 0**

Japan has partially complied with its commitment to advance the global anti-corruption agenda.

On 30 June 2016, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) published statements “admonishing”\textsuperscript{1204} Japan for its lack of effort in combating bribery, particularly that of Japanese companies conducting international business. Chair of the OECD Working Group on Bribery, Drago Kos, stressed the importance of Japan’s anti-corruption efforts given its crucial role in the world economy, and warned of the negative consequences that would occur as a result of “continued failure”\textsuperscript{1205} in fulfilling the Working Group’s suggestions, which include creating an “Action Plan”\textsuperscript{1206} to organize law enforcement so as to better handle corruption. In response to the OECD’s criticism, which echoes statements made in previous years, Japan expressed its commitment to the “global fight against corruption,”\textsuperscript{1207} and the OECD itself plans to follow up with another evaluation of Japan in March 2019.\textsuperscript{1208}

On 15 July 2016, the Japan Federation of Bar Associations (JFBA) issued a new set of anti-corruption guidelines as a framework for companies to better ensure compliance with anti-bribery laws both domestic and foreign.\textsuperscript{1209} These guidelines, supplementing the statements issued a year prior by the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry\textsuperscript{1210} aim to increase overall fiscal transparency by 1) encouraging companies to implement their own “internal control system”\textsuperscript{1211} to “better detect and prevent bribery,”\textsuperscript{1212} including a

specific emphasis on accurately recording “relevant commercial activity and transactions”\(^{1213}\) and 2) by promoting greater involvement in the anti-corruption agenda on part of lawyers and related legal counsel, providing a “practical”\(^{1214}\) approach which can be used to advise companies on how to best conduct their businesses abroad in compliance with anti-corruption laws.\(^{1215}\)

On 23 August 2016, the JFBA announced the establishment of a relief fund for victims of embezzlement by “fraudulent lawyers.”\(^{1216}\) The relief fund, to be implemented starting in April 2017, is being created in response to a “growing problem”\(^{1217}\) in the country where many legal professionals, particularly lawyers, are abusing the “guardian of adult system,”\(^{1218}\) in which they are court-appointed to oversee and manage the “assets of senior citizens deemed unfit to make sound judgments because of dementia or other problems.’ By establishing the fund, the JFBA is aiming to “restore public faith”\(^{1220}\) through increasing transparency in the legal system, especially the adult guardian system, and to hold lawyers who are either “found guilty of embezzlement in court” or have received “disciplinary action from their bar associations” more accountable for their financial crimes by entitling their victims to compensation money of up to JPY5 million.\(^{1221}\)

On 30 September 2016, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs released a press statement announcing the signing of a tax convention between Japan and Slovenia.\(^{1222}\) The convention aims to foster a closer, more transparent economic relationship between the two countries by 1) clarifying “taxation on cross-border investments,”\(^{1223}\) 2) “adjusting international double taxation”\(^{1224}\) by clarifying the “taxable scope”\(^{1225}\) in the two countries; and 3) introducing new dispute resolution methods such as “arbitration proceedings”\(^{1226}\) for tax authorities. All of the points outlined in the Convention are to promote more effective cooperation and information exchange between Japan and Slovenia, helping them to not only prevent tax evasion, but also encourage mutual


investments and economic activity.\textsuperscript{1227} The convention is to become applicable on the taxable period starting on 1 January 2017 in both countries.\textsuperscript{1228}

On 18 November 2016, the Osaka Prefectural Police established a new 140-person “emergency unit”\textsuperscript{1229} to combat recent “proliferation of fraud cases.”\textsuperscript{1230} The establishment of the new specialized force comes after the National Police Agency published reports at the end of October detailing the number of cases and extent of the monetary damage fraud has caused in the year to date — the reports show a worsening compared to last year’s, and place Osaka as having the largest amount of stolen money compared to the other 46 prefectures in Japan.\textsuperscript{1231} The emergency team hopes to increase law enforcement cooperation in anti-corruption efforts by tackling issues that were previously not addressed “sufficiently”\textsuperscript{1232} due to a lack of available manpower, such as “tracing the bases of fraud groups”\textsuperscript{1233} and raising exposure to the public of names found on fraud lists.\textsuperscript{1234}

On 21 March 2017, the Cabinet of Prime Minister Shinzo Abe approved an anti-conspiracy bill that would modify the current organized crime law, allowing the government to begin penalizing criminal conspiracy.\textsuperscript{1235} The conspiracy charges are said to apply to “groups of two or more people, where at least one person procures funds, supplies or surveys a location in preparation for committing a crime.”\textsuperscript{1236} The government is aiming to enact the bill by mid-June, but this is actually the third attempt to do so as the bill has faced much public backlash and even recent protests amid “concern that the law may be used against civic groups.”\textsuperscript{1237} In response, Cabinet Secretary Yoshihide Suga defended the bill by labelling it a crucial step towards Japan ratifying the UN Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime, an “urgent necessity”\textsuperscript{1238} given that Japan remains the only G7 nation yet to ratify the treaty, despite initially signing it in 2000. While many,

including members of the Tokyo Bar Association remain skeptical and raise concerns over possible human rights issues, the government has clarified that the new bill will be targeting only “terrorists and other organized crime syndicates, not ordinary citizens.”

On 31 March 2017, the Ministry of Education released a report confirming over 60 cases of misconduct where government officials had acted illegally to secure jobs for retired or retiring bureaucrats, a controversial but widespread practice known as *amakudari*. The internal investigation began in January following an initial probe that lead to disciplinary action against seven bureaucrats involved in a scandal of job-securing for a colleague as a professor at Waseda University. In response to the findings, the Ministry of Education has stated it will take “punitive action against more than 37 people,” and has also vowed to promote improved compliance with the National Public Service Law, which targets the *amakudari* practice by banning civil servants from asking companies to employ their retired colleagues. The ministry’s report also calls for a “reorganization within parts of the human resources division” as well as the implementation of a third-party monitoring system.

Japan has taken steps to affirm its continued commitment to combating corruption, with actions both domestically and abroad. Thus, Japan has been awarded a score of 0 for partial compliance.

*Analyst: Apanuba Mahmood*

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to counter corruption.

On 13 July 2016, the UK’s Serious Fraud Office (SFO) pressed charges against F.H. Bertling, a UK-based logistics and shipping company, along with seven of its current and former executives for making corrupt payments. Specifically, the indicted were charged for allegedly bribing an official of Sonangol, an Angolan state oil company, to further their company’s businesses operations in Angola. The case was accepted by

---

the SFO in September 2014; charges were not laid until July of 2016.\textsuperscript{1248} However, eventually, this matter was resolved, and given the complex nature of the case, taking this period of time is not problematic, especially in light of the fact that the SFO has successfully concluded other major cases recently, including the Deferred Prosecution Agreements with Rolls Royce and Tesco.\textsuperscript{1249,1250}

In September 2016, the UK also underwent the first IMF Fiscal Transparency Evaluation ever for a G7 country, and received a positive review.\textsuperscript{1251}

On 5 September 2016, the Law Commission, the statutory independent body responsible for keeping the law under review and making recommendations for reform to Parliament where needed,\textsuperscript{1252} released a Consultation Paper intended to review the current law on misconduct in public office.\textsuperscript{1253} It criticizes the current law as unclear and insufficient on many fronts.\textsuperscript{1254} It proposed three efforts for reform. First, a new offence based on the breach of duty committed by a public office holder. Second, a new offence based on the abuse of power, authority, or position held by a public office holder. Third, the abolition of the current law with no immediate replacement; while this route is not heavily endorsed it is still addressed fully.\textsuperscript{1255}

On 13 October 2016, the Criminal Finances Bill was introduced to the House of Commons.\textsuperscript{1256} The bill will give British law enforcement officers the ability to seize assets suspected of being connected to the proceeds of crime if the owners are unable to prove legitimate origin of wealth.\textsuperscript{1257} This bill aims to tackle both domestic and international corruption, further enhancing barriers against foreign money laundering in the British real estate market. The Criminal Finances Bill is part of a larger package aimed at “strengthening the government’s response to money laundering”\textsuperscript{1258} which includes “reforming the Suspicious Activity Report”\textsuperscript{1259} and “increasing … international reach through events like the Anti-Corruption Summit”\textsuperscript{1260} to build cooperation with overseas partners, reflecting the international nature of the issue.\textsuperscript{1261}

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
On 11 November 2016, British police launched a full investigation into allegations of corruption against the English Football Association that were brought forward by an investigative report published by the Daily Telegraph in September. The allegations have already caused the resignation of Sam Allardyce as the national team manager. In addition, 8 current or previous players are involved in these allegations among several other front office employees. 

On 29 November 2016, the United Kingdom announced that it will ratify the Unified Patent Court Agreement, emphasizing that it will not be derailed by Brexit. The Unified Patent Court is designed to provide a system of patent protection that is universal across Europe, with the aim of combating financial crime in this sector. The UPC requires all 13 countries to ratify before the plans can move forward; they are still waiting on Germany who is expected to ratify early 2017. There are still logistical issues that need to be ironed out concerning Britain’s eventual implementation of Brexit. 

In December 2016, the UK launched, as a founding member, the Contracting 5 (C5) open contracting initiative alongside France, Mexico, Colombia, and the Ukraine, enhancing contracting transparency. 

On 8 March 2017, the European Union’s anti-fraud office (OLAF) announced the uncovering of a massive fraud ring, concluding that British customs played a central role by continuously ignoring warnings that Chinese goods were entering the country at a fraction of their cost of production. Brussels is thought to be preparing Britain a €2 billion bill for their negligence. Reports are that the investigation is still ongoing as the fraud has “not been stopped to date.” OLAF refused to speculate on Britain’s possible motivation for providing lax customs enforcement to Chinese products but those familiar with cases like this one proposed that it could be done with the intention of luring more shipping traffic into the UK.

On 15 March 2017, the UK finance ministry published an updated draft of the money-laundering regulations in order to bring its rules and regulations into line with international standards. The ministry also announced an effort to coordinate the currently divided approach to detecting money-laundering.

The establishment of the “Office for Professional Body Anti-Money Laundering Supervision (OPBAS)” will amalgamate the current 25 distinct associations tackling the same task into one succinct body. OPBAS will have the post to penalize sectoral bodies for any violation of the regulations. It will be housed within the Financial Conduct Authority, the regulator currently tasked with market oversight and ensuring reasonable conduct in the financial system.

Further, in March 2017, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development published its report of the Phase 4 review of the UK against the Anti-Bribery convention. This review by experts examines cases in considerable detail, and highlighted the UK’s strong past record in fighting foreign bribery as well as its strong anti-corruption drive, as emphasized by the London Summit in 2016, and the announcement of the aforementioned legal reforms. The UK was praised for it efforts to enhance its detection capacity of foreign bribery, improve whistleblowing channels, and mobilize its overseas missions.

In April 2017, the UK also passed the Criminal Finances Act. The Act amends the 2002 Proceeds of Crime Act and contains important new provisions against money laundering, tax evasion, corruption, and terrorist financing. This law also gives law enforcement agencies and private sector partners enhanced capabilities. It specifically involves the creation of Unexplained Wealth Orders (UWOs), which require those suspected of serious crime or corruption to explain their sources of wealth. These UWOs can be made even in the cases of non-EEA foreign officials (PEPs), without the need to prove a link to a serious crime, given the increased risk that they may be involved in grand corruption. Further, this act extends non-conviction-based confiscation powers to the Financial Conduct Authority and HM Revenue and Customs.

On a final note, the UK has retained tenth place (joint with Germany) in the 2016 Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index. This is the second highest ranking of a G7 member country (after Canada).

In sum, the United Kingdom has worked with governments to strengthen law enforcement cooperation on corruption, enhance fiscal transparency, bolster anti-corruption capacity building support, and promote the global effort to fight corruption through multilateral frameworks such as the UNCAC. As such, it receives a score of +1.

**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to promote and advance priorities on global anti-corruption.

On 15 June 2016, US Vice President Joe Biden announced in Washington that the White House plans to invest USD220 million in financial assistance to Ukraine this year in support of Ukrainian Prime Minister Volodymyr Groysman’s reform agenda, which includes implementing anti-corruption reforms. These funds will particularly go towards strengthening Ukraine’s justice sector, including “expanding their partnerships with the National Anti-Corruption Bureau, Specialized Anti-Corruption Prosecutor’s Office, and National Police, as well as support for independent media and civil society.”

---


---
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On 12 July 2016, US Ambassador to the United Nations Samantha Power announced the launch of the Global Anti-Corruption Consortium, a multi-government program that will support civil society led efforts to combat corruption. Speaking at the Open Government Partnership Global Summit in Paris, Power said “the United States is joining with the governments of Argentina, Australia, Denmark, and Norway, and the Open Society Foundation, in launching the Global Anti-Corruption Consortium, which will provide nearly USD6 million to support the work of investigative journalists and global advocates to expose international graft so that corrupt officials can be brought to justice.”

On 20 July 2016, the US government took action to enforce anti-corruption laws by announcing that it intends to seize more than USD1 billion in assets tied to international public corruption under the Kleptocracy Asset Recovery Initiative. The civil complaint accuses high ranking officials close to Malaysia’s prime minister, Najib Razak, for allegedly pilfering more than USD3 billion from Malaysia’s sovereign wealth fund to purchase lavish items and properties in the United States. The FBI worked in conjunction with the US Department of Justice and the Malaysian Anti-Corruption Commission to investigate this case, which has been described by Department of Justice officials as “the largest single action ever brought under the Kleptocracy Asset Recovery Initiative.” The Kleptocracy Asset Recovery Initiative aims to “curb high-level public corruption around the world, forfeit the proceeds of corruption by foreign officials, and when appropriate, to use the recovered assets to benefit the people who were harmed.”

On 1 September 2016, US Agency for International Development (USAID) launched a joint anti-corruption project with the Indonesian Ministry of Law and Human Rights titled CEGAH (meaning “prevent” in Indonesian), a five-year, USD20.8 million program designed to strengthen Indonesia’s anti-corruption efforts. “Through our work together, we hope to advance transparency, accountability, fairness, and justice,” stated USAID Mission Director Erin McKee. CEGAH aims to “support the integration of anti-corruption initiatives across government agencies, build the capacity of government auditors and investigators to evaluate the effectiveness of flagship government programs … and work with Central Statistical Offices and the media to fully utilize available government data.” Overall, the CEGAH project aims to prevent

---

corruption by “providing ongoing support to government and civil society to create systems that decrease opportunities for corruption.”

On 3 September 2016, President Barack Obama and President Xi Jinping of China committed to strengthening their cooperation in law enforcement and anti-corruption at the G20 Hangzhou Summit. The two sides agreed to further enhance cooperation in anti-corruption initiatives under multilateral frameworks such as the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), as well as “deny safe haven to the corrupt and their criminal proceeds, continue to implement the 2014 APEC Beijing Declaration on Fighting Corruption, and support the work of the Network of Anti-Corruption Authorities and Law Enforcement Agencies (ACT-NET).”

On 29 September 2016, USAID announced a USD1 billion loan guarantee to support the Ukraine’s key economic and governance reforms, including reforms to help the Ukraine fight corruption. “This loan guarantee and USAID’s ongoing assistance in the Ukraine will bolster the process of implementing meaningful reforms and facilitate efforts to combat corruption and build a more independent, democratic, and financially viable and prosperous Ukraine,” stated USAID Administrator Gayle Smith.

On 3 November 2016, Greg Delawie, US ambassador to Kosovo, urged Kosovo leaders to tackle corruption at the UK/US Kosovo Trade and Investment Forum. Ambassador Delawie announced that the United States government will help Kosovo combat corruption by investing, over the next year, “over [USD]12 million in development aid and expertise focused on the rule of law.” Delawie further assured Kosovo leaders of Washington’s commitment to anti-corruption, stating that, “as in other developing countries, corruption remains a significant challenge, and something that I and my government have made a top focus of our diplomatic efforts and our assistance programs.”

The United States has worked with governments to strengthen law enforcement cooperation on corruption, enhance fiscal transparency, bolster anti-corruption capacity building support, and promote the global effort to fight corruption through multilateral frameworks such as the UNCAC. As such, it receives a score of +1.

*Analyst: Duja Muhanna*

**European Union: +1**

The European Union fully complied with its commitment to moving the global anti-corruption agenda forward.

On 14 June 2016, the EU-Ghana Anti-Corruption, Rule of Law and Accountability Programme (ARAP) was established. This partnership is a five-year programme of EUR20 million aimed at supporting the National Anti-Corruption Action Plan of Ghana. The key objective of ARAP is to increase the capacity of civic education providers, such as the National Commission on Civic Education and the Media, in order to

---


conduct advocacy campaigns for better accountability and a reduction in corruption. A secondary objective of the programme is to strengthen law enforcement agencies in combating corruption.¹²⁹⁵

On 29 June 2016, the European Parliament Intergroup for Integrity, Transparency, Corruption, and Organized Crime (ITCO) announced in a press statement that it will continue to push for protection for whistleblowers.¹²⁹⁶ This statement came as a response to the guilty verdict of Antoine Deltour, who had been served a 12-month suspended sentence for speaking out about the tax deals between the state of Luxembourg and large corporations. Benedek Javor, an ITCO intergroup Bureau Member who was present at the time of the verdict, said, “We remind the European Commission to urgently act to protect European citizens who have the courage to take huge personal risks for the common good. We expect a legislative proposal this year.”¹²⁹⁷ The ITCO intergroup has also called for transparency registers for lobbyists in a press statement released on 28 September 2016.¹²⁹⁸ In the press statement, ITCO co-president Dennis de Jong reinforced the importance of reliable information from lobbyists, and in cases of fraud, “sanctions based on criminal law should be imposed.”¹²⁹⁹

On 5 July 2016, The European Commission adopted a proposal that would update the Fourth Anti-Money Laundering Directive and therefore “further reinforce EU rules on anti-money laundering to counter terrorist financing and increase transparency about who really owns companies and trusts.”¹³⁰⁰ This particular proposal will also be the first initiative to implement the February 2016 Action Plan for strengthening the fight against terrorist financing and will also tackle tax transparency issues. First Vice-President Frans Timmermans said in the press statement, “Today’s proposals will help national authorities to track down people who hide their finances in order to commit crimes such as terrorism. Member States will be able to get and share vital information about who really owns companies or trusts, who is dealing in online currencies, and who is using pre-paid cards. Making public the information on who is behind companies and trusts should also be a strong deterrent for potential tax-evaders.”¹³⁰¹ The adopted proposal includes important updates to previous legislation such as tackling terrorist financing risks linked to virtual currencies, tackling risks linked to anonymous pre-paid instruments, full public access to the beneficial ownership registers, and the interconnection of said registers.

On 23 September 2016, the EU along with the Danish government announced a major anti-corruption initiative in Ukraine. This program will be implemented by the Danish Development Cooperation Agency with the support of the EU Advisory Mission in Ukraine, and is expected to be worth over EUR16 million. Already aided by advisory mission, this specific program will seek to further assistance for Ukraine with regards to “strategic advice, training, provision of equipment and coordination with anti-corruption bodies in EU member states in order to share best practice.”

On 28 September 2016, the European Commission released a press statement proposing a mandatory Transparency Register covering all three EU institutions: the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission itself. The proposal also includes an Interinstitutional Agreement, which seeks to implement a system ensuring the transparency of lobbying activities, while building on the existing voluntary Transparency Register of the Parliament and the Commission. Furthermore, the Commission’s proposal will clarify the “scope of activities and bodies covered, bolsters the monitoring and effective enforcement of the Register’s Code of Conduct for lobbyists and will simplify and improve the quality of data through streamlined input requirements and increased quality control.”

On 5 October 2016, the OECD and the Greek government, with the support of the EU launched a collaborative project to help implement Greece’s National Anti-Corruption Action Plan. This recently updated action plan seeks to “integrate effective measures to promote integrity within the government’s overall reform programme, enhance public-private sector cooperation on tackling fraud and corruption and raise public awareness of the negative impact of corruption for Greek society.” The 18-month project has ten targeted outcomes and include modernising internal and external audit mechanisms, strengthening whistleblower protection, and enhancing the partnership between private and public sectors in combating corruption.

On 16 November 2016, the EU partnered with Albania to establish the largest anti-corruption project in the Western Balkans. Financed by the EU with an amount of EUR3 million, this twinning project will pair Albania with Austria and Germany, who will aid the nation in the coordination and implementation of anti-corruption policies. While Albania is not yet in the EU, this project will further the fight against corruption and aid Albania’s accession efforts in the European Union. This 29-month project will also help establish

---

implementation of the Whistleblower Protection and Access to Information laws, in addition to improving oversight and control of political party finances and improving public intolerance of corruption.\textsuperscript{1310}

On 6 December 2016, the European Council adopted a directive that will require member states to provide access to the beneficial ownership of companies.\textsuperscript{1311} The objective of the directive is to prevent money laundering and tax evasion by giving tax authorities the information needed to fulfill their monitoring obligations and are part of the directive authorizing automatic exchange of information set out by directive 2014/107/EU.\textsuperscript{1312} It will apply after 1 January 2018, allowing member states until 31 December 2017 to implement the directive into the national legal system.\textsuperscript{1313}

On 13 January 2017, the European Commission granted a request by the Republic of Moldova by proposing a Macro-Financial Assistance programme that would help the country address its short-term financing needs, while tackling corruption and poor governance.\textsuperscript{1314} The European Commission hopes that this programme worth upwards of EUR100 million will ultimately help stabilize the economy. According to Valdis Dombrovskis, Vice-President for the Euro and Social Dialogue, who is also in charge of Financial Stability, Financial Services and Capital Markets Union, “This assistance will help Moldova meet its most immediate financing needs and stabilise its economy. At the same time, we are confident that the conditions related to this financing will contribute to improving economic governance in the country and encourage vital reforms.”\textsuperscript{1315}

At time of writing, member states are in the process of implementing the fourth anti-money laundering directive, previously adopted in 2015.\textsuperscript{1316} However, considerable amendments to the directive have been made through the third Presidency Compromise text.\textsuperscript{1317} Some of the changes include making it more difficult to use anonymous pre-paid cards; widening the scope and definition of virtual currencies; and requiring the identity of customers for remote payment transactions exceeding EUR 50.

Thus, the European Union has been awarded a score of +1 for full compliance for enforcing and promoting anti-corruption legislation and efforts within its jurisdiction and abroad.

Analyst: Gabrielle Lim


“[Recognizing the importance of the international multi-stakeholder efforts such as the Open Government Partnership, the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and its integrity work, and the UN Global Compact,] we pledge to move the anti-corruption global agenda forward while effectively building synergies with the relevant anti-corruption initiatives and instruments, especially through emphasizing the importance of EITI in making the extractive sector more transparent, and consequently deterring corruption.”

_G7 Action to Fight Corruption_

Assessment

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

Background

Both anti-corruption and energy have been long-standing issues on the G7’s agenda. Since the inception of the Group of Six in 1975, both issues have been discussed in depth and acted upon in a variety of ways. However, in relation to this specific commitment regarding extractive industries (oil, gas, and mining), focus on anti-corruption in the energy sector was first discussed in depth at the 2003 Evian Summit in France. In a declaration entitled “Fighting Corruption and Improving Transparency,” G8 members broadly recognized that, “transparency inhibits corruption and promotes good governance.”

In relation to extractive industries, member states agreed to, “encourage governments and companies, both private and state-owned, to disclose to the IMF [International Monetary Fund] or another agreed independent third party … revenue flows and payments from the extractive sectors.” In addition, members encouraged “the IMF and the World Bank to give technical support to governments participating in the initiative.”

The Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) was officially established in June 2003 in London. The EITI is an “international standard for transparency in extractive industry payments and receipts.” Companies within member states are “required to publish what they pay to governments and governments are required to publish what they receive from companies.” These reports are then monitored and reconciled.

---

1321 History of the EITI: How it all started, where we went and where we are now, EITI International Secretariat (Oslo, Norway) Date of Access: 4 February 2017. https://eiti.org/history#early-beginnings.
by an “independent administrator.” The G8’s encouragement for the World Bank and the IMF to provide support for countries aiming to achieve greater transparency, as mentioned above, led to the creation of the World Bank-administered Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) for the EITI in 2004. According to the EITI International Secretariat, “The MDTF disbursed almost USD 60 million in technical and financial assistance to EITI programmes in over 40 countries before being replaced by the Extractives Governance Programmatic Support (EGPS) facility in 2016.”

The EITI Standard is composed of two parts, which are intended to ensure transparency on the rights to natural resources, on the way profit is made from these resources, and on the various impacts these processes have on the wellbeing of citizens and economies. The EITI stresses civil society engagement stemming from a functioning multi-stakeholder group as one of its key goals, and as an integral component of the active, efficient, and effective process of oversight. According to the EITI governing board, the key requirements to multi-stakeholder oversight include: 1) government and industry engagement; 2) the effective functioning of a multi-stakeholder group; and 3) a clear agenda or plan for the implementation and enforcement of the EITI’s objectives.

The EITI process includes the step of validation, in which the Initiative evaluates the performance of implementing countries and educates them on compliance. By holding all EITI implementing countries to the same global standard, the EITI ensures all stakeholders that the assessment of the degree of implementation in a country is objective, accurate, and indicative of EITI standards.

The EU, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), and the G7 member states currently implementing the EITI aim to encourage the enforcement of anti-corruption measures and transparency, as well as general good governance and the assurance of equal opportunities for the private sector. This encouragement is particularly aimed at developing countries and those currently emerging on the global stage, and is linked to international political objectives more often than to domestic ones.

As of 2016, the EITI has 51 implementing countries, as well as 17 supporting countries. In addition, the EITI is comprised of “dozens of supporting companies in the oil, gas and mining industries; and numerous transparency and natural resource civil society organizations.”


and Germany in 2016.\textsuperscript{1336} France is not currently an implementing member of EITI, but indicated its intention to join in 2013.\textsuperscript{1337} Notably, Canada, Italy, and Japan are not implementing members of EITI.\textsuperscript{1338}

While all G7 members have not committed to becoming implementing members of EITI, the G7/G8 has continued to emphasize the importance of transparency in extractive industries. At the 2006 St. Petersburg Summit in Russia, the “St. Petersburg Plan of Action Global Energy Security” emphasized the importance of, “increasing transparency, predictability and stability of global energy markets,”\textsuperscript{1339} and members pledged to “take forward efforts to make management of public revenues from energy exports more transparent,” including in the context of the EITI and the IMF Guide on Resource Revenue Transparency.\textsuperscript{1340} This commitment was reaffirmed at the 2008 Hokkaido Toyako Summit in Japan with specific reference to rising oil prices worldwide. At that time, G8 leaders affirmed that “greater transparency will lead to better functioning energy markets and hence a better balance between supply and demand.”\textsuperscript{1341}

At the 2009 L’Aquila Summit in Italy, G8 leaders once again reaffirmed their support of EITI and pledged to “intensify efforts to promote validation by all implementing countries and all companies operating in those countries. We also strongly encourage EITI candidate countries to complete implementation within their agreed timeframe and call on other developing and emerging countries and their companies to adhere to the initiative.”\textsuperscript{1342}

At the 2013 Lough Erne Summit, G8 leaders asserted that “the lack of strong systems of transparency and accountability in the management of the extractive sector in some resource-rich countries has too often allowed revenues to be diverted from high-priority national needs.”\textsuperscript{1343} In turn, members committed to, “Raising global standards of transparency in the extractive sector and building the capacity of countries to manage their resources effectively will improve accountability, reduce the space for corruption and other illicit activities and ensure that citizens benefit fully from the extraction of natural resources.”\textsuperscript{1344} The leaders called on other countries to work together to ameliorate quality, completeness, and timeliness of data regarding transparency in extractive industries, and also encouraged more countries to sign on to the EITI.\textsuperscript{1345}

G7 leaders have also emphasized the importance of transparency and accountability to prevent corruption in other sectors, and in government. For example, they have repeatedly renewed their commitment to working with relevant international groups such as the OECD, and the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), and have pledged to actively spread awareness of the Declaration Against Corruption which was adopted at the Anti-Corruption Summit on 12 May 2016.\textsuperscript{1346} They have also committed to supporting initiatives like the Open Government Partnership, and UN Global Compact.

Commitment Features

In the 2016 G7 Action to Fight Corruption, the G7 broadly committed to 1) enhancing prevention of corruption in public procurement and enhancing fiscal transparency; 2) strengthening law enforcement cooperation on corruption; 3) enhancing anti-corruption capacity-building support; and 4) promoting the global effort to fight corruption.\(^{1347}\)

However, this commitment relates more narrowly to anti-corruption efforts taken in support of specific initiatives. Thus, member states have “pledged[d] to move the anti-corruption global agenda forward while effectively building synergies with the relevant anti-corruption initiatives and instruments, especially through emphasizing the importance of EITI in making the extractive sector more transparent, and consequently deterring corruption.”\(^{1348}\)

In order to achieve compliance, G7 members would have “effectively build ... synergies.”\(^{1349}\) Synergy can be defined as “combined action or operation.”\(^{1350}\) In this case, it refers to cooperation between a G7 member state and organizations including the Open Government Partnership, United Nations Global Compact, and the OECD, in relation to its Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises.\(^{1351}\) Efforts that count towards compliance must be effective. The G7 Research Group generally defines an effective initiative as one that produces the intended result. This would mean that the partnership furthers anti-corruption efforts.\(^{1352}\)

The G7 Action to Fight Corruption specifically suggests a number of means by which G7 members can fulfill this commitment under the section “Promoting [the] Global Effort to Fight Corruption.” For example, states may fulfill this commitment by “Promoting efforts to build confidence and dialogue between governments and civil society ... including as observers in subsidiary bodies of the UNCAC Conference of States Parties and in the review process.”\(^{1353}\) Alternatively, they could: undertake the “implementation of individual action plans on beneficial ownership” or call for participants in the World Trade Organization (WTO) to sign the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement. A full list of possible means of compliance can be found in section four of the G7 Action to Fight Corruption.

The commitment also makes special note of the EITI, committing to fight corruption “especially through emphasizing the importance of EITI in making the extractive sector more transparent.”\(^{1354}\) In this context, “especially” means “in particular,”\(^{1355}\) with an emphasis on the importance of the EITI. Here, the G7 is specifically stressing the significance of that organization in furthering anti-corruption efforts. For that reason, G7 member states will also be required to take action to support the EITI in order to achieve full compliance. Emphasizing the importance of the EITI is a clear means of supporting the EITI, since the group says that

---


“the only formal requirement of a supporting country is to make a clear public endorsement.”

However, the EITI also notes that states can help it by providing “financial, technical, and political support at the international level and in implementing and other resource-rich countries.”

Thus, full compliance for a G7 member state in this case would necessitate active promotion of dialogue at an international level among governments and other actors on the subject of anti-corruption efforts, while specifically emphasizing the importance of the EITI in ensuring transparent, accountable, and effective procurement in the extractive industries sector.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>The G7 member state did not effectively build synergies with the relevant anti-corruption initiatives and instruments AND did not emphasize the importance of the EITI in making the extractive sector more transparent in order to deter corruption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The G7 member effectively built synergies with the relevant anti-corruption initiatives and instruments OR emphasized the importance of the EITI in making the extractive sector more transparent in order to deter corruption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>The G7 member effectively built synergies with the relevant anti-corruption initiatives and instruments, AND emphasized the importance of the EITI in making the extractive sector more transparent in order to deter corruption.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lead Analyst: Tina Vulevic*

**Canada: 0**

Canada has partially complied with its commitment to effectively built synergies with the relevant anti-corruption initiatives and instruments, and emphasize the importance of the Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative (EITI) in making the extractive sector more transparent in order to deter corruption.

On 15 July 2016, Canada published its Third Biennial Plan to the Open Government Partnership. This report identifies Canada’s commitments under the partnership, and lists actions that Canada will take during the 2016-2018 period to meet these promises.

On 9 December 2016, Publish What You Pay Canada (PWYPC) released a statement announcing its new project to act as a central registry of companies and trusts available to the public, with the hopes of speeding up investigations, and increasing government revenues by allowing effective crack-downs on tax evaders in extractive industries. Specifically, PWYPC called for extractive companies in Canada to publically disclose the payments they make to foreign governments in the countries where they work, and for Canada to fully implement the EITI.

Canada has taken action outside of the compliance period to support the EITI. Canada contributed CAD35,000 to the EITI for January to December 2016, and CAD65,000 to support the EITI Conference in February 2016. However, Canada does not appear to have taken any concrete steps to encourage other

---

countries to improve their extractive industries through the implementation of EITI since this time. Canada has also failed to emphasize the importance of EITI through diplomatic or commercial channels.

In sum, while Canada has built synergies with other relevant anti-corruption initiatives, it has not emphasized the importance of implementation of EITI. For this reason, Canada gets a score of 0.

Analyst: Yidi (Andy) Guan

France: 0
France has partially complied with its commitment to promote good governance in the extractive industry, and to encourage other countries to improve governance of their extractive industries through the implementation of the Extractive Industries Tax Initiative (EITI).

On 8 November 2016, the French Parliament definitively passed the “Proposed Law Regarding Transparency, the Fight against Corruption and the Modernization of Economic Life,” known as the Loi Sapin II. The goal of the proposed law was to bring France to the highest European and international standards in the areas of transparency and anti-corruption.1363

With respect to transparency, the Loi Sapin II initiated the creation of a national electronic register. Representatives of interests will have to register and declare their business operations.1364 If breaches are found, the Supreme Authority for Transparency in Public Life has the authority to issue formal warnings and to impose a maximum fine of EUR30,000.1365 Furthermore, the law also extended the legal protection afforded to whistleblowers in the financial system.1366 This fulfills subsections a) and e) of the 2016 G7 Action to Fight Corruption’s third commitment, “Enhancing Anti-Corruption Capacity Building Support.”1367 Subsection a) of the third commitment states that G7 countries will “[strengthen] anti-corruption capacity building in such areas as improving auditing and accounting processes, civil service integrity reform, anti-money laundering, [mutual legal assistance] and asset recovery, as well as improving budget formulation, expenditure standards and transparency in public procurement,” while subsection e) states that they will “[support] capacity building of civil society and journalists to contribute to anticorruption reform and expose corruption and bribery.”1368

With respect to anti-corruption, the Loi Sapin II helped create a National Agency to Combat Corruption.1369 The National Agency ensures that companies with a workforce of over 500 people, and whose annual turnover exceeds EUR100 million, implement anti-corruption procedures.1370 It has the authority to issue

formal warnings and impose a fine of up to EUR1 million for legal entities and EUR200,000 for natural persons.\textsuperscript{1371} This also fulfills subsections a) and e) of the 2016 G7 Action to Fight Corruption’s third commitment.

From 7 December 2016 to 9 December 2016, a delegation from France attended the Open Government Partnership Global Summit.\textsuperscript{1372} President François Hollande made a statement at the Summit, where he expressed three goals. The first was to expand the number of countries in the partnership.\textsuperscript{1373} The second was to renew the common pact by encouraging countries to produce national action plans, and to increasing partnerships between the public sector and civil society.\textsuperscript{1374} The third goal was to consider alliances and concrete initiatives between countries that are interested in fighting corruption.\textsuperscript{1375}

However, since that event, France has not taken any concrete steps to encourage other countries to improve their extractive industries through the implementation of EITI. France has also failed to emphasize the importance of EITI through diplomatic or commercial means.

In sum, while France has made progress by development of anti-corruption laws, and international partnerships such as the Open Government Partnership, it has failed to encourage other countries to do the same, and has not emphasized the importance of implementation of EITI. For this reason, France receives a score of 0.

\textit{Analyst: Ivan Hsieh}

Germany: 0

Germany has partially complied with its commitment to further the anti-corruption global agenda by effectively building synergies with relevant anti-corruption initiatives, and by emphasizing the importance of Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) in making the extractive sector more transparent.

The Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH (GIZ) is helping the German Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (BMWi) and the Multi-Stakeholder Group to implement EITI’s standards in Germany.\textsuperscript{1376} Since 2003, Germany has supported EITI both politically, and financially in over 40 developing countries.\textsuperscript{1377} In July 2014, Germany announced its intention to implement the principles of EITI, and its candidacy as a member state was approved by the EITI Board in February 2016.\textsuperscript{1378} Germany is currently actively working towards promoting EITI by preparing its first ever annual EITI Report by August


2017. The report will shed light on the raw materials sector, and its financial flows. It is expected that by August 2018, Germany will receive an official validation of the implementation of EITI if it continues to diligently implement and follow the necessary steps.

The Multi-Stakeholder Group is playing a key role in Germany, steering the entire process of Germany’s entry into EITI’s list of compliant countries. The group assists in building synergetic relationships among stakeholders, and promotes the development of new ideas and solutions for the implementation of EITI. As a result, the group’s secretariat and members are achieving high levels of data transparency in the raw materials sector, and are furthering dialogue on the EITI within the country.

On 6 August 2016, the German Bundestag introduced measures to regulate the exploitation of natural gas and oil. The Bundestag enforced laws introducing mandatory environmental impact assessments for all fracturing operations, mining standards, and regulations on the use of fracturing technology, and deep drilling operations. These included “The Law on Changes to Water Protection and Conservations Regulations in order to prohibit Procedures using Fracking Technology and to Minimise Risks,” and “The Law to Extend Liability for Mining Operations to Borehole Mining and to Subterranean Caverns (cavities), which regulates issues relating to liability.”

Germany has played an active role in adhering to the anti-corruption global agenda by promoting anti-corruption initiatives, and through its work with the Multi-Stakeholder Group. For this reason, Germany receives a score of 0.

Analyst: Simran Sawhney

Italy: +1

Italy has fully complied with its commitment to promote good governance in the extractive industry, and has also encouraged other countries to improve their extractive industries governance via diplomatic and commercial channels.

Last year, Italy supported the implementation of Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) through the Italian Energy Company (ENI), which was one of the earliest supporters of the initiative. ENI is a multinational company which plays an active role in promoting anti-corruption efforts. ENI is also a member of the Multi-Stakeholder Groups in Congo, Mozambique, East Timor, Ukraine and Ghana. Apart from its

1379 D-EITI: For Transparency in the German Raw Materials Sector, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
1381 D-EITI: For Transparency in the German Raw Materials Sector, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
1383 D-EITI: For Transparency in the German Raw Materials Sector, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
1385 D-EITI: For Transparency in the German Raw Materials Sector, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
active role, it also monitors the work of MSGs in Kazakhstan, Nigeria, and Norway through the side EITI
groups, and contributes to EITI implementation both in Italy and Italy’s chief energy partners.

On 25 February 2016, at the 7th EITI Global Conference in Lima, the Italian Ambassador, Mauro Marsili
announced that Italy was actively searching for ways to improve the implementation of EITI, whether that be
through higher stakeholders’ involvement, further refinement of the EITI Standard, or through new voluntary strategies.

On 12 May 2016, at the Anti-Corruption Summit in London, UK, a representative for Italy stated that Italy
was committed to working together with other countries to enhance “company disclosure (regarding
payments to governments for the sale of oil, gas and minerals),” and specifically stated that this is
complementary to the ongoing work within the EITI.1387 In addition, Italy affirmed its support for the
establishment of an anti-corruption centre at the Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development
(OECD) and reiterated its support by stating that it will work with other countries and their civil societies to
accelerate the implementation of the voluntary provisions of the UN Convention Against Corruption.1388

Also, at the Anti-Corruption Summit in London, Raffaele Cantone, President of Italy’s Anti-Corruption
Authority (ANAC), signed a memorandum of understanding with the OECD Secretary-General Angel
Gurría, emphasizing both parties’ dedication to institutional integrity, covering extractive industries among
other sectors.1389 Though the initiative has not been launched yet, it is expected that the partnership will bring
enormous benefits to both parties in the future.1390

In sum, Italy has played an active role in furthering the anti-corruption agenda by promoting good
governance practices in the extractive industry both within the country, and globally through its work with
international groups such as the Multi-Stakeholder Groups. For this reason, Italy has earned a score of +1.

Analyst: Tina Valevic

Japan: 0

Japan has partially complied with its commitment to build synergies with other anti-corruption initiatives,
antd to encourage countries via diplomatic and commercial means to improve their extractive industries.

On 29-30 June 2016, several Japanese representatives from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of
Economy, Trade, and Industry, Ministry of Justice, and National Police Agency met with representatives of
the Parties to the Anti-Bribery Convention of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
(OECD) in Tokyo to discuss issues on Japan’s efforts to combat bribery in Japanese companies.
After this meeting, Japan declared that it would commit to the global fight against corruption, and presented
updates on its effort to implement the recommendations of the OECD Working Group on Bribery in
International Transactions.1391

On 15 September 2016, Japan’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs organized the G7 CONNEX Initiative
International Conference on Capacity Building and Transparency as a follow-up conference to the Ise-Shima

1389 OECD and Italy’s National Anti-Corruption Authority Reinforce National Cooperation in Fighting Corruption, OECD (Paris)
cooperation-in-fighting-corruption.htm.
1390 OECD and Italy’s National Anti-Corruption Authority Reinforce National Cooperation in Fighting Corruption, OECD (Paris)
cooperation-in-fighting-corruption.htm.
1391 Japan Must Make Fighting International Bribery a Priority, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 30
priority.htm.
Summit.1392 This conference invited several international organizations and representatives from member states to partake in five sessions. These sessions facilitated discussions on the future of the CONNEX initiative and member states’ efforts in capacity building and transparency.

On 30 September 2016, the Japanese National Contact Point (NCP), developed under the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, revised its “Procedural Guidelines” to clarify the NCP’s procedures to better reflect its experiences. It also changed it title to “Procedural Guidance.”1393 Through promotional endeavours and contributing to resolutions, the Japanese NCP seeks to ensure the effectiveness of the OECD Guidelines, demonstrating Japan’s recognition of the importance of working with multi-stakeholder efforts.

On 20 November 2016, the EITI published a table of “Supporting countries’ contributions for 2016.” The table stated that Japan has donated 37,000 USD for the purpose of CONNEX.1394 Ten days later, the Deputy Permanent Representative of Japan to the OECD, Ryotaro Suzuki, presented remarks to the Seventh Plenary Meeting of the Policy Dialogue on Nature Resource-Based Development.1395 Suzuki discussed Japan’s efforts in leading both the CONNEX Initiative at the G7 Summit, and efforts in hosting the G7 CONNEX Initiative International Conference on Capacity Building and Transparency. Suzuki reported that such tasks have led Japan to create a synergy between CONNEX efforts and broader development efforts.1396

In December 2016, Japan requested a study by the EITI on how CONNEX and the EITI can work together to improve transparency in the oil, gas, and mining sectors.1397 The study highlighted the points of complementarity between the two organizations with case studies that explore the challenges faced by EITI countries, and how CONNEX can contribute expertise and assistance.1398 Among the key recommendations, it was suggested that CONNEX and the EITI collaborate on beneficial ownership disclosure to provide public information on preferential deals, and to encourage more countries to codify more contract procedures in law to reduce the space for individual discretion in the extractive industries contracts.1399

However, since last year’s summit, Japan has not taken any concrete steps to encourage other countries to improve their extractive industries through the implementation of EITI.

In sum, Japan has effectively built synergies with relevant anti-corruption organizations such as CONNEX and emphasized the role of the EITI in pushing forward the anti-corruption agenda. However, because it has failed to encourage other countries via diplomatic and commercial channels to improve their extractive industries, Japan has been awarded a score of 0.

Analyst: Jing Wang

---


United Kingdom: +1
The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to transparency and deterrence of corruption by promoting good governance and protocols of the Extractive Industries Tax Initiative (EITI), and by building synergistic relationships in the international community.1400

While it has yet to be assessed against the 2016 standard of the EITI,1401 the UK has assisted in creating synergies through its continued support of standards laid out in the 2016 Anti-Corruption Summit.1402 It has also established an implementation mechanism for the EITI in the form of the Multi-Stakeholder Group (MSG).1403

The United Kingdom has enacted several policy reforms and declarations aimed at international coordination against corruption, primarily centred around guidelines set out at the 2016 Anti-Corruption Summit held in London, UK.1404 The UK and 40 other participating states ratified the Global Declaration Against Corruption,1405 which encourages the promotion of transparency “by targeting entrenched corruption, linking up institutions and professions around the world to build capacity and foster a shared culture of integrity.”1406

While the Declaration was signed at the UK Anti-Corruption Summit on 12 May 2016, prior to the G7 Ise-Shima Summit, the UK government has since continuously updated and reformed its content throughout the last year, with the most recent update on 9 December 2016.1407 Alongside this, the UK has consistently published reports and other documents relevant to the promotion of transparency in its online anti-corruption forum.1408 Most recently, this forum has detailed MP Sir Eric Pickles’s participation at the Open Government Partnership Summit in Paris, France on 7 December 2016, to initiate further dialogue on domestic and international transparency.1409 This was followed up by a report issued by the House of Commons, which reveals United Kingdom’s follow up plans for policy reforms on corruption.1410

Though UK’s status as a member state of EITI is still pending approval,1411 the UK has nevertheless created a plan of action to demonstrate its commitment to the EITI through the domestically organized Multi-

Stakeholder Group.1412 The group is responsible for the implementation of the standards of the EITI in the UK’s policy sector, both internationally and domestically through enhancing “accountability to the UK public on the revenues from the UK’s extractives industries.”1413 The organization has kept continuous public records of its activities and progress, including a collection of the minutes from its meetings, with the latest published from its 21st meeting on 11 January 2017.1414 At this meeting, the Multi-Stakeholder Group approved the Open Data Policy declaration, a document which states the UK’s objectives to promote greater flow of open data networks and to “increase transparency about government and business activities.”1415 This document reflects the UK’s general trend towards a policy of open data available to the public, paralleling its actions in promotion of the Global Declaration Against Corruption.1416 On 31 March 2017, the group will hold its second launch of the UK EITI Report, held in Aberdeen, Scotland, which will serve as a follow up to the initial conference held on 5 October 2014, and provide the UK with further platforms for discourse and distribution of the protocols of the EITI.1417

In sum, the UK has been given a score of +1 for its willingness to promote EITI protocols and governance measures within the country, and for its collaboration with international groups and other states for administration of the goals and guidelines of the EITI.

Analyst: Jack Ryan

United States: 0

The United States has partially complied with its commitment to promote governance in the extractive industry, and to encourage other countries to improve their extractive industries through the implementation of the Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative (EITI).

On 16 November 2016, the US Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewell released the second report of the U.S Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (USEITI).1418 The initiative is aimed at governments and companies alike, and its purpose is to disclose paid revenues for the development of renewable energy projects on public land, as well as for the development of other natural resource industries such as oil and gas.1419 Secretary Jewell also emphasized the importance of a newly redesigned interactive data portal. The portal centralizes all the disclosures made regarding natural resource revenue information, with the help of new state-

level datasets to better understand topics pertaining to extractive industries. After further encouraging state-level participation in USEITI, three states have thus far joined the initiative — Alaska, Montana and Wyoming — in order to expand access to local-level data on revenues, distribution of extractive industries, and more.

Currently, the disclosure of information contained in USEITI is strictly voluntary. However, the Securities and Exchange Commission aims to change that by promulgating rules that would require publicly traded companies in the energy and mining sector to reveal the amount of payments made to the federal, and to the foreign governments. In this way, USEITI is heavily emphasized as a mechanism for ensuring domestic compliance to the US commitment to furthering the anti-corruption commitment made at the Ise-Shima Summit.

Furthermore, Secretary Jewell stated that “the success of USEITI reporting not only underscores our domestic commitment to strong stewardship and accountability of natural resource revenues, but furthers President Obama’s Open Government Partnership priorities by setting a global example,” further demonstrating that the United States recognizes the importance of the international multi-stakeholder effort in the form of Open Government Partnership.

However, the United States does not seem to be engaged in building synergies with any external anti-corruption organizations besides the EITI. It has also failed to demonstrate support for other countries to improve their extractive industries through the implementation of EITI.

For continuously emphasizing the importance of the EITI domestically, though failing to build effective external synergies with relevant anti-corruption groups, and failing to encourage other countries to improve their extractive industries, the United States receives a score of 0.

**Analyst: Tina Vulevic**

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to promote governance in the extractive industry, and to encourage other countries to improve their extractive industries through the implementation of the Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative (EITI).

On 27 June 2016, a report by the US Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), titled “Disclosure of Payment Extraction Issuers,” revealed how the European Parliament and the EU have adopted rules of disclosure in reviewing energy projects, which are required to provide “public disclosure of the payment information.” These provisions are being applied to all member states of the EU, and provide indication of

---

the EU’s ability to support synergies by promoting transparency of its own legislative handling of anti-corruption measures.\textsuperscript{1426}

On 8 October 2016, the European Union contributed EUR5 million to Extractives Global Programmatic Support Program, a multi-donor Trust Fund under the World Bank’s Energy and Extractives Global Practice.\textsuperscript{1427} The contribution was aimed at providing technical and financial support to countries implementing or considering to join EITI.

On 29 November 2016, the EU assisted in resolving the negotiation of agreements with Azerbaijan for transparent implementation of the EITI, to ensure that its anti-corruption measures stem not only into Azerbaijan’s energy sector, but into prevention of illegal practices nationally.\textsuperscript{1428}

On 7 December 2016, at the 4th Annual Open Government Partnership Summit in Paris, a roundtable was organized on the European Union.\textsuperscript{1429} The group discussed how Brussels could draw on the principles of the partnership to increase its citizen’s trust in its institutions.\textsuperscript{1430}

Therefore, the EU has been given a score of +1 for its advancement of international synergies on transparency through collaboration with other organization, and its commitment to administering the EITI.

\textit{Analyst: Jane Filipiuk}

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
13. Terrorism: Combatting Terrorist Financing

“We reassert our commitment to countering terrorist financing as declared in the G7 Action Plan on Combatting the Financing of Terrorism at the G7 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors’ meeting in Sendai.”

G7 Ise-Shima 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></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</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>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

At the 2016 Ise–Shima Summit, G7 leaders and policymakers reaffirmed that concerted global action to combat the financing of terrorist activities remains a critical element in the fight against international, state, and sub-state terrorism.¹ The Global Plan to Combat the Financing of Terrorism (CFT) is a global priority due to the fact that monetary support “provides the means for terrorists to perpetrate attacks, sustain networks and spread their ideology through propaganda.”²

CFT has been a persistent issue on the G7 agenda. Following the 9/11 attacks, G7 finance ministers drafted the Action Plan to Combat the Financing of Terrorism.³ This October 2001 initiative called for immediate and concerted international action to freeze terrorist assets and impose appropriate sanctions.⁴ In addition, the 2001 Action Plan to Combat the Financing of Terrorism urged countries to create functioning financial intelligence units (FIUs) with the purpose of identifying and tracking terrorist assets both domestically and internationally.⁵

The G7 members agreed to join the Egmont Group, an organization which facilitates coordination between national FIUs, with the ultimate goal of sustaining an international, financial intelligence network.⁶

In a further attempt to encourage international coordination, the Action Plan to Combat the Financing of Terrorism (2001) declared that the Financial Action Task Force (FATF), “should play a vital role in fighting

the financing of terrorism, and supported the FATF’s decision to expand its mandate “to combat terrorist financing.” Established by the Group of Seven in 1989, the FATF is an inter-governmental body that seeks to, “set standards and 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.” Since 2001, the G7 members have been working to implement the FATF’s recommendations regarding combating the financing of terrorist activities.

At the 2002 Evian Summit, the G7 established the Counter-Terrorism Action Group (CTAG), an international body with a mandate to support the United Nations Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee. Collectively, these organizations coordinate donations to counterterrorism capacity-building assistance, including anti-money laundering and anti-terrorism financing training, and monitor member states’ adherence to the UN’s counterterrorism instruments.

From 2004 to 2015, the UN Security Council issued several binding resolutions, including 1540 (2004), 2170 (2014), 2199 (2015), and 2253 (2015). By and large, these resolutions condemn foreign funding of terrorist organizations, and seek to suppress all forms of the financing of terrorism. At the 2015 Elmau Summit, G7 leaders reaffirmed their commitment to combatting terrorist financing through “coordinated action.” In particular, G7 leaders agreed to “effectively implement the established international framework for the freezing of terrorists’ assets, and will facilitate cross-border freezing requests among G7 countries,” and to “take further actions to ensure greater transparency of all financial flows, including through an appropriate regulation of virtual currencies and other new payment methods.” Finally, G7 leaders committed to effectively implementing FATF standards, “including through a robust follow-up process.”

Commitment Features

The G7 remains committed to bilateral, regional, and global efforts to counter terrorist financing. Despite the establishment of the FATF as a functional, institutionalized actor that provides a comprehensive global
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framework for combatting CFT standards, the G7 remains concerned, “that the evolving nature of current terrorist financing threats requires us to adapt our existing measures to combat those threats.”\textsuperscript{1448}

Due to the aforementioned global security concerns, G7 leaders adopted the G7 Action Plan on Combating the Financing of Terrorism at the G7 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors’ meeting in Sendai ahead of the Ise-Shima Summit in May 2016. As stipulated in these documents, the G7 countries have agreed to: 1) “enhance G7 information exchange and cooperation”\textsuperscript{1449} regarding CFT; 2) review FATF standards in light of evolving terrorist financing threats;\textsuperscript{1450} 3) implement coordinated and targeted financial sanctions;\textsuperscript{1451} and 4) reinforce the FATF to meet “current challenges.”\textsuperscript{1452}

The first element of this commitment recognizes that information exchange and international cooperation are critical in combating terrorist financing. The G7 commits to build on the work of international organizations, such as FATF and the Egmont Group, to further address potential vulnerabilities. Specifically, each G7 member commits to conducting a “mapping exercise” of its existing domestic and international financial intelligence bodies. This includes G7 FIUs and pertinent domestic authorities. The purpose of this “mapping exercise” is to ascertain if better coordination and cooperation are possible, both within nations and between G7 members.\textsuperscript{1453} Member states also commit to exploring “new and innovative forms of information exchange and international cooperation.”\textsuperscript{1454} Finally, members agree to evaluate cooperation between G7 FIUs and relevant private sector entities, with the goal of improving “timely access to information, adequate support and feedback to financial institutions, and effective mechanisms of dialogue to share contextual information and useful guidance, in order to improve the quality of terrorist financing detection.”\textsuperscript{1455}

The second element of this commitment recognizes that the development of the FATF as a comprehensive global framework of CFT standards is vital in helping governments detect, analyze, and report terrorist financing activity. Broadly, G7 members commit to conducting a review of the FATF Standards, with the ultimate goal of adjusting each member’s national requirements. Specifically, G7 members commit to: reduce the threshold for the declaration of cross-border cash transactions (EUR/USD/CAD 15,000 and JPY 2,000,000 to EUR/USD/CAD 10,000 and JPY 1,000,000\textsuperscript{1456}); ensure that all G7 members are applying the FATF standards to new payment methods, such as virtual currency and prepaid cards; and assess other criteria used to develop preventative measures, for instance by exploring thresholds for “account, account-like products and cross-border wire transfers.”\textsuperscript{1457}

---


The third element reaffirms the G7’s commitment to implementing targeted financial sanctions, primarily, by way of terrorist asset freezing as set out in the UN Security Council Resolution 2253 (2015).1458 Specifically, G7 members commit to: strengthen the capacity of the G7 to put forward effective proposals to the UN Security Council in a timely manner; encourage individual G7 members to propose resolutions at the national level that can be supplemented by those recommended to the UN Security Council; and use national legal frameworks to fulfill the requests of other G7 members to freeze the assets of individuals who are suspected of engaging in terrorist financing activities.1459

The final element of this commitment recognizes the FATF as “the most legitimate and effective body to shape the global effort to tackle terrorist financing worldwide.”1460 The G7 is cognizant that the implementation of FATF standards is vital to address the evolving nature of terrorist financing activities. Specifically, the G7 commits to reinforcing the FATF network worldwide to promote further cooperation and enable G7 members to more adequately tackle security threats.1461

A G7 member will have fully complied with this commitment if it takes action on three or more of the proposed CFT commitments listed in the G7 Action Plan on Combating the Financing of Terrorism. If the member makes efforts on only two of these commitments, it will have partially complied. Finally, if the member fails to take action, or makes an effort in only one of these areas, it will be assigned a score of –1, or non-compliance.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>–1</td>
<td>G7 member takes action on one proposed commitment to combat the financing of terrorism (CFT) OR fails to take any action on any proposed CFT commitment listed in the G7 Action Plan on Combating the Financing of Terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>G7 member takes action on AT LEAST TWO of the proposed CFT commitments listed in the G7 Action Plan on Combating the Financing of Terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>G7 member takes action on THREE OR MORE of the proposed CFT commitments listed in the G7 Action Plan on Combating the Financing of Terrorisim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada: +1**

Canada has fully complied with its commitment to take further action on combating terrorist financing.

Canada has taken extensive steps to apply the standards set by the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) to new payment methods, such as virtual currency and prepaid cards.

On 15 September 2016, the FATF released an assessment of Canada’s anti-money laundering and combating the financing of terrorism (AML/CFT) framework.

Following the publication of a report by the International Monetary Fund, its provisions were adopted by the FATF at its plenary meeting in Busan, Korea, on 22-24 June 2016. The following statement was included in the report: “Following OSFI’s [Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions] supervisory interventions, the two institutions are now implementing prepaid access controls in reloadable card programs similar to controls over deposit accounts. Regulatory amendments to include prepaid cards in the regulations are being developed. Other new products used — albeit to a very limited extent — include virtual currencies,
which fall outside the current framework but which the government has proposed to regulate for AML/CFT purposes."\(^{1462}\)

Canada strengthened the FATF’s ability to respond to international security threats. During the 2016 North American Leaders’ Summit on 29 June 2016, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau commented on Canada’s participation in illicit financial flows by claiming that “through various forums — including the Financial Action Task Force, its global network, and the Egmont Group of Financial Intelligence Units — the countries exchange information and reinforce their shared commitment to increasing the global implementation of measures to counter illicit financial flows. Canada, the United States, and Mexico also coordinate and complement each other’s efforts to provide assistance to international partners working to increase their ability to address this issue.”\(^{1463}\)

On 20 December 2016, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 2331 (2016), condemning all forms of human trafficking in the strongest terms. The council also encouraged the FATF to include analyses of human trafficking in relation to terrorism financing. Michael Douglas, Canada’s Deputy Permanent Representative to the United, remarked that, “human trafficking also created extraordinary profits for both terrorist and criminal organizations,” and highlighted Canada’s support for the work of the Financial Action Task Force.\(^{1464}\)

Canada has taken actions to enhance information exchange and cooperation in collaboration with financial intelligence units (FIUs) and the Egmont Group.

On 22 December 2016, Canada and several G7 nations participated in a mapping exercise to examine new methods to improve information exchange capabilities and increase cooperation between FIUs and private sector entities. Specifically, this exercise reaffirmed Canada’s commitment to working alongside FINTRAC,\(^{1465}\) a partner of the Egmont Group that seeks to facilitate communication among FIUs.

Canada acknowledged the necessity of freezing the assets of individuals connected to terrorist groups. Global Affairs Canada, the country’s leading agency for foreign affairs, trade, and development, contends that the Canadian government has the right to freeze an entity’s assets and financial transactions if that entity is in violation of the Criminal Code.\(^{1466}\) Further, Global Affairs Canada is responsible for enforcing relevant UN Security Council resolutions and the Special Economic Measures Act,\(^{1467}\) in particular those articles that sanction the freezing of assets.\(^{1468}\) Canada’s Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development is in the process of reviewing the Special Economic Measures Act and the Freezing Assets of Corrupt Foreign Officials Act, which may strengthen or change the capacities of the government to freeze
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\(^{1465}\) Mr. Kevin Stephenson (Executive Secretary, Egmont Group of Financial Intelligence Units) at the Finance Committee, Finance Committee on 5 May 2015 (Ottawa) openparliament.ca. Date of Access: 10 January 2017. https://openparliament.ca/committees/finance/41-2/79/kevin-stephenson-1/only/


---
assets and respond to requests.\textsuperscript{1469} The Canadian government continues to adhere to structural frameworks put in place to facilitate the freezing of assets.

On 27 February 2017, in response to a controversy in which an unnamed Canadian bank was fined CAD1.15 million for non-compliance, the Director of FINTRAC, Gerald Cossette, explained that, "As such, we are going to look to work with Finance Canada to review the legislation in relation to our penalty program. We are also examining our administrative monetary penalty policies to ensure, among other things, that they strike an appropriate balance between the need for transparency and the requirements of the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act.\textsuperscript{1470}

On 22 March 2017, FINTRAC announced amendments to regulations under the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act (PCMLTFA).\textsuperscript{1471} Changes made include modifications to the definitions of: signature, signature card, securities dealer, casino, affiliate, client credit file, elements in risk assessment, and records that must be kept for "reasonable measures." Some of these changes came into force in June 2016, with the rest entering into force in June 2017. These reforms will strengthen information sharing as a way to enhance Canada’s Anti-money Laundering and Anti-Terrorist Financing Regime.

Canada has made effective contributions to the international framework on combating terrorist financing by enhancing its information exchange capabilities and strengthening its commitment to asset-freezing at the governmental level. Thus, Canada has been awarded a score of +1.

\textbf{Analyst: Emerson Segismundo}

\textbf{France: +1}

France has fully complied with its commitment to continue implementing relevant measures to combat terrorist finance during the compliance period, although it has made significant efforts in the past.

France has taken action to increase the European Union’s ability to implement targeted financial sanctions. On 3 August 2016, an initiative to “introduce an autonomous EU sanctions regime with respect to groups and individuals supporting groups affiliated with or linked to ISIL or AlQaeda” was accepted.\textsuperscript{1472} This decision was proposed jointly by France and the United Kingdom for the purpose of allowing the EU to move forward on combating terrorist financing in this area without a directive from the United Nations.\textsuperscript{1473}

France has also adopted measures to strengthen its asset freezing regulations. On 24 November 2016, France published “an order bolstering measures for freezing assets.”\textsuperscript{1474}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}[\textsuperscript{1469}]
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
France has also undertaken other initiatives to combat terrorist financing that do not fall within the purview of the G7’s commitment, and therefore do not count toward compliance.

For example, France has established TRACFIN, a branch within the Ministry of Finance and Public Accounts, whose purpose is to combat money laundering as well as the financing of terrorism. In 2015, TRACFIN published a report stating that illicit financing could be found in four professions: banks and credit institutions, the insurance industry, payment institutions, and manual changers. According to new data acquired in 2016, the number of reported cases of illicit financing rose by 49 per cent from January to September. In December 2016, TRACFIN published a report that outlined the phenomenon of crowd funding — online donation platforms — as a popular means through which people are financing terrorism. According to the report, EUR50 million was made through crowd funding, a figure that has doubled since 2014. TRACFIN has implemented new legislation within France that is expected to take effect on 1 January 2017, stipulating that those attempting to organize a crowd funding campaign must register with financial control organizations and provide identification of both the person running the project as well as the person hoping to benefit from the funds obtained. French customs offices play a key role in combating terrorist financing, as customs seized over EUR150 million in criminal assets and 9 million counterfeit items, as published in a report by French customs agencies on 16 March 2017. President François Hollande has stated that the French government will hire 1000 new customs agents in 2016-2017, with most assuming the post in the latter half of 2017. France has also allocated EUR45 million as a supplementary budget to provide customs officers with necessary equipment, such as weapons, bulletproof protections, and means of detection.

On 24 February 2017, Michel Sapin, Minister of the Economy and Finance of France, addressed the FATF Plenary meeting. During his speech, Sapin suggested that “the FATF be granted legal status by France, its host country.” Sapin asserted that “This option would make the FATF a stable legal entity that reflects the importance of its current role on the international stage.”

---

On 24 March 2017, the United Nations Security Council passed United Nations Security Council Resolution 2347, which condemned the destruction and illicit trade of cultural heritage, a source of funding for many terrorist organizations. For instance, ISIL earned approximately USD1.5 million in 2015 by selling many items on the black market. France and Italy sponsored the resolution and France, along with five other countries, has pledged USD75 million to a new UNESCO-backed alliance to protect cultural heritage sites that are threatened by conflict.

France has implemented new measures that comply with its commitment to combat the financing of terrorism during the compliance period and has taken concerted efforts to facilitate coordinated action through the FATF. Thus, France has been awarded a score of +1.

Analyst: Sarah Bear

Germany: 0

Germany has partially complied with its commitment to take further action on combating terrorist financing, although it has taken extensive steps to enhance information exchange between domestic partners and G7 members.

In the wake of the terrorist attacks in Paris on 13 November 2015 and in Brussels on 22 March 2016, Germany passed the Act to Improve Information Exchange in the Fight Against International Terrorism, an amendment signed into law on 30 July 2016 that enhances information-sharing capabilities between the Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution (BfV), Germany’s domestic security bureau, and other German domestic intelligence agencies. For instance, the act enables the BfV to “create or participate in common databases with foreign intelligence services for the investigation of attempts or completed actions directed at events or groups of people.”

Moreover, the act called for increased cooperation among the members of the Club de Berne, a European intelligence-sharing forum that incorporates 28 neighbouring European Union governments and member states of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. In 2016, a derivative of the Club de Berne, the Counter Terrorist Group (CTG), established a new information-sharing platform in The Hague, Netherlands. The new legislation will allow the BfV to fully participate in the CTG’s operations.

Germany has also emphasized the importance of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) in the fight against terrorist financing. As host of the G20 this year, Germany has set out a number of priorities for the organization which include an “aim to ensure global and comprehensive implementation of the recommendations of the Financial Action Task Force.”

Cognizant that the trading of artwork can engender the financing of terrorist activities, Germany adopted a revised version of the Act on the Protection of Cultural Property on 23 July 2016. The new legislation included new provisions to prevent the destruction of cultural sites, an activity employed by terrorists as an important source of funding, in particular in zones of conflict. The adoption of the Act reaffirmed Germany’s

---

commitment to UN Security Council Resolution 2199, a resolution unanimously adopted by member states in 2015 that condemned the destruction of world cultural heritage sites in Syria and Iraq, as well as the illicit trafficking of cultural property to fund terrorism activities. Germany reaffirmed its commitment to the Act on the Return of Cultural Property of 2007, a revision of the UNESCO 1970 Convention\(^{1492}\) that sought to outline Germany’s regulations for importing and exporting cultural property. Specifically, the new agreement mandated compulsory licensing procedures to export cultural property from Germany and provided a rigid sanctions framework to prevent the illegal trade of imported cultural property within Germany.\(^{1493}\)

Germany has made effective contributions to the international framework on combating terrorist financing by enhancing its information exchange capabilities and reinforcing UN commitments to sanction the violation of cultural property, a considerable financial source for terrorism activities. It has acted on two of the proposed CFT commitments and thus has been awarded a score of 0.

**Analyst: Jude Haj Ali**

**Italy: +1**

Italy has fully complied with its commitment to combat terrorist financing.

Italy has taken actions to enhance information exchange and cooperation between the Bank of Italy and the Vatican’s Financial Information Authority (AIF).

On 26 July 2016, the Bank of Italy and the AIF signed a cooperation agreement aimed at enhancing the exchange of information in the field of financial supervision on the basis of reciprocity.\(^{1494}\) This declaration builds on a similar agreement concluded in 2013 between the AIF and the Italian financial intelligence unit (FIU) that sought to disrupt money laundering and terrorist financing activities.\(^{1495}\) As AIF President René Brühlhart explains, the new agreement seeks to broaden channels geared at monitoring the relationship between Italian financial intermediaries and entities carrying out financial activities in order to “strengthen the bilateral cooperation between the Holy See and Italy in the common fight against illicit financial activities.”\(^{1496}\)

In October 2016, Italy took on a more prominent role in the Counter-ISIL Finance Group (CIFG), an organization that Italy co-established in January 2015\(^{1497}\) to enhance coordination among international partners to arrest the financing of Da’esh operations. On 26 October 2016, CIFG hosted its sixth meeting with delegations from over 35 countries.\(^{1498}\) The meeting provided an opportunity for Coalition members to
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\(^{1498}\) The Sixth Counter ISIL Finance Meeting Convenes in Kuwait (Kuwait) 26 October 2016. Date of access: 11 January 2017. https://www.treasury.gov/connect/blog/Pages/The-Sixth-Counter-ISIL-Finance-Meeting-Convenes-in-Kuwait.aspx.
sharpen their understanding of ISIL’s financial infrastructure\textsuperscript{1499} as a way to propose viable strategies to disrupt ISIL’s sources of revenues and its access to the international financial system.

On 13 December 2016, Giuseppina Pellicano, Head of Countering the Financing of Terrorism and International Financial Sanctions, emphasized the need for collaboration among Italy’s authorities at the United Nations’ joint special meeting on “Depriving Terrorist Groups from Accessing, Raising, and Moving Funds: Practices and Lessons Learned.” Italian customs is closely cooperating with several FIUs to implement and enforce a viable system to prevent cross-border cash transactions and exchange and update information in the customs database to detect terrorist financing and money-laundering activities.\textsuperscript{1500}

Pellicano also discussed Italy’s efforts to implement Targeted Financial Sanctions, a series of economic sanctions that are under the purview of the Financial Security Committee (FSC), an independent body in the Ministry of Economics and Finance. The FSC receives and designates evidence for identifying terrorism concerns and entities. As Pellicano explained, “the FSC has the power to ask of sharing information even in case covers by secrecy laws.”\textsuperscript{1501} Within this national framework, Italian FIUs can issue a five-working-day freezing order in case of suspected transactions of terrorist financing.\textsuperscript{1502}

In addition, Pellicano spoke about Italy’s cross-border cash transaction system. In her remarks, she explained that, “all cash and bearer negotiable instruments must be declared where equal or above the fixed threshold of EUR10,000,” and the exceeding part that was not correctly declared is ceased.\textsuperscript{1503} Moreover, she reminded the body that in the case of incomplete or false declarations, Italy would act resolute in applying severe administrative sanctions.\textsuperscript{1504}

On 14 December 2016, the National Institution of Statistics published Italy’s Sustainable Development Goals of the 2030 Agenda for 2016. As part of its 16th goal, Italy anticipates strengthening its relevant national institutions, increasing capacity-building at all levels, and concentrating its efforts on putting an end to violence, terrorist financing activities and crime in developing countries by way of enhanced international cooperation.\textsuperscript{1505}

On 24 March 2017, the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 2347, which condemned the destruction and illicit trade of cultural heritage, a source of funding for many terrorist organizations.

\textsuperscript{1499} The Sixth Counter ISIL Finance Meeting Convenes in Kuwait (Kuwait) 26 October 2016. Date of access: 11 January 2017. https://www.treasury.gov/connect/blog/Pages/The-Sixth-Counter-ISIL-Finance-Meeting-Convenes-in-Kuwait.aspx.


Alongside France, Italy sponsored the resolution and reaffirmed its commitment to put an end to this reprehensible crime. Addressing the Security Council, Fabrizio Parrulli, Head of Italy’s Carabinieri Command for the Protection of Cultural Heritage explained it was currently investigating the trafficking of 800,000 art collections and 35,000 individuals, “detaining more than 1,000 people in the defence of cultural heritage.”

He further explained that the Carabinieri had managed to recover thousands of pieces of stolen cultural property and build high-profile legal cases to condemn the culprits. The Command has also facilitated training sessions with other countries to teach them about proper procedure in protecting cultural heritage.

In addition, Italy, alongside five other countries, has pledged USD75 million to a new UNESCO-backed alliance to protect cultural heritage sites that are threatened by conflict.

Italy has made effective contributions to the international framework on combating terrorist financing by enhancing its information exchange capabilities between FIUs and the Bank of Italy, engaging in a robust system that prevents cross-border cash transactions, and reaffirming its commitment to enforcing sanctions against those who perpetrate terrorist financing and money laundering activities. Thus, Italy has been awarded a score of +1.

Analyst: Zishu Gao

Japan: 0

Japan has partially complied with its commitment to take further action on combating terrorist financing, including assessing and implementing relevant measures. Japan has taken steps to reinforce standards set by the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) to inhibit the financing of terrorist activities.

On 11 October 2016, Japan’s Ministry of Finance released the Outcome of the G7 Assessment of Potential Standards Enhancements. In this document, the Japanese government released a review of the G7’s progress in meeting its obligations under its commitment to “assessing potential standards enhancements of the preventive measures.”

It found that all G7 members will soon have adopted legislation to include new payment methods such as virtual currency and prepaid cards. Finally, it noted that the G7 is carrying out an investigation into the costs and benefits of additional threshold changes to strike a balance between the necessity of stronger regulations and regulatory costs.

On 22 December 2016, the MoF conducted a mapping exercise of financial intelligence units (FIUs) and outlined several measures to improve cooperation in a published document titled Enhancing G7 Information Exchange and Cooperation for Countering the Financing of Terrorism. These proposals included new methods for cooperation between FIUs and law enforcement agencies, as well as coordination among private sector agencies.

---


On 22 December 2016, the Ministry of Finance also took steps to implement coordinated and targeted financial sanctions through proposals outlined in the G7 Collaboration in the Implementation of Targeted Financial Sanctions report. These proposals suggested ways for the G7 to collaborate and strengthen sanctions through the United Nations, as well as supplementing these measures through individual action and coordinating national legal frameworks to freeze assets.1512

Since the Ise-Shima Summit, the Japanese FIU and the Japan Financial Intelligence Centre have reinforced the international FATF network by signing Statements of Cooperation with the FIUs of Cuba, Laos and Ghana during the compliance period.1513

Japan has made contributions to the international framework on combating terrorist financing by reaffirming its commitment to FATF standards and by supporting increased cooperation with other countries. Thus, Japan has been awarded a score of 0.

*Analyst: Jeffrey Li*

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to take further action on combating terrorist financing. The UK has taken extensive steps to implement targeted financial sanctions, primarily by way of freezing terrorist assets.

On 13 October 2016, the House of Commons passed the Criminal Finances Bill1514 to improve the government’s ability to, among other things, combat terrorist financing. The following month, the House introduced an asset-freezing bill that outlined provisions to “impose restrictions on assets owned by persons involved in supplying terrorist organizations in the UK with arms, for the purpose of securing compensation for citizens of the United Kingdom affected by the supply of such arms.”1515 The UK reaffirmed its commitment to supporting national charities operating in difficult environments overseas to mitigate the risk of funds being abused for terrorist purposes.1516 In August 2016, the UK, along with over 20 other countries, met in Bali at the Counter-Terrorism Financing Summit, where it reinforced its commitment to strengthen, collaborate, and share financial intelligence between partner nations to track terrorist activities.1517

The UK has taken steps to improve its information-exchange capabilities and increase its international cooperation. The Home Office proposed to create new legislation by October 20171518 to achieve better information sharing between law enforcement agencies and private sector entities. In an effort to strengthen the UK’s national security, the government passed the Investigatory Powers Bill that received royal assent on
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29 November 2016. This act is intended to strengthen the UK’s ability to intercept communications and retrieve intelligence that may pose a terrorist threat to the country’s national security. This bill coincides with the Home Office’s October 2017 commitment to gain stronger intelligence to reduce vulnerabilities and close loopholes that can be exploited by terrorists. Furthermore, the Home Office committed to deliver “prevent campaigns” to raise awareness among professionals in the regulated sector regarding actions needed to mitigate money laundering and terrorist financing risks.

The UK reaffirmed its commitment to abide by the FATF standards that were revised in 2012. These amendments recommended a greater emphasis on a risk-based approach to facilitate anti-money laundering and combat the financing of terrorism. The UK is tentatively scheduled to undergo an assessment against the prevailing standards in March or April 2018. The Financial Action Task Force agreed to suspend financial crime and counter-measures against Iran for 12 months. The UK agreed to amend the Fourth European Union Anti-Money Laundering Directive (4AMLD) by June 2017. The 4AMLD adopted in May 2015 sought to bring European Union legal frameworks in line with the revised FATF standards, while taking into account the European Commission’s review of the implementation of the third directive. The changes introduced in the 4AMLD will increase the transparency of legal persons and arrangements and strengthen the enhanced checks (“due diligence measures/counter measures”) for high-risk countries.

On 24 March 2017, the UK helped adopt United Nations Security Council Resolution 2347, which aims to “end the use of cultural destruction as a terrorist financing tool and weapon of war.” Terrorist groups such as ISIL and al-Qaeda have generated large sums of money through the looting and smuggling of cultural property from archaeological sites and other places of social values. The passage of UNSC2347 affirms the United Kingdom’s commitment to strengthen its goal of combating terrorist financing as, a commitment it had previously made in 2001 with the adoption of UNSC1373. This resolution called on all states to “prevent and suppress the financing of terrorist acts”

The UK has made effective contributions to the international framework on combating terrorist financing by introducing asset-freezing legislation, increasing its information-exchange capabilities, and reaffirming its commitment to FATF standards. Thus, the United Kingdom has been awarded a score of +1.
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United States: +1

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to take further action on combating terrorist financing. The US has taken extensive steps to promote counter-terrorism cooperation with other countries and implement sanctions in order to undermine terrorists and their sources of funding.

On 27 May 2016, the Office of the Press Secretary at the White House released the G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration. The statement reaffirmed the US’s commitment to improving the transparency of individuals’ properties that are vital to preventing the financing of terrorism activities. Moreover, the report indicated a responsibility to reduce terrorist groups’ access to sources of funding and adhere to the provisions declared in the G7 Action Plan on Combating the Financing of Terrorism.

On 29 June 2016, Senators Bob Casey and Johnny Isakson introduced the Stop Terrorist Operational Resources and Money bill, which allowed the United States to penalize countries that fund terrorists or terrorist groups. Under this bill, the president is “empowered to limit credit, levy economic sanctions, and reduce development assistance and military sales in an effort to penalize countries tolerating terrorism financiers.”

The United States contributed to implantation and enforcement mechanisms of financial sanctions that seek to discourage terrorist financing activities. On 1 July 2016, the Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) issued regulations to execute the Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act of 1990. The regulations increased the maximum amount of civil monetary penalties under OFAC regulations and include global terrorism sanctions regulations, terrorism sanctions regulations, and foreign terrorist organizations sanctions regulations. According to current legislation that was formalized on 1 August 2016, the applicable maximum civil penalty for the violation of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act is $284,582 or an amount that is twice the amount of the transaction that violates the Act, whichever is greater. For the foreign terrorist organizations sanctions regulations, the applicable maximum civil penalty is $75,122 or twice the amount of which a financial institution was required to retain possession.

Following the Ise-Shima Summit, the US stressed the importance of promoting cooperation among countries in the international system to tackle terrorist security and issues pertaining to terrorist financing. On 27 July 2016, US officials met India’s officials in Washington DC for the 14th US-India Counterterrorism Joint Working Group collaboration. The meeting enhanced the partnership between the two countries and solidified their mutual commitment to combat terrorist financing.

From 19 to 21 October 2016, the plenary meeting of Financial Action Task Force (FATF) was held in Paris under the Spanish presidency of Juan Manuel Vega-Serrano. The meeting discussed the US’s 2016 FATF
mutual evaluation reports, which indicated that the US was highly effective in countering terrorism and terrorism financing by prosecuting individuals for terrorist financing and executing financial sanctions.\textsuperscript{1537}

On 22 November 2016, Daniel Glaser, the United States Treasury Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, and Luis Caputo, Secretary of Finance of the Republic of Argentina discussed a partnership agreement to combat the financing of international terrorism.\textsuperscript{1538} This cooperation has helped both countries to conduct research on illicit finance threats of mutual concern that can be used for designing strategies to counter terrorist financing.

On 20 December 2016, the supervisors of the Anti-Money Laundering and Countering Financing of Terrorism Act met at the International Supervisors Forum in Washington DC.\textsuperscript{1539} Established in 2013, this platform serves to enhance collaborative efforts made by governmental regulatory agencies in the United States, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Australia and Canada to combat terrorist financing, money laundering, and other financial crimes.\textsuperscript{1540} In December 2016, participants discussed the challenges and successes of supervision and identified reporting methods to recognize terrorist financing activities. The discussion acted as a critical step in enhancing transnational cooperation, essential for regulating the financing of terrorism activities in a volatile world of rapidly changing technology and global financial provisions.

As well, in December 2016, the US reported that it had cut the Islamic State’s financing and trade in looted antiquities.\textsuperscript{1541} The US Department of Justice filed a lawsuit in Washington DC to seize cultural artifacts held by ISIS. The Department claimed that ISIS not only massively destroyed these rare antiques, but also acquired a significant portion of its funding from illegally trading these ancient relics. In line with US law, these artifacts were deemed to represent assets of a designated terrorist organization and were subsequently seized by the US government.

On 3 February 2017, the United States Department of the Treasury’s Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) levied sanctions on American individuals who supported Iran’s ballistic missile program and Iran’s Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps-Qods Force.\textsuperscript{1542} In its rationale for sanctioning these individuals, the US government claimed that “the support of terrorism and the development of Iran’s ballistic missile program pose a threat to the region, to our partners worldwide, and to the United States.”\textsuperscript{1543} As a result, the government seized the assets and properties of the culprits and American citizens were prohibited from engaging in transactions with these individuals.

\textsuperscript{1540} International Anti-Money Laundering Supervisors meet in Washington, Department of Internal Affairs of New Zealand, 20 December 2016. Date of Access: 6 January 2017. https://www.dia.govt.nz/press.nsf/d77da9b523f12931cc256ac5000d19b6/2e29337822a0f7c7cc25808e007b58c3!OpenDocument
On 14 March 2017, the OFAC levied sanctions on Muhammad Hadi al-‘Anizi, the leader of al-Nusra Front and al Qaeda, because he supported several acts of terrorism and provided financial and material support to various terrorist groups.\(^{1544}\) Both groups are Islamist terrorist organizations based in Syria that have provided funding in the past to al-Nusra Front and other extremist regimes in the region as a way to solidify their goal of establishing an independent caliphate in Syria.

The US has made effective contributions to the international framework on combating terrorist financing by enforcing sanctions against individuals who engage in terrorist financing activities, increasing information exchange and cooperation with other countries, and identifying a reporting mechanism to better track terrorist financing activities. Thus, the United States has been awarded a score of +1.

_Jiayue (Joy) Li_

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to combating the financing of terrorism.

Since the 2016 Ise-Shima Summit, the European Union has continued to reiterate support for the swift implementation of the Financial Action Task Force’s (FATF) standards, as well as for the United Nations Security Council Resolution 2253.\(^{1545}\)

On 5 July 2016, the European Commission, under Jean-Claude Juncker, adopted a proposal to both strengthen EU rules on anti-money laundering to terrorist organizations and increase transparency rules on ownership of companies and trusts.\(^{1546}\) This proposal updated the May 2015 Fourth Anti-Money Laundering Package, which required all member states to nationally register the beneficiaries of companies and trusts by the end of 2016. Enhanced cooperation among EU financial intelligence units (FIUs) increased their access to information in centralized banks, payment account registers, and central data retrieval systems. To ensure transparency, all member states were urged to establish holders of bank and payment accounts.\(^{1547}\)

The proposal adopted by the European Commission on 5 July 2016 also explicitly tackled terrorist financing risks linked to virtual currencies and anonymous pre-paid cards.\(^{1548}\) In working to prevent misuse of virtual currencies being used for the financing of terrorist purposes, the European Commission recognized that “customer-due diligence controls” would be necessary in exchanging virtual for real currencies to end anonymity in virtual exchanges. Furthermore, the European Commission proposed to minimize usage of anonymity in pre-paid instruments by lowering the need for identification from EUR250 to EUR150 and widening verification requirements.\(^{1549}\)

On 14 July 2016, the European Commission also formally adopted a list of developing countries with strategic deficiencies in their regimes on the countering of terrorist financing. Banks were mandated to enhance diligence measures on financial flows from 11 countries, which mirror the list published by the

---


FATF. The EU authorized targeted technical assistance to these 11 countries to enhance capacity in countering the financing of terrorism and improving anti-money laundering measures.\textsuperscript{1550}

On 2 June 2016, the Netherlands Presidency of the Council of the EU hosted Dimitris Avramopoulos, the Commissioner for Migration, Home Affairs, and Citizenship, and Věra Jourová, the European Union Commissioner for Justice, Consumers, and Gender Equality, as well as Loretta E. Lynch, the United States Attorney General, and Alejandro Mayorkas, the Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security, to discuss trans-Atlantic cooperation in freedom, security, and justice.\textsuperscript{1551} This meeting yielded a reaffirmed commitment to the maintenance of high standards for protection of personal data transferred by law enforcement authorities and strengthened the rights of citizens to facilitate cooperation. The agreement called on both the EU and the United States to improve border security, cooperate in identifying terrorists and legislate initiatives to improve information sharing between the two G7 groups.\textsuperscript{1552}

In his address delivered on 14 September 2016, President Juncker explained that the European Commission needed to mutually recognize criminal asset freezing and confiscation orders, recommending an additional proposal to combat fraud and non-cash payment counterfeiting. By early 2017, the European Commission anticipates that the powers of customs authorities will be widened to address terrorism financing through the illicit trading of general and cultural goods.\textsuperscript{1553}

In his same speech, President Juncker also announced the intention of the European Commission to legislate the harmonization of money laundering offences, as proposed in the Fourth Anti-Money Laundering Directive that was previously adopted in 2015. The European Commission presented updated reports on an EU terrorist financing tracking system as well as an EU asset freezing regime that would complement existing regimes currently held under the Common Foreign and Security Policy.\textsuperscript{1554}

The State of the Union address also reaffirmed the European Commission’s commitment to a platform that to connect FIUs from EU members, a plan that was established in early 2016. With the help of Commission services, this initiative serves to further enhance cooperation, develop tools, and better identify suspicious financial transactions. These FIUs developed information technology tools for direct information exchange (at FIU.NET) that have been utilized by the European Counter-Terrorism Centre since 1 January 2016.\textsuperscript{1555}

On 16 November 2016, the European Commission released its Second Report on Progress Towards an Effective and Sustainable Security Union, outlining several necessary provisions for EU autonomous listings against terrorist groups such as al Qaeda and the so-called Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL,) also referred to as Da’esh.


On 16 February 2017, Commissioners Dimitris Avramopoulos and Julian King made a joint statement to introduce the adoption by the European Parliament of the directive on combatting terrorism by reinforcing checks at Schengen external borders. This legal framework will be enforced by police and prosecutors across the European Union to criminalize terrorism-related offences, including the financing of terrorism. The initial proposals for this framework were tabled by the Commission in December 2015, and the Parliament and Council have moved swiftly in the adoption and implementation of its directives.\footnote{Joint Statement by Commissioners Avramopoulos and King on the Adoption by the European Parliament of the Commission’s Proposals for a Directive on Combatting Terrorism and for Reinforcing Checks at the Schengen External Borders (Strasbourg) 16 February 2017. Date of Access: 4 April 2017. http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_STATEMENT-17-290_en.htm}


The European Union has made effective contributions to the international framework on combating terrorist financing by reinforcing its FATF standards, increasing cooperation among FIUs, and calling on the European Commission to recognize criminal asset-freezing. Thus, the European Union has been awarded a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Courtney Amanda Wong}
14. Terrorism: International Cooperation to Counter Terrorism

“We commit to work to support the implementation of relevant UN Security Council resolutions, to bolster information sharing, to strengthen border security, to improve aviation security, to counter terrorist financing, to fight against trafficking of cultural properties, to prevent and counter violent extremism, to step up our engagement with the private sector and to further coordinate our capacity building assistance.”

_G7 Ise-Shima 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></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>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></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Background

Counterterrorism has been a reoccurring issue on the G7 agenda since the 1980s. However, a greater emphasis has been placed on coordinated action since 2001. At the 2002 Kananaskis Summit in Canada, G8 members unveiled the G8 Global Partnership against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction with the aim of supporting coordinated action against nuclear and arms proliferation and terrorism.1559

At the 2003 Evian Summit in France, the G8 recognized three key areas of action in order to facilitate counter-terrorism, “first, to deny terrorists the means to commit terrorist acts (for example, to prevent the financing of terrorism, and denial of false documents and weapons); second, to deny terrorists a safe haven and ensure that terrorists are prosecuted and/or extradited (for example to accelerate the conclusion of counter-terrorism conventions and protocols, to deny terrorists entry into a country and to reinforce law-enforcement agencies); and third, to overcome vulnerability to terrorism (for example to enhance domestic security measures and capability for crisis management and consequence management).”1560 This trilateral model has effectively served as the basis for all subsequent actions taken by the G8/G7 in this area.

Specific counter-terrorism initiatives appeared on the agenda again in 2004 (Sea Island Summit),1561 2006 (St. Petersburg Summit),1562 2007 (Heiligendamm Summit),1563 2008 (Hokkaido Toyako Summit),1564 2010

---


These commitments covered counter-terrorism issues ranging from aviation security, stemming financing to terrorist groups, condemning specific terrorist acts, maritime safety, non-proliferation, kidnapping, and border security.

More specifically, at the 2007 Heiligendamm Summit in Germany, members released the “G8 Summit Statement on Counter Terrorism,” which emphasized the importance of the United Nations in combatting terrorism and recognized that, “the UN is the sole organization with the stature and reach to achieve universal agreement on the condemnation of terrorism and to effectively address key aspects of the terrorist threat in a comprehensive manner.” Moreover, at the 2010 Muskoka Summit, G8 members reaffirmed their commitment to concerted counterterrorism measures and emphasized, “the need to improve the coordination of the growing bilateral and multilateral counter-terrorism capacity-building initiatives, and to make these efforts more innovative, far-reaching and sustained … We will seek to build closer cooperation among relevant G8 partner programs to make our effort to address terrorism and related security threats more coherent and effective.” As such, collective and institutional action has been, and continues to be, an important facet of the G7/G8’s approach to counterterrorism.

At the 2016 Ise-Shima Summit, member states announced the development of a counter-terrorism action plan with concrete measures to enhance G7 and international counter-terrorism efforts. This plan was developed during a meeting of Foreign Ministers in Hiroshima, which proceeded Ise-Shima. The plan was officially adopted at the summit in Ise-Shima as the “G7 Action Plan on Countering Terrorism and Violent Extremism.”

The plan was developed to increase the occurrence and efficacy of international cooperation to counter terrorism. More particularly, the initiative seeks to facilitate a better collective response through focusing “on specific critical gaps.” The commitment, as articulated in the leaders’ declaration and action plan, emphasizes universality. It presents terrorism as a global threat, which incurs a shared loss to humanity; a collective outcome that requires a collective response. For instance, global aviation and internet security require cooperation by countries willing to implement appropriate domestic security measures, to ensure global success.

Human rights also feature prominently in the G7 Action Plan. First, the Action Plan emphasizes the importance of upholding human rights whilst implementing various counterterrorism measures, such as

---

1566 Camp David Declaration, G7 Information Centre (Toronto) 19 May 2012. Date of Access: 10 February 2017. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2012campdavid/g8-declaration.html.
border security and immigration. Secondly, the initiative urges further progress on certain human rights principles, such as through empowering alternative voices, tolerance, and capacity building.\textsuperscript{1574}

**Commitment Features**

As outlined above, G7 members agreed at Ise-Shima to bolster their collective counterterrorism measures. The 2016 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration gives a broad overview of areas of action. However, a member’s compliance with this commitment is more clearly outlined in the three actions points of the G7 Action Plan on Countering Terrorism and Violent Extremism. The three points are 1) counter terrorism measures; 2) empowering alternative voices and tolerance in society; and 3) capacity building.\textsuperscript{1575}

1) **Counter Terrorism Measures**

First, counterterrorism includes a broad range of state action. One important avenue of action is the implementation of relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions, which include resolutions 1373(2001), 1540(2004), 2170(2014), 2178(2014), 2199(2015) and 2253(2015).\textsuperscript{1576} This also involves helping to facilitate other UN Member States’ implementation of their commitments to these resolutions.\textsuperscript{1577}

Information sharing and cooperation amongst G7 states is another important area of counterterrorism action. Member states have committed to “bolster information sharing among relevant authorities in G7 countries both domestically and internationally through existing mechanisms” (such as INTERPOL) and to strengthen international legal cooperation.\textsuperscript{1578}

Members have also committed to bolstering border security and aviation security.\textsuperscript{1579}

Another imperative commitment is countering terrorist financing, through strengthening communication links between G7 members and assessing “current reporting and customer identification and verification thresholds,” along with “asset freezing tools.”\textsuperscript{1580}

The prevention of the trafficking of cultural antiquities is becoming an increasingly pertinent issue. Member states have committed to “call on all states to enhance efforts to hinder looting and trafficking of cultural property originating from regions under the control of terrorist groups” (through the aid of UNESCO and INTERPOL).\textsuperscript{1581}

Finally, members should seek to engage with private sector stakeholders, specifically internet companies, to counter “the threat posed by terrorist groups exploiting the Internet and social media for terrorist purposes.”\textsuperscript{1582}

2) **Empowering Alternative Voices and Tolerance**
The second broad area of action related to this commitment is “empowering alternative voices and tolerance.” This action point focuses on the creation of national and domestic strategies that support the UN Secretary General’s Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism (PVE) and call for their rapid implementation.\(^\text{1583}\) To be compliant with this point a member state would need to promote pluralism, tolerance, and gender equality through cross-cultural and interfaith dialogues, and provide active support to relevant organizations (e.g. the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund). This action point underlines the importance of strategic communication as a tool in fighting terrorism and countering ISIL (Da’esh) propaganda.

(3) Capacity Building

The third action point focuses on improving coordination and calls upon relevant international, regional, and sub-regional organizations to enhance collaboration. These measures aim to more efficiently and effectively provide counter-terrorism-related capacity building and technical assistance programs. Increasing G7 donor coordination for improved counterterrorism financing is a crucial part of this point.\(^\text{1584}\)

Given the multifaceted nature of this commitment, compliance can be assessed and achieved through a variety of means. As outlined above, there are many potential avenues of action related to each of the three points delineated in the G7 Action Plan on Countering Terrorism and Violent Extremism. As such, each member state may take a different combination of actions when working towards compliance. It is important to note, however, that Ise-Shima emphasizes the creation of a more comprehensive counter-terrorism strategy. The plan encourages member states to be inclusive in countering terrorism by connecting with civil society, supporting existing programs while creating networks for increased cooperation, paying attention to terrorism prevention, and complying with human rights obligations.

Thus, to achieve full compliance, a member state would need to take substantive actions in each of the three action points outlined in the G7 Action Plan on Countering Terrorism and Violent Extremism. If a member state takes substantive action related to two of the action points outlined in the G7 Action Plan on Countering Terrorism and Violent Extremism they will be awarded partial compliance. Finally, if a member state takes substantive action related to only one of the action points outlined in the G7 Action Plan on Countering Terrorism and Violent Extremism, or no action at all, they will be penalized for a lack of compliance.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score (S)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member state does not take any substantive action towards the three action points outlined in the G7 Action Plan on Countering Terrorism and Violent Extremism OR member state takes action related to only ONE action point outlined in the G7 Action Plan on Countering Terrorism and Violent Extremism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member state takes substantive action regarding TWO of the three action points outlined in the G7 Action Plan on Countering Terrorism and Violent Extremism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member state takes substantive action relating to ALL three action points outlined in the G7 Action Plan on Countering Terrorism and Violent Extremism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada: +1**

Canada has fully complied with its G7 commitment of international cooperation to counter-terrorism. In addition to productive engagement multi-laterally through information sharing and capacity building, Canada has continued to uphold its domestic priorities as outlined in the 2011 counter-terrorism strategy, Building Resilience Against Terrorism.\(^\text{1585}\) Canada has taken action on counterterrorism while paying close

---
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attention to pluralism and the building of trust with diverse communities for the purpose of prevention and de-radicalization. Most notable in this regard, is the creation of the Office of the Community Outreach and Counter-Radicalization Coordinator under the Ministry of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness.\textsuperscript{1586}

Since Ise-Shima, Canada has focused on bolstering existing counter-terrorism programs with new accountability measures. In August 2016, Canada established the National Parliamentary Security and Intelligence Committee (NSICOP). The Committee is meant to provide non-partisan oversight on national security policy, granting access to Parliamentarians to scrutinize security and intelligence operations. The Committee aligns Canada’s national security accountability regime with those of its Five Eyes allies (the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand) by creating “an all-party committee to monitor and oversee the operations of every government department and agency with national security responsibilities.”\textsuperscript{1587} Though the Committee incorporates many features of its model, the United Kingdom’s Intelligence and Security Committee (ISC), it also deviates from the UK’s Committee, more closely resembling the ISC, not as this committee is currently constituted, but rather as it existed prior to reforms made under the United Kingdom’s Justice and Security Act in 2013.\textsuperscript{1588} Canadian policy-makers were involved in numerous learning opportunities with other countries in the process of the Committee’s creation. Ralph Goodale, and the presumed Chair of NSICOP, David McGuinty, held discussions in France, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States to examine these countries’ respective legislative oversight committee.\textsuperscript{1589}

Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Ralph Goodale paired his announcement regarding the creation of the Committee with an affirmation of Canadian measures to respond to the threat posed to 151 Canadians listed on the ISIS “kill list.”\textsuperscript{1590}

The June 2016 establishment of the Passenger Protect Inquiries Office, new legislation regarding aviation security, similarly provides accountability measures to existing regulations on aviation, offering tribunals for redress for wrongly targeted air passengers, and safeguarding rights more broadly.\textsuperscript{1591}

Canada considers terrorist financing a “global problem,” which requires a well-coordinated, multilateral response.\textsuperscript{1592} The Financial Action Task Force (FATF), of which Canada is an active members sets standards for combating money laundering and terrorist financing and monitors the implementation of these standards among its members states and more than 190 other countries in the global network of FATF-Style Regional Bodies through peer reviews and public reporting. The FATF’s 2016 evaluation of Canada’s measures to combat money laundering and terrorism financing found that The Canadian authorities have a good understanding of most of Canada’s money laundering and terrorist financing risks. Some further risks were


identified by FTAF including: assessment of law firms and legal counsels, the ability of financial intelligence to request addition information, and terrorism financing related sanctions inadequately implemented by non-business organizations, such as non-governmental organizations. Furthermore, Canada is a member of the international Counter-Isil Finance Group and supports high risk nations with terrorist financing through technical assistance on counter-terrorist financing through capacity-building.

Canada continues to contribute to INTERPOL monetarily. It also provides leadership through INTERPOL programming. For instance, a cooperative exercise funded by Global Affairs Canada and attended by Canada’s Ambassador to Jordan, Peter MacDougall in October 2016, lead national Jordanian law enforcement agents, armed forces, and health workers in strengthening the coordination of multi-agency responses to bioterrorism incidents under the framework of INTERPOL’s Operational Response Project.

The Canadian government’s focus in terms of the promotion of tolerance, pluralism, and alternative voices has been sharply focused on responding to popular concern over the 2015 Anti-Terrorism Act, Bill C-51 which broadened the authority of Canadian government agencies to share information about individuals suspected of engaging in terrorist activities. The election-period promise of the to repeal Bill C-51, has been followed up with Our Security, Our Rights, a national security green paper, and an online consultation process open to the public. This is the first time open public debate on national security has been facilitated by the government in Canada. With celebration of this open approach, there is also some criticism over the failure to unilaterally repeal Bill C-51 as promised.

The green note clarifies rights of individuals, the powers of government agencies, and provides a section regarding “what do other countries do?” pushing Canadians to look to the international arena to suggest potential amendments and alternatives. The paper, and the consultation process, emphasize a responsible inter-agency information sharing, a commitment to full statutory review of the Act every three years, as well as a focus on the areas of intersection between rights outlined in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms with security.

Canada has been a vocal advocate of the United Nations Countering Violent Extremism/Preventing Violent Extremism (CVE/PVE) strategy. David Drake, Canadian Director General of International Security made a statement at the Geneva Conference on Preventing Violent Extremism in April 2016 on Canada’s support for CVE/PVE and alluded to upcoming domestic action through connections between federal, provincial, and municipal radicalization and prevention programs.

Indeed, the Government continued to explore new ideas and innovative approaches to counter radicalization to violence. The 2016 budget announced CAD35 million over five years CVE/PVE, with CAD10 million per year ongoing, to create the Office of the Community Outreach and Counter-Radicalization Coordinator.

---
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This office replaces the former Conservative government’s Kanishka Project, founded in 2011, and cut from government funding as of March 2015. Kanishka was a center for the study of terrorism and counter-terrorism, mostly operating by the offering of grants to scholar and practitioners. The new office emphasis a more hands-on approach, which intends to facilitate the cooperation civil servants, academics, and religious and ethnic communities to work together to find solutions to violent extremism.

This move has been largely commended by community organizations, like the National Council of Canadian Muslims, who celebrate the establishment of additional accountability and coordination mechanisms. The council also urges the government to review the effects of the Security of Canada Information Sharing Act and the Safe Air Travel Act on Canadians, as well as the new Criminal Code offence of advocating and promoting terrorism in general, citing Maher Arar as an example of the normalization of extraordinary security measures unjustly limiting the civil liberties of Canadians. The Canadian Network for Research on Security, Terrorism and Society, a former benefactor of Kanishka, also identifies the new program introductions to Canada’s counter terrorism policy as “critical,” but urges the government not to lose sight of the importance of strategic academic research and evidence-based practice on terrorism, suggesting the creation of an advisory committee to the Office of Community Outreach, following the model of the Chatham House rule. Indeed the new office has not compromised the research activities formerly supported by Kanishka, but has simply rebranded them with an emphasis on de-radicalization and community integration.

“Building Resilience Against Terrorism” outlines a four-pronged approach to prevent, detect, deny, and respond, to terrorism through security intelligence agencies, law enforcement agencies, and the military while integrating an international approach into its core practice. Furthermore, Canada’s strategy recognizes that Canadian security is linked to that of other countries. Capacity building is part of the commitment made by Canada in a recent CAD35 million contribution to United Nations peacekeeping missions. On 21 September 2016, Former Foreign Affairs Minister Stephen Dion announced that CAD2 million of this funding would support two Global Counterterrorism Forum initiatives: The Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund, aimed at addressing violent extremism at the community level, and the International Institute for Justice and the Rule of Law, which works for judicial and prosecutorial cooperation. The Senate has been critical of the ambiguous nature of the UN package of which these counter-terrorism contributions are a part, though no comment has been made regarding the direction of counter-terrorism funds specifically. The concern is in large part about the importance of seeking Parliament’s approval before sending troops abroad through peacekeeping missions.

Much of the impetus driving this new assistance stems from the UN Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee, which plays a central role in ensuring that states implement UN Security Council Resolution 1373, connecting to both capacity building and Canada’s commitment to support of global counter-terrorism measures through the UN resolutions.

---


1604 Academics Investigate the Roots of Radicalization, University Affairs, 6 February 2017. Date of Access: 14 April 2017.
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France: 0

France has partially complied with its commitment to support international cooperation to counter terrorism. France’s counter-terrorism measures have been fairly comprehensive since May 2016, covering two of the three components of the Ise-Shima G7 Action Plan on Countering Terrorism and violet Extremism. However, France has not taken any substantive actions to promote alternative voices and tolerance in regards to counterterrorism efforts.

First, in regards to counter terrorism measures, France has taken substantive actions to implement new domestic policy and endorse international cooperation. On 12 December 2016, François Delattre, permanent representative of France to the United Nations, welcomed the unanimous UN Security Council adoption of Resolution 2322(2016) on strengthening international judicial cooperation. He stressed the importance of international judicial cooperation for the prevention of the unmonitored departure and return of foreign terrorist fighters through international aviation networks, and called for the further development of communication tools, such as a network of focal points or electronic communications, to support and facilitate cooperation. Prior to its Ise-Shima counter-terrorism commitments (in 2013), France had established Passenger Name Record and Advance Passenger Information in traveller screening and showed strong support for the adoption and wider implementation of the draft directive by the European Parliament on 14 April 2016.


Pertaining to combating terrorist financing, France has continued to strengthen its mechanisms by introducing new legislation. On 3 June 2016, France promulgated a new law to fight against organized crime, terrorism, and terrorist financing which improved the efficiency of existing measures to grant the criminal justice system greater traceability of financial transactions. Tracfin, the service of the French Ministry of Finances that combats money laundering and terrorism financing, can now accordingly access information directly from entities in charge of managing the payment systems behind bank cards, such as the Groupement d’intérêt économique (Economic Interest Group). Starting in July 2017, the law will also intensify existing terrorist asset freezing tools, notably by extending freezing measures from bank accounts to personal property, real estate, and benefit payments from government agencies.

Beyond terrorist financing, the aforementioned law also extends its provisions to the prevention of the trafficking of cultural antiquities by creating a new criminal offence for the trafficking of cultural property originating from territories under terrorist control. Such an offence could garner a seven-year prison sentence and a EUR100,000 fine.\footnote{Dossier de Presse: la Lutte Contre le Financement du Terrorisme S'intensifie, French Ministry of the Economy and Finance (Paris) 30 November 2016. Date of Access: 8 March 2017. http://proxy-pubminefi.diffusion.finances.gouv.fr/pub/document/18/21794.pdf.}

In addition, France has encouraged further measures between UNESCO, INTERPOL, EUROPOL, the World Customs Organization, as well as agencies at the national level to foster European and international cooperation in the field.\footnote{Circulations de Biens Culturels – Mobilisation de la France, French Ministry of Culture and Communication (Paris). Date of Access: 8 March 2017. http://www.culturecommunication.gouv.fr/Politiques-d%C3%A9fense-du-bien-culturel/Enjeux/circulations-des-biens-culturels/Patrimoines-en-danger/Mobilisation-de-la-France.}

Furthermore, France, alongside with New Zealand and the United Kingdom, provided an update on UN Resolution 2309 (2016) pertaining to aviation security, which was considered by the Executive Committee of the International Civil Aviation Organization and then adopted by the special meeting of the UN Security Council on 22 September 2016, confirming France’s continued attention to the implementation of relevant UN resolutions.\footnote{Report of the Executive Committee on Agenda Item 16, ICAO (Montreal) 4 October 2016. Date of Access: 8 March 2017. http://www.icao.int/Meetings/a39/Documents/WP/wp_493_en.pdf.}

Second, in regards to its commitment to empower alternative voices and promote tolerance, on 20 November 2016, French Foreign Minister Jean-Marc Ayrault gave a speech at the World Policy Conference in Doha in which he confirmed the link between counter-terrorism and respect for human rights. He called on France to fight terrorism through the promotion of universal human rights and fundamental freedoms, to fight discrimination and inequality, and to promote civil, political and social rights.\footnote{Politique Etrangère - Lutte Contre le Terrorisme - États-Unis - Syrie - Irak - Discours de M. Jean-Marc Ayrault, World Policy Conference (Doha) 20 November 2016. Date of Access: 8 March 2017. http://basedoc.diplomatie.gouv.fr/exl-doc/EPJ00648503.pdf.}

On 14 October 2016, France demonstrated its commitment to support and endorse the UN Secretary General’s Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism (PVE) through a joint statement, asserting that, “Member states intend to; lead by example, by sharing lessons from our domestic experiences and relevant international and regional organizations; act upon the General Assembly’s call to develop and implement national and regional PVE Action Plans, and assist other Member States in doing so; and continue to examine support to UN-led PVE activity, including by providing expertise and programming and extra-budgetary support to UN entities.”\footnote{Joint Statement on the Issue of Preventing Violent Extremism, Permanent Mission of France (New York) 14 October 2016. Date of Access: 8 March 2017. http://www.franceonu.org/Joint-statement-on-the-issue-of-preventing-violent-extremism.}

While France has demonstrated continuous verbal support for empowering alternative voices and tolerance, it has not taken any substantive, publicized actions towards this commitment.\footnote{Débat sur l’Examen de la Stratégie Antiterroriste Mondiale des Nations Unies - Intervention Prononcée par Mme Catherine Calothy, Permanent Mission of France (New York) 1 July 2016. Date of Access: 8 March 2017. http://www.franceonu.org/Strategie-antiterroriste-mondiale-il-n-y-aura-pas-d-efficacite-sans.}

Third, in regards to France’s commitment to facilitate capacity building and promote international and regional cooperation in the fight against terrorism, on 1 July 2016, in a speech at the United Nations General Assembly, France’s Under-Secretary for the Fight Against Terrorism and Organized Crime, Catherine Calothy, stressed the need to increase coordination and efficiency within the context of the UN “global approach.”\footnote{Dossier de la Lutte Contre le Terrorisme Mondiale des Nations Unies, Intervention Prononcée par Mme Catherine Calothy, Permanent Mission of France (New York) 1 July 2016. Date of Access: 8 March 2017. http://www.franceonu.org/Strategie-antiterroriste-mondiale-il-n-y-aura-pas-d-efficacite-sans.}

Calothy also asserted that the global fight against terrorism must be fought collectively, with the active participation of all countries, especially in terms of terrorist finance, border control, aviation security, and police and judicial cooperation. As such, countries should not only use instruments of
international cooperation, such as INTERPOL databases, but should also contribute and update them.\footnote{Débat sur L’examen de la Stratégie Antiterroriste Mondiale des Nations Unies - Intervention Prononcée par Mme Catherine Calothy, Permanent Mission of France (New York) 1 July 2016. Date of Access: 8 March 2017. http://www.franceonu.org/Strategie-antiterroriste-mondiale-il-n-aura-pas-d-efficacite-sans.} In this way, France has used its position at the United Nations to serve as an advocate for collaborative counter-terrorism measures.

Public-private partnership also features heavily in France’s willingness to increase capacity building through coordination and collaboration among countries globally. On 12 December 2016, the French representative to the United Nations, François Delattre, called upon the UN and its member states to enhance collaboration to more efficiently and effectively provide capacity building and technical assistance programs.\footnote{Coopération Judiciaire et Policière Internationale dans la Lutte contre le Terrorisme - Intervention de M. François Delattre, Permanent Mission of France (New York) 12 December 2016. Date of Access: 8 March 2017. http://www.franceonu.org/Conseil-de-securite-uni-sur-l-importance-de-la-cooperation-internationale-dans.} He stressed the assistance of UN Office on Drugs and Crime to help establish databases and regional cooperation networks.\footnote{Coopération Judiciaire et Policière Internationale dans la Lutte contre le Terrorisme - Intervention de M. François Delattre, Permanent Mission of France (New York) 12 December 2016. Date of Access: 8 March 2017. http://www.franceonu.org/Conseil-de-securite-uni-sur-l-importance-de-la-cooperation-internationale-dans.} He further highlighted the crucial role of the UN to both encourage member states to increase information exchange and evidence collection, and to bring together states, international organizations, private sector actors, and civil society to foster public-private cooperation.\footnote{Coopération Judiciaire et Policière Internationale dans la Lutte contre le Terrorisme - Intervention de M. François Delattre, Permanent Mission of France (New York) 12 December 2016. Date of Access: 8 March 2017. http://www.franceonu.org/Conseil-de-securite-uni-sur-l-importance-de-la-cooperation-internationale-dans.}

On 7 October 2016, France announced EUR42 million to help Africa’s Sahel region prepare for potential terrorist attacks. Over a five-year period (2017-2022), France will “train all the countries of the G5 Sahel [Chad, Niger, Burkina Faso, Mali and Mauritania] and Senegal with 42 million Euros in financing, including 24 million Euros for equipment.”\footnote{Emma Farge, France to Invest $47 Million in Sahel Counter-Terror Training, Reuters (Dakar) 7 October 2016. Date of Access: 25 March 2017. http://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-france-africa-security-idUKKCN1272I2.} A month prior to this announcement, France deployed French riot control officers to Senegal with the purpose of “training Senegalese police forces to combat urban attacks on soft targets.”\footnote{Emma Farge, France to Invest $47 Million in Sahel Counter-Terror Training, Reuters (Dakar) 7 October 2016. Date of Access: 25 March 2017. http://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-france-africa-security-idUKKCN1272I2.} In this way, France has fulfilled its commitment to facilitate capacity building in counterterrorism efforts, specifically in regards to increasing regional and sub-regional cooperation.

France has demonstrated both leadership and effectively contributed in the creation and support of counter terrorism measures and in capacity building. While France has made repeated, verbal affirmations of the importance empowering alternative voices and tolerance in the fight against terrorism, it has not taken any publicized, substantive actions. As such, France has been awarded a score of 0.

\textit{Analyst: Cécile Amiot}

\textbf{Germany: +1}

Germany has partially complied with its commitment on international cooperation to counter terrorism. It has implemented necessary counter terrorism measures, and extensive legal frameworks for international cooperation and capacity building, however there have been few new developments in combating terrorist financing or empowering alternative voices and promoting tolerance.

Germany has implemented several new pieces of legislation to develop international information sharing and cooperation. The Act to Improve Anti-Terror Information Exchange in the Fight Against International Terrorism entered into force 30 July 2016. This act amends several existing laws that govern anti-terrorism measures by equipping the German domestic intelligence agency, the Federal Office for the Protection of the
Constitution (BfV), with new means to fight international terrorism. The legislation sets up an improved system of international information-sharing between intelligence services regarding Islamic terrorist activities. Specifically, it provides the legal basis to allow the BfV to participate in the Counter Terrorist Group (CTG), an information sharing platform between all 28 European Union members plus Norway and Switzerland. The CTG was created in order to establish a common database for European intelligence agencies to share information on terrorist activities.\textsuperscript{1627}

In addition, the Act to Improve Anti-Terror Information Exchange in the Fight Against International Terrorism also enacted an amendment to the Act on the Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution, which governs the BfV. The amendment allows the BfV to “create or participate in common databases with foreign intelligence services for the investigation of attempts or completed actions directed at events or groups of people.”\textsuperscript{1628} “This is meant to increase German intelligence cooperation with other EU members and members of North Atlantic Treaty Organization.”\textsuperscript{1629}

It also reduces the minimum age of individuals whose personal data can be saved, changed, or used by the BfV from 16 years of age to 14 years. This amendment was designed with the express purpose of combating the growing radicalization of minors.\textsuperscript{1630}

On 4 November 2016, the Bundesrat approved the Act for Foreign-Foreign Signals Intelligence Gathering of the Federal Intelligence Service. The act expands the powers of the Federal Intelligence Service by amending the Act on the Federal Intelligence Service. The amendment includes detailed provisions to “regulate the cooperation, participation in common databases, and data exchange with foreign intelligence services.”\textsuperscript{1631}

Further pertaining to its commitments to promote international cooperation, on 18 October 2016 Germany organized the “Enhancing Cooperation among States, Civil Society and the United Nations in Countering Violent Extremism and Transnational Organized Crime.” A collaboration with the UN Office on Drugs and Crime, the discussion highlighted the need for closer collaboration between member states, civil society, and the United Nations. The talks resulted in a recommendation to enhance the capacity of civil society working with member states in countering violent extremists and preventing terrorism. It also highlighted the importance of involving women in de-radicalization and countering violent extremism.\textsuperscript{1632} This conference, therefore, also helped to fulfill Germany’s commitment to empower alternative voices and tolerance.

Also relating to empowering alternative voices and tolerance, Germany served as the 2016 Chair for the Organization for Security and Co-operation (OSCE) in Europe and organized the June 2016 OSCE Counter-Terrorism conference, which united academics, youth representatives and women, to design initiatives and strategies to counter violent extremism and radicalization. Eighteen international and regional

---


organizations, including several United Nations agencies, attended the conference, as well as more than sixty civil society representatives.\textsuperscript{1633} The diverse group was brought together to "share experiences and unite in preventing terrorism and protecting human rights."\textsuperscript{1634} As part of the conference, the #LetsDoodle campaign was launched to challenge dualistic thinking of violent extremism.\textsuperscript{1635}

Germany has made effective contributions to combatting international terrorism by increasing international cooperation through information sharing and intelligence gathering. Germany has also concretely implemented its G7 commitment to empower alternative voices, acting as an international leader. Therefore, it is awarded a compliance score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Leigh Bohner}

\textbf{Italy: 0}

Italy has partially complied with its commitment towards international cooperation to counter-terrorism. It has continued to implement relevant United Nations resolutions and is actively involved in both European and international coalitions for cooperation, capacity building, and information exchange. However, the preeminence of administrative deportation in the Italian security response to terrorism, and limited access for the public to the debate on counter-terrorism, render Italy uncompliant in terms of the Ise-Shima commitment to pluralism and the promotion of diverse civil society engagement.

A statement delivered by Italy at the Seventh Ministerial Plenary of the Global Counterterrorism Forum on the 21st of September, 2016, indicates full commitment to the full implementation of the international conventions and UN Resolutions, and highlights Italy as one of the first countries to adopt specific legal measures to implement Resolution 2178 on foreign terrorist fighters.\textsuperscript{1636} On 2 December 2015, the European Commission presented its proposal for a directive on combating terrorism, replacing Council Framework Decision 2002/475/JHA, as amended by Framework Decision 2008/919/JHA, and updating its provisions to integrate new international terrorism-related instruments, among them UN Security Council Resolution 2178(2014) on foreign terrorist fighters. As of a June 2016, a progress report which tracks the European body's implementation of the aforementioned legislation, Italy continues to uphold the resolution, intercepting foreign fighters and strengthening aviation security.\textsuperscript{1637}

The 2016 Financial Action Task Force (FATF) review of Italy indicates, that Italy’s Financial Security Committee has proven to be a useful platform for coordinating action for the prevention of the use of the financial system and of the economy for money laundering and terrorist financing.\textsuperscript{1638}

A recent March 2017 report from the International Centre for Counter-Terrorism (ICCT) in the Hague highlights Italy’s increasing reliance on administrative deportation of suspected terrorists or individuals with some link to terrorism.\textsuperscript{1639} Administrative measures are essentially aimed at preventing terrorism within the territory of a State, decided upon and ordered by the executive (or with its close involvement) and subject to

limited judicial review.  According to some experts such as Lorenzo Vidino and Edward N. Luttwak, the extensive use of this tool, associated with restrictive citizenship laws, represents an important factor to explain why this country has thus far escaped terrorist violence. However the ICCT concludes that this conclusion does not account for home-grown Jihadism in Italy; a new threat. This externally oriented approach also fails to nurture the United Nations Action plan for Countering Violent Extremism/Preventing Violent Extremism (CVE/PVE) and localized approaches to de-radicalization.

Italy’s statement at the Global Counterterrorism Forum also indicates a major focus on culture and the “ideological struggle” to counter-terrorism. It is at the forefront in the fight against looting and trafficking of antiquities, including through contribution to the launch of the UNESCO Blue Helmets of culture. This is a Turin-based task force that protects heritage sites in conflict zones worldwide.

Starting in 2016, teenagers in Italy turning 18 receive a EUR500 stipend to spend on museums, theaters, concerts and movies from the Italian government called a “culture bonus.” Prime Minister Matteo Renzi initially announced the program in the wake of the terrorist attacks in Paris in November 2015, he said extremists should be fought not only with military efforts, but also ideologically; “they imagine terror, we answer with culture.” This approach is questionable given Italy’s restrictive citizenship laws.

Nonetheless, Italy is an active and engaged member of the Global Coalition to counter Daesh, leading the working group on counter-financing and the sub-group on police training. Additionally, Italy has provided active support to Iraqi forces, contributed USD 7 million to the UN Development Programme’s Funding Facility for Immediate Stabilization of the region, and the deployment of Italian military personnel alongside an Italian company completing the infrastructural repair of the Mosul dam. Therefore, Italy receives a score of 0 for partial compliance.

**Japan: 0**

Japan has partially complied with its commitments to counter-terrorism. The Japanese government has implemented measures to prevent terrorism and bolster international cooperation, especially following the

---

terror attack in Bangladesh on 1 July 2016 that killed seven Japanese citizens.\(^{1651}\) However, Japan has not created a comprehensive strategy in all three action points outlined in the United Nations Secretary General’s Plan of Action to Counter Violent Extremism, lacking in terms of empowering alternative voices and tolerance.

On 15 July 2016, in order to increase counter-terrorism measures, the government of Japan hosted a cabinet meeting for the “Promotion of Measures Against Transnational Organized Crime and Other Relative Issues and International Terrorism.”\(^{1652}\) At this meeting, Japan signaled its intent to focus efforts on strengthening information collection, reinforcing the safety of Japanese nationals abroad, implementing border controls, and heightening security at important facilities.\(^{1653}\)

Japan has also increased the efficacy of cooperation, effective information sharing, and capacity building with other countries. For instance, to enhance collaboration, Japan held counter-terrorism consultations with Russia\(^{1654}(23 June 2016),\) Korea\(^{1655}(15 July 2016),\) India\(^{1656}(11 November 2016),\) and Belgium\(^{1657}(23 November 2016).\) Furthermore, on 15 February 2017, Japan offered to assist the Philippines with growing piracy and terrorism threats by providing high speed boats. Japan indicated that this facilitation of international, anti-terrorism cooperation was an attempt to contribute to “capacity building.”\(^{1658}\) Finally, on 8 February 2017, Japan approved a loan of approximately USD100 million to support humanitarian and counterterrorism projects in Iraq.\(^{1659}\)

In relation to aviation security, on 22 September 2016, Japan voted in favour of UN Security Council Resolution 2309(2016).\(^{1660}\) Resolution 2309(2016) calls for “enhanced screening, security checks and facility security,” as well as “strengthened cooperation and information-sharing among States and a requirement that airlines provide advance passenger information to national authorities in order to track the movement of individuals identified by the counter-terrorism committees.”\(^{1661}\) The resolution further emphasizes the importance of “regional and international cooperation on border control, law-enforcement and criminal

---

justice.”\(^{1662}\) Japanese Ambassador to the United Nations Yoshifumi Okamura asserted that Japan “would strongly support the new aviation security framework, as well as continue its efforts to fight global terrorism.”\(^{1663}\) Okamura cited Japan’s financial contributions to the International Civil Aviation Organization as evidence of its commitment to aviation security.\(^{1664}\)

To increase capacity building, on 7 September 2016, the Japanese government committed USD440 million to intensify counter-terrorism and safety measures in Southeast Asia over the next three years.\(^{1665}\) The aid will be used to improve border control, train law enforcement officials, and enhance youth education in ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) countries and Sri Lanka.\(^{1666}\) The money will be allocated through loans and grants, and will include the introduction of biometrics identification systems and explosives detection equipment.\(^{1667}\)

On 14 October 2016, Japan also chaired the first meeting of the Ise-Shima Cyber Group, which G7 leaders decided to establish in May 2016, to strengthen collective efforts on cyber security. The representatives discussed how to “promote international law, norms, confidence building measures and capacity building in order to increase stability and security in cyberspace.”\(^{1668}\)

Pertaining to Japan’s commitment to empower alternative voices and promote tolerance, on 1 July 2016, Japan expressed support for the Plan of Action to Counter Violent Extremism, particularly aspects that encouraged greater engagement with civil society, women, youth, and the private sector.\(^{1669}\) Beyond this, there is no evidence of a comprehensive strategy.

Japan has taken substantive action to coordinate counter-terrorism efforts with countries and increased capacity building through counter-terrorism financing. However, the country has not demonstrated a comprehensive strategy in empowering alternative voices and tolerance. Additionally, Japan has exhibited little explicit commitment to human rights in counter-terrorism. Thus, Japan has been awarded a score of 0.

\textit{Analyst: Siobhan Bradley}

**United Kingdom: 0**

The United Kingdom has partially complied with its commitment to counter-terrorism. The UK has completed substantive work with regards to counter-terrorism measures in collaboration with other G7 members. However, the UK’s domestic counter-radicalization measures have been heavily criticized by civil


society actors, and the country faces further complications on a global level with negotiations about the nature of information sharing and security service collaboration given the UK's withdrawal from the European Union. These details have compromised the UK's full compliance with the commitment.

The British government has continued to enact counter-terrorism measures and is particularly committed to strengthening security capabilities including naval and aviation security. Immediately following the Ise-Shima Summit, the government announced increased powers to the UK Border Force to board vessels to conduct arrests of suspected illegal entrants. In September 2016, Prime Minister Theresa May advocated for increased global aviation security in her address to the United Nations General Assembly. By 22 September, with thanks to the initiative of Theresa May and the British Foreign Secretary Boris Johnston, for the first time in its history, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 2309 on civil aviation security. The resolution demonstrates global resolve to tackle the threat posed to aviation industry. The UK has positioned itself as a global resource for actionable follow-up to the the resolution. Bloomberg reported that “the U.K. has expanded its efforts to help other countries improve their systems, with an expanded team of aviation security liaison officers who travel the world offering advice.”

Immediately prior to the Ise Shima Summit, May announced the government’s Action Plan for anti-money laundering and counter-terrorism financing. This plan will undergo a two-year review process by the Financial Action Task Force starting in September 2017. This is a result of the National Crime Agency’s 2016 annual national strategic assessment, and the conclusion that a worrying figure of between GBP 36 billion and GBP 90 billion a year is laundered towards criminal activity, with a significant portion directed to terrorist activities.

In July 2016, the UK Joint Committee on Human Rights published a report on the government’s decade-old anti-extremism program, Prevent. The joint committee “stressed the need to have a clear distinction between extremism and religious conservatism,” criticizing the lack of clarity in the government’s anti-extremism legislation and suggesting that the bill alienates Muslim communities. Indeed, the Prevent program has been publicly criticized by the National Union of Teachers and the Muslim Council of Britain (MCB), has faced a legal challenge from a British Muslim scholar, and has witnessed the development of a rival

---

anti-radicalization strategy by the MCB.\textsuperscript{1678} The effectiveness of the program was also called into question with the August 2016 after the death of a radicalized 16-year-old British-born student in Syria.\textsuperscript{1679}

As a centerpiece of the Home Office’s counterterrorism strategy, Prevent has hindered the UK from achieving its Ise-Shima commitment to promote pluralism and tolerance through cross-cultural and interfaith dialogues. The heavy criticism of the program also calls to question the second feature of this commitment of improving coordination and enhancing collaboration with civil society.

Indeed, new initiatives such as the Action Counters Terrorism program, announced in March 2017, build on Prevent as opposed to amending it.\textsuperscript{1680} It urges the public to act when encountering suspicious behavior, and to report to the police anyone who may indicate a propensity to terrorism, to help “bring dangerous offenders to justice and prevent terror attacks in the UK and overseas.”\textsuperscript{1681} In January 2017, in a research report assessing counter-terrorism measures across EU nations, Amnesty International found the UK’s regulations to be the “most draconian” of the 14 countries studied.\textsuperscript{1682} The UK is judged according to “mass surveillance,” use of “diplomatic assurances” to deport people where there is a risk of torture, stripping people of their nationality, and controlling their movement and detaining without charge or sufficient legal process.\textsuperscript{1683}

The UK’s commitment to information sharing and capacity building through multilateral security organizations like Europol has been called into question due to the Brexit realignment.\textsuperscript{1684} As of April 2017 the UK continues to be a member of Europol and relevant sub-groups like the European Counter-Terrorism Center (ECTC).\textsuperscript{1685} Since Ise-Shima, the UK continues to be a relatively active participant in the activities of Europol, beyond information sharing, including joint-projects to topple online terrorist propaganda and recruitment communications.\textsuperscript{1686} However, the UK’s role in this cooperative capacity is unclear amidst negotiations for the UK’s withdrawal from the European Union. Indeed, the former head of the Metropolitan Police counterterrorism command has called for the government to use its security capabilities as a bargaining chip in the upcoming negotiations.\textsuperscript{1687} Such threats regarding the end of security cooperation were made official by Theresa May in the “Article 50 Letter,” outlined conditions for the UK’s withdrawal, and delivered to Donald Tusk the President of the EU.\textsuperscript{1688} The relationship between Britain’s security apparatus


and those of European states has been characterized by confusion and will not be clear until Brexit negotiations are completed.

Nonetheless, the UK remains committed to capacity building in bilateral partnerships with countries like Israel. A January 2017 report by the RAND Corporation on the implications of Brexit on security and defense, cautions against the UK’s likely increased investment in alternative bilateral and non-EU mechanisms, such as Five Eyes, and Interpol. RAND raises concerns about increased fragmentation, administrative costs, and the potential for critical information to “fall between the cracks,” though such implications have not been seen in the UK’s position with regards to the EU as of yet. Therefore the UK receives a score of 0.

**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied with the counter-terrorism commitment made at the G7 summit at Ise-Shima. The Department of State oversees counter-terrorism with respect to foreign assistance, capacity building, and global cooperation through the Bureau of Counterterrorism and Countering Violent Extremism. Domestically, counter-terrorism matters are taken up by the National Counterterrorism Centre under the office of the Director of National Intelligence. Though recent Presidential executive orders like a ban on the entry of individuals from a set of Muslim majority countries have been criticized for compromising counter-terrorism efforts by playing into terrorist propaganda, and significant cuts under President Trump’s proposed budget threatened the continued future operations of the Department of State, for the time being, and since Ise-Shima, the US has conducted a robust counter-terrorism effort.

The CT Bureau has advanced counterterrorism and countering violent extremism priorities at the United Nations by raising the profile of prevention measures during the 2016 UN General Assembly’s (UNGA’s) fifth review of the Global Counter Terrorist Strategy in July. The UNGA endorsed over 70 recommendations of the Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism, and through the adoption of UN Security Council Resolutions 2309 on aviation security and 2322 on judicial cooperation on terrorism investigations and prosecutions.

Furthermore, the United States co-leads the Border Security Initiative (BSI) in collaboration with the United Nations Counterterrorism Forum and Morocco. The Good Practices in the Area of Border Security and Management in the Context of Counterterrorism and Stemming the Flow of Foreign Terrorist Fighters were

---


adopted at the Seventh Ministerial Plenary Meeting of the Global Counterterrorism Forum in New York in September 2016, after a presentation by this coalition.  

The United States Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL) runs strong anti-money laundering and counter-terrorist financing (AML/CTF) programs, strategies, and tools which help committed partners to prevent, trace and recover illicitly-acquired assets and to “disrupt and dismantle global terrorist financial and criminal laundering operations.” The INL implements standards set by the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) on national reporting, laws and agencies to avoid illicit terrorism financing. On 20 December, 2016, the FATF released an evaluation of the United States. The review found that the United States received the highest possible ratings on investigating and prosecuting terrorist financing, and recovering the proceeds of crime through asset forfeiture. It also confirmed that the United States is successfully investigating and prosecuting money laundering, providing and seeking cooperation from international partners, and using financial intelligence to conduct money laundering and terrorist financing investigations. The report underscores the effectiveness of the United States’ multi-agency approach to combating terrorism and terrorist financing, specifically through the 104 Joint Terrorism Task Forces operating nation-wide harmonizing counter-terrorism financing operations across 104 US cities with the help of the Department of Homeland Security, the US military, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and the Transportation Security Administration. Furthermore, on 20 December, 2016, Congressmen Michael Fitzpatrick and Stephen F. Lynch, co-chairs of the Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing, released a comprehensive report on the state of terrorism financing globally, as well as the American response. It included recommendations to follow-up on the FATF report.

The United States and the European Union convened the second senior level Security and Development Dialogue on 20 July 2016 in Washington DC to discuss a number of shared international priorities, including preventing and countering violent extremism. At the Global Counterterrorism Forum in September, the United States and Turkey also launched an initiative on the protection of soft targets, like hotels, to raise awareness, identify needs, and leverage the expertise and experience of governments and industry to better protect potential soft targets. The United States is providing USD1 million to help fund this initiative.

Nonetheless, the Department of State, is a leader in Countering Violent Extremism (CVE). In May 2016, the State Department and United States Agency for International Development released the first-ever Joint Strategy on Countering Violent Extremism (CVE), which highlights the need to foster and empower a broad-based coalition of government and non-governmental partners to address violent extremism. The U.S is a strong global leader on CVE, which includes projects focusing on youth, addressing prison radicalization, the Global Counterterrorism Forum’s Life Cycle of Radicalization to Violence, the RESOLVE Network bridging

---


caps in global terrorism research and creating networks of global scholars, as well as the CVE Centers of Excellence, situated in high-risk environments.\footnote{1705}

In 2016, the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund, a Swiss-based public-private partnership fund which the State Department funds and contributes to through executive board membership, began signing its first grants to support community-based CVE efforts in Bangladesh, Mali and Nigeria.\footnote{1706} Furthermore, the State Department and the CT Bureau partnered with the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development to establish the East Africa CVE Center of Excellence and more specifically with regards to capacity building, the Counter-Messaging Hub in Djibouti. This hub will serve as a critical platform for members of the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development and other organizations to conduct training and capacity-building programs.\footnote{1707}

The CT Bureau is also helping partner countries build their civilian counterterrorism criminal justice expertise in areas such as border security, crisis response, terrorist finance, and information sharing. Through training and equipment, consultations, and mentorships, civilian law enforcement officers, investigators, prosecutors, judges benefit from nearly $400 million overseen by the CT Bureau the 2016 Fiscal year. Approximately $175 million of this funding is directed to the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund, established in 2015.\footnote{1708} The bureau also seeks to use CTPF funding to expand partnerships with non-security and non-governmental actors to counter radicalization and recruitment to violent extremism, especially in regions threatened by ISIS.\footnote{1709}

Therefore the United States receives a score of +1.

**Analyst:** Joudy Sarraj

### European Union: +1

The European Union has been fully compliant in implementing all three components of the G7 commitment to international co-operation to counter terrorism as articulated in the G7 Action Plan on Countering Terrorism and Violent Extremism.

In relation to supporting relevant United Nations resolutions, on 5 July 2016, the European Union published a proposal to amend the fourth directive of legislation 2015/849 that enables EU states to deny entry to those involved in terrorist networks and allows the transfer of passenger name record data through extensive networks, thereby facilitating its ability to deny entry to terrorists by tracking airline data.\footnote{1710} This legislation is in support of UN Resolution 1373 (2001) which requires all Member States to “suppress the financing of terrorist acts, freeze financial assets used for terrorism, deny known terrorists access, and take steps to ensure

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \footnote{1709}{Programs and Initiatives, U.S Department of State. Date of Access: 10 April 2017. https://www.state.gov/j/ct/programs/.
\end{itemize}
the accountability of those who commit terrorist acts.”\textsuperscript{1711} In addition, it encourages member states to cooperate with one another in tracking terrorist acts and movements.\textsuperscript{1712}

UN Resolution 1540(2004) has likewise been effectively adopted by the EU and supported by complimentary EU directives. Resolution 1540(2004) required that UN member states “refrain from providing any form of support to non-State actors that attempt to develop, acquire, manufacture, possess, transport, transfer or use nuclear, chemical or biological weapons and their means of delivery, in particular for terrorist purposes.”\textsuperscript{1713} As demonstrated by Jaciek Bylica, Special Envoy for Disarmament and Non-proliferation, in a statement on behalf of the EU on 15 December 2016, at the Security Council, the EU has successfully implemented 1540(2001) and has proposed changes so as to strengthen member states’ capacities to respond to nuclear proliferation in the face of new technology and challenges.\textsuperscript{1714}

The second counter terrorism measure required pertains to information sharing and cooperation. The European Union has committed itself to information sharing both amongst EU States and internationally. As previously mentioned, the EU is in the process of implementing the passenger name record system, which will facilitate information sharing amongst EU members and an international network in regards to travel.\textsuperscript{1715}

Furthermore, in the wake of recent terrorist attacks, the EU has increased its efforts to share information within its jurisdictions, with the result being that “information sharing on counter terrorism, across European countries as well as through and with Europol, has reached an all-time high by the end of 2016.”\textsuperscript{1716} This information sharing is largely facilitated by the European Counter Terrorism Centre (ECTC), launched in January 2016. The ECTC seeks to combat terrorism through, “tackling foreign fighters; sharing intelligence and expertise on terrorism financing (through the Terrorist Finance Tracking Programme and the Financial Intelligence Unit); [countering] online terrorist propaganda and extremism (through the EU Internet Referral Unit); [combating] illegal arms trafficking; [and facilitating] international cooperation among counter terrorism authorities.”\textsuperscript{1717} Throughout 2016, the ECTC expanded its information database which allowed Europol to support 127 counter terrorism operations between January and December.\textsuperscript{1718}

The European Union continues to make significant efforts to implement its G7 commitment to counterterrorism through international legal cooperation. These efforts relate to specific agencies such as Eurojust, an EU body of judges and prosecutors who “support and strengthen coordination and cooperation between national authorities in relation to serious crime;” and the European judicial network in criminal matters, “network of magistrates and prosecutors who act as contact points in EU countries to facilitate


judicial cooperation.”\textsuperscript{1719} It motioned in June 2016, to strengthen these bodies with the addition of a center of “specialized expertise supporting judicial authorities, like prosecutors and judges dealing with cybercrime, cyber-enabled crime and investigations in cyberspace” to the European Judicial Cybercrime Network.\textsuperscript{1720} This center will facilitate the exchange of information on relevant law and provide tools for practitioners. Furthermore, the EU cooperates with INTERPOL in funding Evidence and E-Crime projects to facilitate fate exchange and to research the economic aspects of cybercrime.\textsuperscript{1721}

In terms of border security, on 10 June 2016, the EU launched the European Border and Coast Guard Agency. The agency’s mandate is to “help to manage migration more effectively, improve the internal security of the European Union and safeguard the principle of free movement of persons.”\textsuperscript{1722}

In relation to the tracking of antiquities, the EU has implemented measures with the intention of hindering the flow of trafficking. In so doing, Europol has worked successfully with INTERPOL and UNESCO, as evidenced in January 2017, by Operation Pandora, wherein 3651 artefacts were seized by Cypriot and Spanish police.\textsuperscript{1723}

The second action outlined at the Ise-Shima Summit was the empowerment of alternative voices and tolerance in society. In support of this commitment, on 22 February 2017, the EU endorsed the UN Secretary General’s Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism and, in so doing, called for the strengthening of the UN counter terrorism structure.\textsuperscript{1724} In September 2016, the EU funded “Preventing Violent Extremism: Leaders Telling a Different Story,” a project which brought together representatives from the media, private sector, academia, civil society, intergovernmental organizations, and EU institutions with the aim of preventing radicalization. The initiative sought to “provide a space to reflect together on new and effective approaches for delivering narrative and challenge the message of violent extremist groups.”\textsuperscript{1725}

Also in relation to countering violent extremism, the EU has worked to counter the exploitation of the internet and social media by terrorist groups. In July 2015, the EU launched the Internet Referral Unit (IRU) to “combat terrorist propaganda and related violent extremist activities on the internet e.g. terrorist propaganda videos, pictures of beheadings, bomb-making instructions and speeches calling for racial or religious violence.”\textsuperscript{1726} Specifically, on 5 September 2016, Europol announced that it had identified a large amount of social media content “containing terrorist and violent extremist propaganda” and, for the first

\textsuperscript{1721} In September 2016, the EU funded “Preventing Violent Extremism: Leaders Telling a Different Story,” a project which brought together representatives from the media, private sector, academia, civil society, intergovernmental organizations, and EU institutions with the aim of preventing radicalization. The initiative sought to “provide a space to reflect together on new and effective approaches for delivering narrative and challenge the message of violent extremist groups.”
time, the unit had “organised and joined forces with the IRUs [from France, Germany, Slovenia, and the United Kingdom] on a 48-hour joint action to secure the removal of the material as quickly as possible.”

Overall, the EU has complied with the counter terrorism measures promised at the G7 Summit. While some of the required measures were implemented prior to the Summit, the EU has demonstrated an overall compliance and has, indeed, taken substantive action relating to follow-up on this action point. Thus, the EU has earned a score of +1.

Analyst: Kelsey Wiseman

---

15. Syria: Refugees

“We are committed to supporting displaced persons and their host communities and to working towards a long-term, sustainable post-conflict stabilization and rehabilitation of Syria and to eradicating conditions conducive to violent extremism.”

*G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ 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>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</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>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background**

Since the beginning of the civil war in Syria in 2011, at least 11 million Syrian refugees have fled their homes.1728 While close to 6.5 million people have been internally displaced, another 4.8 million have fled to the neighbouring states of Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey.1729 The crisis in Syria has also contributed to the increased levels of migration to Europe, which has had a significant impact on many states within the G7. Over one million refugees and migrants travelled to Europe by sea in 2015, and of those who took the Mediterranean Route, half were from Syria.1730 Germany and Sweden, which are the European Union’s top refugee-receiving countries, have received approximately 300,000 and 100,000 asylum applications respectively.1731 While the numbers of those fleeing to Europe decreased in 2016, the refugee crisis remains an important issue.

The Syrian revolution began on 11 March 2011, when the occupants of a southern city began to protest the government’s decision to torture 13-year-old boys who had written “The government must go!” on their school, and advocated for a transition to democracy.1732 This sparked calls for President Bashar al-Assad’s resignation.1733 The non-governmental organization I Am Syria notes that “the government responded with heavy-handed force, and demonstrations quickly spread across much of the country.”1734 In April 2011, as an attempt to stabilize the protest, President Bashar al-Assad sent tanks into cities, and security forces opened

---


The Syrian conflict has since evolved into a series of at least “four overlapping conflicts.”1738 When the war between the government forces and rebels catalyzed the conflict and instability, a vacuum of power was created. ISIS took full advantage of this and moved into Syria, setting up a central base of operations in Raqqa, and creating a so-called Islamic caliphate.1739 Thus, the conflict between ISIS and the international coalition against them added a new dimension to the Syrian crisis. Complicating this is the struggle between the Turks and the Kurds, who have been a significant ally of the West in the fight against ISIS, but have created an autonomous region for themselves in Syria.1740 This is due to Turkey’s national security fears regarding the Kurdistan Worker’s Party (PKK), and perception that the Syrian Kurds are an extension of this group.1741 Finally, the Syrian conflict is also a proxy war between the US and Russia, as well as between the Gulf States and Iran.1742

The United Nations Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic has reported an increase in violence in the wake of the latest failed ceasefire, noting that “nearly 600,000 people are under siege” while humanitarian aid is not being allowed into many areas.1743 They note that “civilians and hor de combat fighters continue to be disappeared, taken hostage, tortured and subject to sexual violence … Unlawful killings, including deaths in detention and summary executions, remain a hallmark of this blood-soaked conflict.”1744 The conflict has also revealed Syria’s violation of the Chemical Weapons Convention, which prohibits the use and stockpiling of chemical weapons. Although the US military offered political and diplomatic pressure (i.e., the threat of a military intervention), and thus forced Assad to agree to remove and destroy all of Syria’s chemical weapons, there is evidence that the Syrians have used chlorine gas since.1745

Despite attempts to find a political solution to the conflict, agreements have not been effective thus far. In early 2014, Geneva II broke down following two rounds of discussion after then-UN Special Envoy Lakhdar Brahimi condemned the Syrian government’s resistance to holding discussions to hear the opposition’s
demands. Staffan de Mistura, his successor, shifted the focus onto a series of local ceasefires. The three-year siege of the Homs suburb of al-War was ended in 2015. The United States and Russia led efforts to get representatives of the government and the opposition to talk in Geneva in January 2016, with the aim of discussing a Security Council-endorsed road map for peace, which includes a ceasefire and transnational period ending with elections. The latest “cessation of hostilities” deal began on 12 September 2016. It has since collapsed.

Commitment Features

This commitment can be broken down into three components. G7 members have committed to: 1) “supporting displaced persons and their host communities”; 2) “work ... towards a long-term, sustainable post-conflict stabilization and rehabilitation of Syria”; and 3) “eradicating conditions conducive to violent extremism.”

The first element of this commitment involves the continuation of earlier G7 commitments to support internally displaced persons, refugees and their host communities. While the G7 does not specifically state which countries it defines as host countries, the 2016 Supporting Syria and the Region Conference, which was hosted by G7 members, concluded that “Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq and Egypt have shown extraordinary generosity in hosting refugees but their communities are under considerable strain as basic services are overstretched.” This focus on host communities also indicates that the displaced persons referred to in the commitment are not internally displaced persons, but refugees. Examples of ways that G7 members could comply with the commitment include financial aid and collaboration with UN aid agencies. The G7 and Gulf states have allocated EUR 1.6 billion for UN aid agencies in helping Syrian refugees. However, goods and services such as education, health and infrastructure advancement could also provide evidence of support. In order to support the humanitarian crisis in Syria, G7 members also provide funding and other types of support to organizations such as International Syria Support Group, the UN and the World Food Programme to help facilitate the rapid distribution of safe resources to Syrians.

While supporting host countries is a short term goal, this commitment also includes the goal of “working towards a long-term, sustainable post-conflict stabilization and rehabilitation of Syria.” Since rehabilitation cannot occur without stability, this element requires G7 states to support efforts to achieve and maintain a

---

cessation of hostilities, especially through the implementation of UN Security Council Resolutions (UNSCR) 2254, 2258 and 2268. UNSCR 2254 was adopted on 18 December 2015, and provides a “road map for a peace process in Syria.” UNSCR 2258 aims to improve the ability of humanitarian aid to reach citizens in the country. Finally, UNSCR 2268 supports the cessation of hostilities agreement which aims to “create the space for a long-overdue political transition.”

G7 members have also agreed to support the Geneva Communiqué, and commit to an inclusive and peaceful political transition in Syria.

Finally, the G7 has committed to “eradicating conditions conducive to violent extremism.” While the declaration itself does not list specific means by which this can be done, the G7 Action Plan on Countering Terrorism and Violent Extremism emphasizes the importance of “empowering alternative voices that are capable of challenging the drivers of violent extremism ... to help make societies resilient to violent extremism.” It lists several steps that G7 members should take, including, but not limited to efforts that will: 1) support civil society organizations like the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund and Hedayah; 2) endorse the UN Secretary General’s Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism and “call for its rapid implementation, including by sharing expertise and providing relevant assistance to other UN member states”; and 3) “Promote pluralism, tolerance, and gender equality through cross-cultural and interfaith dialogues and understanding including through education.”

Thus, to achieve full compliance, G7 members must take steps to fulfill all three of these commitments. If the G7 member fulfills only two of these commitments, they will receive a score of 0. If the G7 member fails to take action to achieve any of these commitment, they will be considered non-compliant.

### Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>The G7 member fails to take steps to support displaced persons and their host communities, fails to take action to help stabilize Syria, AND does not work to eliminate the conditions that permit the spread of violent extremism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The G7 member takes steps to achieve at least TWO of its three commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>The G7 member takes steps to support displaced persons and their host communities, works toward a long-term, sustainable post-conflict stabilization and rehabilitation of Syria, AND contributes to the elimination of the conditions that permit the spread of violent extremism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Canada: +1

Canada has fully complied with its commitment to support displaced persons and their host communities, to work towards long-term, sustainable, post-conflict stabilization and rehabilitation of Syria, and to eradicate conditions conducive to violent extremism.

---


Canada has made several commitments to increase its support of displaced Syrian refugees and their host communities in heavily burdened regions including Jordan, Iraq, Lebanon and Turkey. On 19 September 2016, Canada co-chaired a roundtable on “International Action and Cooperation on Refugees and Migrants: The Way Ahead,” where Prime Minister Justin Trudeau urged the international community to help Syrian refugees in the Middle East, noting that “the international community must come together to address their immediate needs and to help rebuild their lives.”1765 On 19 September 2016, the Canadian government committed to increasing humanitarian support by 10 per cent this fiscal year. 1766 As part of a new CAD1.6 billion commitment which was announced in the previous compliance year, the government of Canada has announced CAD442 million in direct humanitarian aid to be distributed over three years to help alleviate the suffering of Syrian refugees in the region.1767 This will be directed to United Nations agencies and the International Committee of the Red Cross to help families meet basic needs, improve access to health and social services, support the needs of women and girls, and support the livelihoods of affected refugees.1768 The Canadian government also announced CAD37.8 million in long-term institutional funding for the UN High Commissioner for Refugees to assist displaced and vulnerable people.

The Canadian government further announced CAD15 million to support the Education and Learning in Lebanon initiative, CAD10 million to support the Scaling Up Access to Formal Education for Syrian Girls and Boys project in Jordan, CAD20 million for the Education Cannot Wait Fund to support the educational needs of children in conflict zones, and CAD739,000 to support accessibility to and quality of learning for refugee children in 25 schools in Lebanon and Jordan.1769 Furthermore, on 5 December 2016, the Canadian government announced CAD8 million in funding for Lebanon including CAD449,782 for the Lebanese Organization for Studies and Training to engage Lebanese and Syrian women in social stability to help promote peace and cooperation between Syrian refugees and Lebanese society.1770

Canada has pledged CAD20 million to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees to support education, health, and social services for Palestinian refugees from the region, including those who fled Syrian refugee camps.1771 The government of Canada has earmarked a further CAD5 million to support the agency’s work in helping Syrian refugees exclusively.1772 The Canadian government has also committed CAD150 million to Iraq to support humanitarian relief work within Iraq, helping conflict-affected Iraqis and
Syrian refugees who have fled the Syrian conflict. On 7 November 2016, the Canadian government committed CAD125 million to the Canadian Foodgrains Bank to help provide food to people affected by humanitarian crises, including to Syrian refugees in the Middle East.

As part of its commitment to working towards long-term, sustainable, post-conflict stabilization and rehabilitation of Syria, the Canadian government has worked alongside the United Nations and the international community at large to push for a negotiated peace agreement. On 13 October 2016, the Canadian government submitted a request to the president of the United Nations General Assembly on behalf of itself and 69 other countries. This request aimed to have the UN General Assembly meet to “explore concerted action to apply pressure on the parties of the violence [in Syria].” Prime Minister Justin Trudeau also issued a statement to the United Nations General Assembly plenary meeting on Syria, in which he stated, “Canada is taking a stand at the United Nations General Assembly today to protect vulnerable Syrians and help find a solution to the conflict engulfing that country.”

On 30 October 2016, as part of the EU-Canada Summit Joint Declaration, the Canadian government reiterated its support for a credible and viable political transition as outlined in UN Security Council Resolution 2254, and its support for the UN in leading and coordinating stabilization and peace-building efforts.

The Canadian government, from 11 November 2016 to 13 November 2016, also brought together special envoys from 15 countries, representatives from the Syrian political opposition, as well as experts and diplomats from the United Nations, Syrian civil society, and other academics to discuss the Syrian situation. Minister of Foreign Affairs Stéphane Dion reiterated Canada’s commitment to “full and unhindered humanitarian access, full respect of international law and a complete, enforceable and verifiable cessation of hostilities.”

1773 Canada pledges humanitarian and stabilization support for Iraq, Global Affairs Canada (Ottawa) 19 July 2016. Date of Access: 2 December 2016. http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?sessid=df1f289ca48d49eb4a1c55cf5f8e7136f853f24bf78f8ecd41c37dc92a685.e38RbhaLb3qNe3eKa3v0?mthd=index&crtr.page=1&nid=1149109&crtr.tp1D=1

1774 Canada announces funding to Canadian Foodgrains Bank to support the most vulnerable, Global Affairs Canada (Ottawa) 7 November 2016. Date of Access: 6 December 2016. http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?sessid=09073ac27d7c71096f211b7562b356c5cb160b3325a4f0734644119b2c33fc95.e38RbhaLb3qNe3eMbN50?mthd=tp&crtr.page=1&nid=1149109&crtr.tp1D=1


Further, the Canadian government published a joint statement from the leaders of Canada, France, Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom, and the United States that declared support for UN Special Envoy Staffan de Mistura’s attempts to resume the negotiations for a peaceful political settlement to end the war in Syria.\footnote{Joint statement from the leaders of Canada, France, Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States on the situation in Aleppo (Syria), Office of the Prime Minister of Canada (Ottawa) December 8 2016. Date of Access: December 8 2016. http://pm.gc.ca/eng/news/2016/12/08/joint-statement-leaders-canada-france-germany-italy-united-kingdom-and-united-states.}

The Canadian government has also supported several initiatives to eradicate conditions conducive to violent extremism in the Syrian region. As part of Operation IMPACT, the government will increase the number of military personnel from 650 to approximately 830, to be deployed at various Global Coalition headquarters and as part of Joint Task Force-Iraq to help plan operations, collect intelligence, and contribute to the protection and conduct of coalition operations.\footnote{Promoting security and stability, Global Affairs Canada (Ottawa) 30 August 2016. Date of Access: 5 December 2016. http://international.gc.ca/world-monde/security-securite/middle_east-moyen_orient/stabilization_development-stabilisation_developpement.aspx?lang=en.} Further, the Canadian government has committed to tripling the size of its “train, advise, and assist mission,” which includes dispatching medical personnel, providing small arms, ammunition, and optics to Iraqi security forces, and deploying three CH-146 Griffon helicopters for tactical support and medical evacuations.\footnote{Promoting security and stability, Global Affairs Canada (Ottawa) 30 August 2016. Date of Access: 5 December 2016. http://international.gc.ca/world-monde/security-securite/middle_east-moyen_orient/stabilization_development-stabilisation_developpement.aspx?lang=en.}

The Canadian government has also committed CAD145 million over the next three years to stabilization and chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear security programming as part of its plan to limit the spread of extremism. In Iraq, the Canadian government has pledged CAD200 million to the government of Iraq to ensure a return to stable, inclusive democracy.\footnote{Canada pledges humanitarian and stabilization support for Iraq, Global Affairs Canada (Ottawa) 19 July 2016. Date of Access: 6 December 2016. http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?id=1101179.}

Further, the Canadian government has announced CAD8 million in funding for Lebanon in defense, security, and stabilization assistance to help limit the spread of violent extremism in the region.\footnote{Minister Dion announces significant support for peace, security and stability in Lebanon, Global Affairs Canada (Ottawa) 5 December 2016. Date of Access: 6 December 2016. http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?mthd=advSrCh&crtr.mnthStVl=1165789&crtr.yrStVl=2016&crtr.dyStVl=7&crtr.dyndVl=1974.} Minister of Foreign Affairs Stéphane Dion stated that this funding will help Lebanon and its host communities build resilience and cope with the ongoing crisis in the region.\footnote{Minister Dion announces significant support for peace, security and stability in Lebanon, Global Affairs Canada (Ottawa) 5 December 2016. Date of Access: 6 December 2016. http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?mthd=advSrCh&crtr.mnthStVl=1165789&crtr.yrStVl=2016&crtr.dyStVl=7&crtr.dyndVl=1975.}

to increase access to justice and accountability for Iraqi and Syrian civilians affected by the conflict.\(^{1788}\) These contributions will help ensure the post-conflict stabilization and rehabilitation of Syria and Iraq. The Government of Canada also announced CAD$453,000 to support the Transitional Justice Coordination Group who work to preserve official documents inside Syria to support transitional justice and build the capacity of Syrian judges and lawyers.\(^{1789}\)

Thus, Canada has been awarded a score of +1 for fulfilling its commitments pledged at the Ise-Shima Summit, and for demonstrating dedication to the fulfillment of each of the three defined commitments through providing financial assistance, putting forth military contributions to the Global Coalition fighting Da’esh, and installing political pressure to find a solution to the Syrian crisis.

*Analyst: Arthur Ferguson*

**France: +1**

France has fully complied with its commitment to supporting displaced persons and their host communities, to working towards long-term, sustainable post-conflict stabilization and rehabilitation of Syria, and to eradicating conditions conducive to violent extremism.

On 26 September 2016, President François Hollande announced plans to shut down Calais, the makeshift refugee camp located in northern France, and disperse the migrants across the country.\(^{1790}\) The decision to demolish Calais was welcomed by the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) and United Nations Committee on Rights of the Child, which cited human rights violations at the camp.\(^{1791}\) Starting 24 October 2016, migrants were moved out of Calais, and ushered onto buses destined for shelters across France.\(^{1792}\) Makehift shelters were also opened across the country to support the displaced persons. On 6 September 2016, Mayor of Paris Hidalgo announced separate shelters for men and vulnerable women and children set to open mid-October.\(^{1793}\) Additionally, French non-governmental organization Emmaüs Solidarité has offered to help set up ten day shelters in northern France, closer to the now-demolished Calais.\(^{1794}\) The shelters will provide medical care and guidance on how to attain asylum before refugees and migrants are processed by the welcome centres.\(^{1795}\)

France is also providing healthcare and educational services for displaced persons both within and outside of France. France is supporting higher education for refugees by receiving Syrian refugees from host country

---


Lebanon, and has allocated EUR1 million to the program.\textsuperscript{1796} On 21 November 2016, Minister of Education, Higher Education, and Research Najat Vallaud-Belkacem announced a plan to provide educational and language support for migrants and refugees.\textsuperscript{1797} The minister urged the state, non-governmental organizations, community actors and citizens to band together to expand national participation in this program.\textsuperscript{1798}

France is also working towards long-term, sustainable post-conflict stabilization and rehabilitation of Syria by providing a draft for a new United Nation Security Council Resolution (UNSCR). On 8 October 2016, France, along with Spain, drafted the text for a UNSCR which called for cessation of aerial bombardment and military flights over Aleppo.\textsuperscript{1799} The text also called for parties involved in the conflict, in particular the Syrian government, to implement the Council’s previous resolutions.\textsuperscript{1800} Furthermore, on 15 November 2016, the United Nations Third Committee Meeting (Social, Humanitarian, and Culture) approved a draft resolution pertaining to human right situation in Syria.\textsuperscript{1801} France co-sponsored the resolution set forth, which expresses concern over the human rights violations occurring in Aleppo.\textsuperscript{1802} The resolution called for the Syrian regime to cease the use of chemical weapons and requested procedures confirming the destruction of the Syrian chemical weapons program.\textsuperscript{1803}

France also made efforts to comply with its commitment to eradicating conditions conducive to violent extremism. The aforementioned draft resolution that France presented to the UNSC in October also called for a halt of all material and financial support to groups associated with al Qaida, Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), and Jabhat al-Nusra.\textsuperscript{1803} On 8 October 2016, French Minister of Foreign Affairs Jean-Marc Ayrault, speaking before the UNSC, argued that rejection of the draft would result in a higher number of displaced persons and refugees.\textsuperscript{1805}

On 14 October 2016, France released a joint statement with thirteen other states asking that the United Nations take action to implement the Secretary-General’s Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism


---
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On 12 December 2016, Permanent Representative of France to the United Nations François Delattre reiterated his deep concerns over violent terrorism before the UNSC. Delattre called for cooperation between international judicial and law enforcement, as this would strengthen the kind of international cooperation which is conducive to preventing the formation of foreign terrorist fighter networks.

On 10 April 2017, a fire broke out at the state supported refugee camp near the port of Dunkirk. The devastation forced roughly 1,500 refugees to flee to surrounding fields. The Ministry of Interior ensured emergency accommodations such as rooms for the most vulnerable were underway. Additionally, the Minister of the Interior Matthias Fekl and Minister of Housing Emmanuelle Cosse asked for the acceleration of availability of places at Centres of Reception and Orientation (Centres d’Accueil et Orientation) where refugees can apply for asylum. On 12 April 2017, the first series of orientations from the Centres of Reception and Orientation began. However, Minister Fekl subsequently iterated that it is unlikely the French government would allow for the reconstruction of the Grande-Synthe refugee camp. Minster Cosse mentioned an alternative in the form of more permanent shelters across the country. In late 2016 Minster Cosse proposed a plan for refugees to be housed in private homes in hopes it would ease the crisis and help immigrants integrate and understand French society.

Thus, France has been awarded a score of +1 for its commitment to supporting displaced persons and their host communities, to working towards long-term, sustainable post-conflict stabilization and rehabilitation of Syria, and to eradicating condition conducive to violent extremism.

Analyst: Sommeyyah Awan
Germany: +1

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to supporting displaced persons and their host communities, to working towards long-term, sustainable post-conflict stabilization and rehabilitation of Syria, and to eradicating conditions conducive to violent extremism.

On 4 February 2016, prior to the G7 Summit, Chancellor Angela Merkel pledged EUR2.3 billion for the period of 2016 to 2018 “to help resolve the refugee crisis in Syria and its neighbouring countries.” Part of this funding was allocated to the “Partnership for Prospects” employment program, which tries “to give refugees prospects of employment where they areas so that they can earn a living. A total of 500,000 jobs are to be created in the region in order to support the establishment of community centres, schools, and hospitals, that will be built by refugees.” After the G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration was released on 27 May 2016, Germany disbursed much of this funding.

On 1 July 2016, Heiko Thoms, German Ambassador to the United Nations, made a statement at the UN General Assembly on global counter-terrorism strategy. He noted several existing German laws which counter terrorist activities. For example, in Germany, it is illegal for someone to support or be a member of a terrorist organization, and it is illegal to visit a terrorist training camp abroad. The ambassador reiterated support for the Secretary-General’s Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism. He also announced that Germany is creating a National Action Plan which will focus on the prevention of extremism and promotion of democracy.

On 5 July 2016, German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier stated that humanitarian aid had successfully reached two besieged cities in Syria: Arbin and Zamalka.

On 11 July 2016, Foreign Minister Steinmeier made a statement about Germany’s support for the World Food Programme (WFP) Innovation Accelerator, a project geared towards innovating food aid. In this statement, Steinmeier underlined that Germany has donated EUR570 million in humanitarian assistance to the WFP for Syria and the surrounding region for 2016.

In August 2016, Frank-Jürgen Weise, Head of Germany’s Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, said that Germany is preparing to receive 250,000 to 300,000 refugees in 2017.

In September 2016, Germany funded humanitarian assistance delivered to 60,000 people in Madaya, Zabadani, Foua and Kefraya in Syria by the WFP in coordination with the Syrian Arab Red Crescent.

---

In September 2016, Germany provided humanitarian assistance to the World Food Programme, which enabled the organization to deliver emergency food provisions to Qayyarah, Iraq. Germany has earmarked nearly EUR1 billion in Iraq for 2016, making it the country’s largest donor.\textsuperscript{1825} According to Germany’s Federal Foreign Office, of this EUR1 billion, EUR500 million will support “stabilisation, humanitarian aid and development,” and EUR500 million will be given in the form of a loan towards the implementation of “stabilisation measures.”\textsuperscript{1826}

On 20 September 2016, Foreign Minister Steinmeier condemned the recent attacks which ended the Syrian ceasefire, and reiterated the necessity of a political settlement for Syria while speaking at the United Nations General Assembly.\textsuperscript{1827}

On 23 September 2016, Germany pledged an additional EUR2 million to the Syrian White Helmets, a volunteer group providing on-the-ground humanitarian assistance in Syria. This top-up pledge makes Germany’s total contribution to the White Helmets EUR7 million for 2016.\textsuperscript{1828}

On 14 October 2016, Germany released a joint statement with thirteen other states asking that the United Nations take action to implement the Secretary-General’s Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism (PVE).\textsuperscript{1829} The proposal also committed Germany and other states to the PVE, with states noting that they “intend to: lead by example … act upon the General Assembly’s call to develop and implement national and regional PVE Action Plans, and assist other Member States in doing so” among other things.\textsuperscript{1830}

On 27 September 2016, Bärbel Kofler, Federal Government Commissioner for Human Rights Policy and Humanitarian Aid at the Federal Foreign Office, said in an interview with Passauer Neue Presse that the conflict required a negotiated solution. More specifically, he underlined the “need to work towards a long-term solution that leads to real peace.”\textsuperscript{1831}

On 20 October 2016, Foreign Minister Steinmeier requested that the Bundestag extend the mandate of the Bundeswehr to fight IS for the purpose of denying Da’esh a territorial base.\textsuperscript{1832}


On 19 October 2016, Germany proposed the creation of the Mosul Stabilisation Council, which is aimed at the reconstruction and stabilisation of Mosul if it is recaptured by Iraqi security forces from ISIS. Foreign Minister Steinmeier said, “we need to do everything we can to ensure no new rifts are created within an already weakened Iraqi state” and “we know that we have to act quickly so that those who have had to flee their homes can have the confidence to return, and we can offer them a concrete future for living in their liberated city.”

As of 2 November 2016, the Federal Foreign Office has committed EUR41 million in reconstruction assistance to Iraq for the year of 2016. This includes a commitment of EUR13.5 million to the Funding Facility for Immediate Stabilization of the United Nations Development Programme.

On 2 December 2016, Foreign Minister Steinmeier announced that Germany would provide EUR50 million in humanitarian aid to Aleppo, Syria. These funds will go to several organizations, and are earmarked to provide “food, accommodation and medical assistance … in and around the besieged city.” Minister Steinmeier also urged involved parties to resume discussions of a ceasefire.

In 2016, Germany made directed multilateral contributions through the WFP to Iraq in the amount of USD41,340,782 and to the Syrian Arab Republic in the amount of USD259,382,037. Although it is unclear how much of this funding was contributed during the compliance period, Germany has also provided funding during 2017. To date, it has directed USD15,923,567 in multilateral contributions to Syria.

In January 2017, the Federal Cabinet of Germany approved a bill which improved the country’s ability to deport persons seeking asylum whose applications are rejected or who lack appropriate travel documentation. The bill also enables the state to keep persons awaiting deportation in custody, especially if they are considered a security threat.

Thus, Germany has been awarded a score of +1 in its efforts to address support for displaced persons and their host communities, support sustainable post-conflict stabilization and rehabilitation of Syria, and eradicate conditions conducive to violent extremism.

*Analyst: Janelle Deniset*

---


Italy: 0

Italy has partially complied with its commitment to support displaced persons and their host communities, to help eliminate conditions that permit the spread of violent extremism, and to work towards a long-term, sustainable post-conflict stabilization and rehabilitation of Syria.

Italy has exceeded Greece in accepting Syrian refugees and has taken substantive measures to address the issue of the Syrian refugee migration crisis.\(^\text{1841}\) According to recent statistics, Italy has seen the arrival of more Syrian migrants in 2016 than in 2015. This year alone, Italy has received about 171,000 migrants.\(^\text{1842}\) The Italian Ministry of Interior Figures states that there has been an increase by 15 per cent in the refugee arrival as compared to last year.\(^\text{1843}\)

Many Syrian refugees claim that the asylum system in Italy is “notoriously bad.”\(^\text{1844}\) The refugee registration procedure is inefficient, as none of the authorities present at the port or the asylum centre conduct checks over the refugees.\(^\text{1845}\) However, Italy is also one of the countries that has provided financial aid to Syrian refugees, in the amount of GBP64,432,296. Italy has provided aid in terms of setting up asylum centres and camps, food aid, medical aid, legal aid, and Italian lessons to the refugees,\(^\text{1846}\) along with allocating them EUR2.50 per day in the form of pocket money.\(^\text{1847}\) After a period of six months, refugees will also be granted a residence permit along with a work permit.\(^\text{1848}\)

On 14 September 2016, the Italian Cooperation service dispatched a humanitarian expedition from the United Nations Logistics Base in Brindisi to disperse eight tons of relief supplies to civilians in the areas of Aleppo, Idlib and Hama. This aid included tents, blankets, plastic canopies for temporary shelter, electric generator and first-aid kits.\(^\text{1849}\)

On 19 September 2016, the United Nations General Assembly introduced the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants in order to assist Syrian refugees and reduce human suffering. According to the reports of the UNHCR, Italy has contributed EUR2 million to UNHCR to set up “health and sanitation interventions in Lebanon and Jordan.”\(^\text{1850}\) The World Bank Group has increased funding for refugees to help

---


host countries create jobs and improve their well-being.\textsuperscript{1851} The Prime Minister of Italy, Matteo Renzi, urged the international community to work towards the refugee crisis and solve the issue, aiming for long-term sustainability.\textsuperscript{1852} He insisted that “we have to save lives now” as evidenced in Italy’s plan to work with Africa to combat the root causes of migration.\textsuperscript{1853} Italy’s contribution is considered to be a part of the “humanitarian aid package.”

On 30 January, 2017, the Italian government and church officials welcomed 41 Syrian refugees at Rome’s airport. These refugees were resettled in Italy through the “humanitarian corridor” agreement between the Italian government and a Catholic-Protestant coalition. The abovementioned 41 Syrians were brought to Italy by the Sant’Egidio Community and the Federation of Evangelical Churches in Italy, which works to provide safe passage to Italy in an attempt to counter deadly smuggling rings working in the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{1854} The project is facilitated through a collaboration with aid workers on the ground in Lebanon who arrange for visas through the Italian embassy; once in Italy, the church groups “take charge of finding the refugees housing, schooling and other immediate services to help them integrate into Italian society.”\textsuperscript{1855}

On 15 February 2017, it was reported that some residents of Italy belonging to the Syrian community contributed by providing food and medical aid to residents of Lattakia, which will be further distributed to four ministries.\textsuperscript{1856}

Thus, Italy gets a score of 0 for its commitment to supporting displaced persons and their host communities, contributing to the elimination of the conditions that permit the spread of violent extremism, and working towards long-term, sustainable post-conflict stabilization and rehabilitation of Syria.

\textit{Analyst: Zaineb Hyder}

\textbf{Japan: +1}

Japan has fully complied with its commitment to support displaced persons and their host communities, to help eliminate conditions that permit the spread of violent extremism, and to work towards long-term, sustainable post-conflict stabilization and rehabilitation of Syria.

Japan has supported displaced persons and their host communities through financial aid that lightens the strain on basic services and helps organizations rapidly distribute resources to Syrians.

On 27 October 2016, Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe hosted a Japan-Jordan summit meeting with King Abdullah II bin Al Hussein, King of the Hashemite kingdom of Jordan, as well as with Japanese and Jordanian delegates.\textsuperscript{1857} Prime Minister Abe acknowledged Jordan as an essential presence in the Middle East, and sought to alleviate the economic and social burdens experienced by Jordan due to its generosity towards

---


Subsequently, Abe announced that the Japanese government would provide Jordan with JPY30 billion as part of a new development policy loan. The summit meeting ended with the Japanese ambassador to Jordan, Shuichi Sakurai, and the minister of planning and international cooperation of the Hashemite kingdom of Jordan, Imad Najib Fakhoury, signing a JPY1 billion grant to provide Jordan with security equipment made in Japan. The grant is intended to 1) stabilize Jordan by improving security; and 2) facilitate Japanese companies’ overseas expansion. The press release on the signing of this grant additionally states: “Terrorists are feared to flow into Jordan along with Syrian refugees. This grant is thus intended to improve security in Jordan by keeping terrorists, and possibly refugees themselves, out of the country, and to support Japanese companies. It does not seek to support displaced persons or to eradicate conditions conducive to violent extremism or to stabilize the situation in Syria itself.

On 2 August 2016, the Japanese government revealed that it would contribute an emergency grant aid of USD300,000 to UNICEF and the World Health Organization. Due to the lack of public health services in Syria, there has been an increase in vaccine-preventable diseases in the region. The purpose of this emergency grant aid is to support nationwide multi-antigen vaccination campaigns in Syria.

On 16 September 2016, Japan also distributed an emergency grant aid of USD4.7 million to three organizations, including the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), to help improve humanitarian efforts in Syria. These efforts provide water, basic hygiene, education and healthcare to areas where access has been limited as a result of heavy fighting. Syrian refugees and their host communities in Jordan also receive education and vocational training by means of this funding.

On 19 September 2016, at the United Nations Summit for Refugees and Migrants, Prime Minister Abe pledged to provide an assistance package of approximately USD2.8 billion to refugees from 2016 to 2018.

This package will go towards providing refugees, migrants and their host communities with humanitarian aid and resources that will promote self-sufficiency.
On 28 March 2017 Japan extended its emergency grant aid of USD15 million to the World Bank’s Global Concessional Financing Facility. This fund will go towards providing emergency health and medical care assistance for Syrian refugees and their host communities in Jordan.

Japan has also taken steps to help eliminate conditions that permit the spread of violent extremism.

On 14 October 2016, Japan released a joint statement with thirteen other states asking that the United Nations take action to implement the Secretary-General’s Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism (PVE). The proposal also committed Japan and other states to the PVE, which states that they “intend to: lead by example ... act upon the General Assembly's call to develop and implement national and regional PVE Action Plans, and assist other Member States in doing so among other things.”

Japan has also taken some action to work towards the cessation of hostilities in Syria. On 8 December 2016, Japan collaborated with Canada and several other nations on a letter to the United Nations Secretary General that requested a formal plenary session to discuss the situation in Syria and encourage action. During that meeting, the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations Koro Bessho, called for a “prompt cessation of hostilities” and a political process to end the conflict based on UN resolution 2254.

On 12 September 2016, Foreign Minister Fumio Kishida issued a statement in which he applauded the United States and Russia for coming to an agreement of nationwide cessation of hostilities. In conjunction with the improvement of humanitarian efforts, Kishida believed that this would lead to progress in Syria's political process.

On 21 September 2016 Foreign Minister Kishida, held a meeting with Sergey Lavrov, the minister of foreign affairs of the Russian Federation. During this meeting, Foreign Minister Kishida informed Foreign Minister Lavrov of his concern that the recent agreement between Russia and the US was in danger. Indicating the importance of having a ceasefire not only for the safe distribution of resources but also for potential talks of peace and democracy, Foreign Minister Kishida urged Russia to uphold its prior agreement.

---


On 6 April 2017, Foreign Press Secretary Norio Maruyama expressed Japan’s deep concern regarding the reported use of chemical weapons during an airstrike on northwestern Syria on 4 April 2017. Maruyama strongly condemned the use of any chemical weapons, and stated Japan’s intentions to coordinate with the international community in order to achieve the cessation of all violence.

Thus, Japan has provided some support for displaced people and has encouraged countries to support the UN’s Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism and has supported further dialogue on the issue. It therefore receives a score of 0.

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitments to support displaced persons and their host communities, to work towards long-term, sustainable, post-conflict stabilization and rehabilitation of Syria, and to eradicate conditions conducive to violent extremism.

The UK has taken action to fulfil its commitment to support displaced persons and their host communities during the compliance period.

The United Kingdom is committed to helping resettle thousands of refugees; by 2020, the government aims to have accepted 20,000 Syrians. For five years, refugees will have Humanitarian Protection status; after those five years, individuals can apply for permanent residence. Individuals will also be quickly assimilated into British society with provisions regarding employment and education. Where housing is concerned, the majority of Syrian refugees will be housed in the private sector. To this end, the UK government has come up with a series of provisions to incentivize landlords to rent out apartments to refugees.

Nonetheless, some officials are concerned that the UK will not be able to resettle 20,000 refugees in the next couple of years. Some believe that approximately 5,000 additional homes and over 10,000 additional school placements would be needed in order to successfully accommodate this number. Despite these concerns, the home secretary recently stated there are enough spots for refugees, though not all concerns regarding insufficient placements have been addressed by the government. Further, Britain has committed GBP10 million to teach incoming Syrians English. There has been a lack of access to English classes for refugees; however, new funding commitments to these lessons will help remedy this problem for immigrants.
On 4 April 2017, the British government announced that it was providing GBP160 million in new funding for Syrian refugees and host communities in Jordan and Lebanon. This money, in addition to GBP840 million that was promised last year, will “focus on providing more education, skills and jobs for refugees and others in countries like Jordan that border Syria.” In particular, it will provide “new support and advice to small- and medium-sized businesses in Lebanon to create more jobs for host communities and Syrian refugees,” in addition to “education for tens of thousands of children in Jordan and Lebanon over the next 3 years.”

On 4-5 April 2017, the UK co-hosted the Brussels Conference on Supporting the Future of Syria and the Region, along with the United Nations, Germany, the EU, Kuwait, Norway and Qatar. The conference raised financial support “in order to meet the massive needs of the populations inside Syria and in neighbouring countries, and strengthen the resilience of host communities.” Participants in the conference also discussed the political situation in Syria. In a Joint Declaration, they “re-iterated their full support and commitment to the UN-moderated intra-Syrian talks in Geneva,” encouraged all sides to comply with the ceasefire and suggested that the Astana meetings could strengthen the ceasefire.

The UK is also committed to creating a long-term sustainable Syria. Military forces are partnering with the New Syrian Army against the Islamic State. In 2016, the UK’s focus will be on supporting the UN Secretary General’s Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism. The government believes that supporting these types of initiatives will help prevent the spread of extremism on a global scale.

The UK has committed to stopping extremist behaviour in Syria and surrounding countries. The government of the United Kingdom has stated its willingness to empower currently subjugated women in civic discussion regarding the creation of peace in their home countries. The government of the United Kingdom believes that this form of civic engagement will help counteract extremist rhetoric, and will aid in the empowerment of women and girls. Further, the UK is taking action to prevent the likelihood of a terrorist attack on its soil. The government is providing all citizens with the Stop Terrorists’ and Extremists’ Online Presence reporting tool, and anonymous reports can be made to police as well. The UK also advocates overall heightened awareness of one’s surroundings; if anything is suspicious, civilians are told, then it should be reported. The...
government hopes that these initiatives will reduce the likelihood of a terrorist attack and the spread of extremist beliefs on United Kingdom soil.\textsuperscript{1897}

Thus, the United Kingdom has been awarded a score of +1 for its aid to Syrian refugees and other host countries, as well as for its efforts towards the empowerment of refugees.

\textit{Analyst: Mariah Stewart}

\textbf{United States: 0}

The United States has partially complied with its commitment to support displaced persons and their host communities, work towards a long-term, sustainable post-conflict stabilization and rehabilitation of Syria, and eradicate conditions conducive to violent extremism. The US has done this by accepting Syrian refugees, helping regions hosting refugees, and laying out guidelines geared at preventing violent extremism.

On 29 August 2016, Secretary of State John Kerry announced in a press statement that the United States had reached President Obama’s goal of admitting 10,000 refugees from Syria.\textsuperscript{1898} In addition, the Obama administration set a new goal, seeking to admit 110,000 refugees to the United States, including many Syrian refugees over the fiscal year of 2017 beginning on 1 October 2016.\textsuperscript{1899} On 27 September 2016, the US Department of State stated in a fact sheet that they were providing more than USD364 million to Syria and the surrounding region, bringing total humanitarian assistance to USD5.9 billion since the start of the conflict.\textsuperscript{1900} Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in Lebanon and the Lebanese government will receive over USD36 million (for a total of USD1.2 billion since 2012) to help with providing education, safe shelters, mental healthcare, and more humanitarian programs.\textsuperscript{1901} The country of Jordan will receive more than USD19 million (for a total of USD814 million since 2012) to aid with meeting basic refugee needs and strengthening relevant infrastructure.\textsuperscript{1902} Turkey will receive more than USD25 million (for a total of USD440 million since 2012) to address the humanitarian needs of the 2.7 million refugees in it.\textsuperscript{1903} Iraq and Egypt will both receive more than USD7 million towards the establishment of more refugee camps and the provision of protection and assistance to refugees in both established and new camps.\textsuperscript{1904}

On 27 January 2017, a newly elected President Donald Trump passed executive order 13769 suspending US Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP) for 120 days and indefinitely barring entry to any Syrian refugee.\textsuperscript{1905} On 3 February 2017, Judge James L. Robart issued a temporary restraining order halting President Trump’s


executive order 13769.\textsuperscript{1906} On 9 February 2017, a panel of three judges from ninth US Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the suspension of the executive order after an appeal by the Department of Justice.\textsuperscript{1907}

On 6 March 2017, President Trump signed executive order 13780 again suspending USRAP, suspending the consideration of refugee applications for 120 days and overall, reducing the number of refugees to be admitted over the fiscal year of 2017 to 50,000 from 110,000.\textsuperscript{1908} On 15 March 2017 a federal judge in Hawaii issued a nationwide order halting the progress of executive order 13780.\textsuperscript{1909} On 29 March 2017, the same federal judge from Hawaii issued a preliminary injunction on the executive order therefore blocking it for a longer period.\textsuperscript{1910}

While the US has provided aid to host communities and Syrian refugees abroad, its new domestic measures towards refugees do not align with this commitment.

The United States has thus far failed to implement the guidelines set out in UN Security Council Resolutions (UNSCR) 2254, 2258 and 2268. Representatives of the Russian and US governments reached a tentative cease-fire agreement with the Syrian government on 10 September 2016.\textsuperscript{1911} On 17 September 2016, the US government confirmed that a US-led airstrike targeting the Islamic State had accidentally killed 62 of President Bashar Al-Assad’s troops, violating the cease-fire; two days later, President Bashar Al-Assad ended the cease-fire agreement.\textsuperscript{1912}

On 3 October 2016, the US Department of State announced that the United States had officially suspended bilateral negotiations with Russia over efforts to sustain a cessation of hostilities in Syria.\textsuperscript{1913} On 15 October 2016, a round of multilateral talks involving the United States, Russia, and other regional powers took place in Switzerland, with no agreement reached by the end of the meeting.\textsuperscript{1914}

On 11 April 2017, the US military confirmed that a US-led coalition airstrike killed 18 of its allied Syrian Democratic Forces.\textsuperscript{1915} On 7 April 2017, 2017 the United States launched 59 Tomahawk cruise missiles at a Syrian airbase that had launched chemical attacks a couple of days before.\textsuperscript{1916}

\textsuperscript{1916} Trump launches military strike against Syria, CNN Politics (Atlanta, Georgia) 7 April 2017. Date of Access: 14 April 2017.
In this sense, the US has failed to ensure long-term, sustainable post-conflict stability and rehabilitation of Syria, and thus cannot be said to be in complete compliance with this commitment.

The US government has laid out guidelines geared at helping to prevent violent extremism, and has provided aid for the empowerment of Syrian refugees and prevention of further radicalization.

On 6 July 2016, the Department of Homeland Security announced a Countering Violent Extremism Grant Program available to non-governmental organizations and institutions of higher education, to be used towards countering violent extremism programs.\(^{1917}\) The program outlines five focus areas: 1) developing resilience; 2) training and engaging with community members; 3) managing intervention activities; 4) challenging the narrative; and 5) building the capacities of community-level non-profit organizations active in Countering Violent Extremism.\(^{1918}\)

As of 27 September 2016, the United States has provided more than USD205 million in aid to NGOs.\(^{1919}\) This funding will assist with the supply of food vouchers/parcels, support to education, access to health and mental health care and the funding of shelter.\(^{1920}\) US aid to non-governmental organizations within Lebanon, Jordan, Turkey, Iraq, and Egypt will be used towards early childhood education for young refugee children, helping to provide a safe space for them to learn and grow, provide vocational training and literacy training, and empower women and educate refugees in general about the wrongs of gender-based violence.\(^{1921}\)

On 20 September 2016, the US government announced the Commitments to the Call to Action for Private Sector Engagement on the Global Refugee Crisis, in which 51 American companies committed to empowering Syrian refugees in the following areas: 1) education: ensuring access to schools and facilitating creation of education programs and platforms for refugees; 2) employment: increasing and supporting employment opportunities and entrepreneurship for refugees; 3) enablement: increasing humanitarian finance, strengthening infrastructure, and supporting countries in welcoming new refugees.\(^{1922}\) The US has laid out guidelines relating to the suppression of the spread of violent extremism and has helped NGOs in this effort as well.

Thus, the United States has been awarded a score of 0 for its aid to Syrian refugees and Syrian refugee-burdened countries, and its efforts towards refugee empowerment.

**Analyst: Adit Tandon**

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to support displaced persons and their host communities, support sustainable post-conflict stabilization and rehabilitation of Syria, and eradicate conditions conducive to violent extremism.

---


Prior to the May Ise-Shima Summit, in February 2016 at the London Summit, the European Union and its Member States pledged more than EUR3 billion “to assist the Syrian people inside Syria as well as refugees and the communities hosting them in the neighbouring countries for the year 2016.”

On 19 June 2016, the EU released a joint statement through its European External Action Service (EEAS) for the occasion of World Refugee Day. This statement reiterated the EU’s continued efforts to share responsibility for displaced persons and their host communities. Representatives of the EEAS emphasized that more than EUR10 billion has been allocated in the EU’s 2015 and 2016 budget to addressing the refugee crisis within the EU and in other host countries.

On 22 June 2016, the European Commission announced projects worth more than EUR200 million to support nearly one million refugees fleeing the war in Syria and their overstretched host communities in Turkey, Jordan, and Lebanon. The assistance package was adopted at the fourth board meeting of the EU Regional Trust Fund in Response to the Syrian Crisis. The board meeting included the European Commission, EU members, representatives from Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey, and representatives of international financial institutions.

On 7 July 2016, the European Union provided an online update about its ongoing initiative entitled “Promoting social cohesion and moderate voice in Syria,” first launched in 2015. The initiative, implemented by Search for Common Ground, is designed to “provide Syrian civil society actors with a tailor-made approach for supporting new and existing initiatives through capacity building, networking, sub grants and continual mentoring to promote social cohesion and non-violent mobilisation and to amplify moderate narratives.” In total, as of July 2016, the EU had contributed over EUR1 million to the project.

On 7 July 2016, the EU also provided an update on an ongoing project entitled “Bridging Syria’s divides,” implemented by BBC Media. The mass media project, aired through radio and online platforms, was designed in 2015 to "build resilience and social cohesion to counter violent conflict and radicalisation across..."
all sections of Syrian society. As of July 2016, the European Union had contributed a total amount of over EUR2 million to the initiative.

On 14 August 2016, the EU declared that its joint police body (Europol) will deploy a team of 30 European anti-terror experts to Greece to single out potential extremists in refugee camps.

On 14 September 2016, European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker said that the EU should play a role in Syrian peace negotiations. Juncker insisted that it was “unthinkable for the European Union not to take part in the negotiations to resolve the war in Syria, and proposed developing a common European strategy for the war-torn Middle East country.”

The EU has also taken some action to counter violent extremism during the compliance period. On 22 September 2016, EU Commissioner Mimica participated in a side event to the UN Summit on Refugees and Migrants. Co-hosted by the EU, the event concerned “the EU’s efforts in integrating a youth dimension in preventing and countering violent extremism.”

On 27 September 2016, the EU launched a EUR348 million aid project aimed at helping nearly one million Syrian refugees in Turkey. The Emergency Social Safety Net program provides Syrian refugees with debit cards to help Syrian refugees purchase food and other basic needs. According to the EU Commissioner for Humanitarian Aid and Crisis Management, Christos Stylianides, it “is the largest ever humanitarian aid project funded by the European Union. It is also the largest ever humanitarian cash transfer program.”

On 2 October 2016, the EU launched the Emergency Humanitarian Initiative for Aleppo, in cooperation with the United Nations. The initiative has two primary aims. The first is to deliver life-saving assistance, such as water, food and medical needs, to a proposed number of 130,000 civilians in East Aleppo. In the statement given on 2 October, High Representative/Vice President Federica Mogherini and Commissioner

---

1933 EU should have role in Syria talks & own military HQ - Juncker’s annual address, Russia Today (RT) 14 September 2016 (last edited 1 December 2016). Date of Access: 9 December 2016. https://www.rt.com/news/359316-eu-juncker-address-syria/
1934 EU should have role in Syria talks & own military HQ - Juncker’s annual address, Russia Today (RT) 14 September 2016 (last edited 1 December 2016). Date of Access: 9 December 2016. https://www.rt.com/news/359316-eu-juncker-address-syria/
for Humanitarian Aid and Crisis Management Christos Stylianides, asserted that “An inter-agency convoy stands ready to move from West to East Aleppo drawing on prepositioned stocks made possible also through EU first line response funding.” The second aim is to facilitate the medical evacuations of wounded and sick from Eastern Aleppo, placing a particular focus on “women, children and the elderly.” The statement made on 2 October also asserted that “The EU stands ready to facilitate and support the evacuation and referral of patients to the adequate medical facilities in the region and if needed to Europe for specialised medical care not available in the region.” In addition to these efforts, the EU also pledged a further EUR25 million in emergency aid relief in order to “support and scale up the first line response of its humanitarian partners to cover urgent medical, water and sanitation, and food assistance in Aleppo and in other priority areas across the country.”

On 17 October 2016, the European Council Conclusions on Syria were published. The EU derided the “deteriorating situation in Syria” and strongly condemned “the excessive and disproportionate attacks by the regime [the Syrian regime] and its allies, both deliberate and indiscriminate, against civilian populations, humanitarian and healthcare personnel and civilian and humanitarian infrastructures and calls on them to cease indiscriminate aerial bombardments.” The EU reasserted its continued commitment to easing the Syrian crisis and called for: “an end of all military flights over Aleppo city; an immediate cessation of hostilities to be monitored by a strong and transparent mechanism; sieges to be lifted; and full unhindered sustainable country-wide humanitarian access granted by all parties.” The European Council Conclusions asserted that these actions were necessary precursors to a viable solution to the crisis.

Between 10 and 11 November 2016, the EU Special Representative for Central Asia hosted a conference on “Preventing Violence Extremism in Central Asia — Challenges and Responses at Community Level.” This conference was, in part, meant to allow the EU to develop a deeper knowledge of violent extremism and the types of initiatives that might be helpful in countering it.

---
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On 15 November 2016, the European Council announced that the EU and Lebanon had adopted partnership priorities for the next four years and a compact which will increase cooperation between the two nations. Specifically, the compact outlines the ways in which Lebanon and the EU will facilitate their pledges made at the February 2016 London conference on supporting Syria and the region.\(^{1950}\) The corresponding European Council press release asserts that, “The objective is to improve the living conditions both of refugees temporarily staying in Lebanon and of vulnerable host communities.”\(^{1951}\) The EU-Lebanon compact delineates that the EU will allocate a “minimum” of EUR400 million in 2016-2017 in order to address the impact of the Syrian crisis on Lebanon, while Lebanon agreed to “ease the temporary stay of Syrian refugees, in particular regarding their residency status.”\(^{1952}\)

On 20 December 2016, the European Union announced that the EU and Jordan had adopted partnership priorities until the end of 2018 and a compact. The EU-Jordan compact delineates that the EU will allocate “at least” EUR747 million in 2016-2017, including EUR108 million in humanitarian aid and EUR200 million in macro-financial assistance.\(^{1953}\) In turn, Jordan pledged to “make it possible for over 165 000 Syrian children to access education and increase opportunities for Syrian youth to receive vocational training.”\(^{1954}\) Previously, on 19 July 2016, Jordan and the EU had agreed to “simplify rules of origin requirements to Jordan exports to the EU, provided job opportunities are offered to Syrian refugees, alongside Jordanians.”\(^{1955}\)

On 15 December 2016, the European Council outlined its approach to migration and security. The Council reaffirmed the European Union’s commitment and endorsement of several ongoing initiatives, including the Joint Action Plan on the implementation of the EU-Turkey statement elaborated between Greece and the Commission, the Valletta Action Plan, the Partnership Framework, and EUNAVFOR MED operation Sophia (with the Libyan coastguard) to prevent “loss of life at sea and break the business model of smugglers.”\(^{1956}\) In regards to migration, the meeting conclusions indicated the need for member states to “further intensify their efforts to accelerate relocation, in particular for unaccompanied minors, and existing resettlement schemes.”\(^{1957}\) Finally, the European Council signaled its intention to work towards “achieving consensus on the EU’s asylum policy during the incoming Presidency.”\(^{1958}\)

In early January 2017, the EU conducted the second round of meetings pertaining to the European Union’s Regional Initiative on the future of Syria by holding a series of bilateral meetings with the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Iran, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey and

---


---
Qatar. The initiative attempts to “identify common ground on the post-conflict arrangements for Syria, and on reconciliation and reconstruction once a credible political transition is firmly under way.”

On 13 January 2017, the United Nations High Commission on Refugees urged EU members to increase aid and assistance to refugees facing the harsh European winter. Spokesperson Cécile Pouilly told a press briefing in Geneva “[w]e are extremely worried about continued reports of push-backs in all countries along the Western Balkans. These practices are simply unacceptable and must be halted, as they place the lives of refugees and migrants at heightened risk and violate their most fundamental rights.”

On 2 March 2017, the European Commission warned EU member states that it will “accept no more excuses” on their failure to properly fulfill refugee resettlement commitments. EU member states have only met eight per cent of their overall commitments to reallocate refugees from unsanitary and cramped camps mostly situated in Greece and Italy — that is only 13,546 relocations, with 3,936 from Italy and 9,610 from Greece.

On 14 March 2017, Medecins Sans Frontieres released a report indicating an “increase in suicide attempts and cases of physical self-harm.” As well as mental distress, “asylum seekers who are stuck in the Balkans have reported being beaten up by police and border guards, bitten by police dogs and repelled with tear gas and pepper spray.”

On 14 April 2017, Turkey continued to issue threats of suspending the refugee deal between Turkey and the EU under the basis of political tensions between Turkey and EU members.

Thus, the EU has been awarded a score of +1 in its efforts to address support for displaced persons and their host communities, support a sustainable post-conflict stabilization and rehabilitation of Syria, and eradicate conditions conducive to violent extremism.

Analyst: Ebrahim M.R. Lababidi

---
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“We remain committed to the universalization of the treaties and conventions relevant to, amongst others, preventing and combating the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, in particular the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention.”

G7 Isle-Shima Leaders’ Declaration on Non-proliferation and Disarmament

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>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

The potential that weapons of mass destruction (WMD) have to cause unprecedented levels of destruction and human suffering serves as a reminder of the dangers of conflict escalation and instability for the international security environment. As the global community continues to grapple with threats emanating from active theatres of conflict — notably in Syria and Ukraine — as well as persistent attempts by North Korea to develop its nuclear weapons program, the risk of further instability remains high. As such, the G7 has committed to promoting international cooperation to “combating the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.”1968 This pledge represents a continuation of the G7’s policy combating proliferation. For example, in 2002 the G7 initiated a ten year Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction initiative aimed at preventing terrorists and other proliferators from acquiring and developing weapons of mass destruction.1969 Having raised USD20 billion, the initiative was later extended in 2011.1970

As the host country for the 2016 Ise-Shima Summit, Japan ensured that WMD would remain a priority on the G7’s agenda, and placed special emphasis on the dangers of nuclear proliferation. In the Leaders’ Declaration, G7 members reasserted their “commitment to seeking a safer world for all and to creating the conditions for a world without nuclear weapons in a way that promotes international stability.”1971

Prior to this, the G7 Foreign Ministers met on 10 and 11 April 2016 in Hiroshima.1972 During this time, they visited the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum, and the Cenotaph for Atomic Bomb Victims.1973 They also
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approved the Hiroshima Declaration on Nuclear Disarmament and Non-Proliferation, in which G7 members re-stated their “strong commitment” to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). This is in accordance with Article IV of the NPT, which recognizes “the inalienable right of all the Parties to … develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes,” and with Article VI, which calls for the pursuit of “effective measures relating to … complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.”

The G7 also placed an emphasis on the importance of the non-proliferation of chemical, biological, and toxic weapons at the Ise-Shima Summit through its support for the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC) and the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC). In line with these treaties, the G7 aims to eliminate and prevent “the development, production and stockpiling of an entire category of weapons of mass destruction.”

Commitment Features

This commitment states that G7 members “remain committed to the universalization of treaties and conventions” that are focused on “preventing and combating the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.” The term “remain[ing] committed” means that this commitment has been made in the past. However, new efforts in this area must be made for G7 members to achieve compliance.

The primary goal of the commitment is to achieve the “universalization” of the named treaties, which can be defined as taking steps to ensure that all states have signed and ratified the agreements, so that the treaties apply to all. The commitment concentrates on the NPT, the CWC and the BTWC, but is not limited to these agreements.

The NPT entered into force in 1970, and “represents the only binding commitment in a multilateral treaty to the goal of disarmament by the nuclear-weapon States.” Currently, only Israel, India, and Pakistan are not signatories, while North Korea withdrew in 2003. The main principles of the NPT include a commitment by states without nuclear weapons “not to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons” and a pledge by nuclear-weapon states not to give them to others or help others acquire them. The International Atomic Energy Agency has been tasked with the job of ensuring that states are adhering to this treaty. Finally,

---

NPT signatories have agreed to work towards disarmament. Recently, however, efforts to strengthen the NPT regime have stalled. Although NPT parties met at Preparatory Committee meetings to “consider principles, objectives, and ways to promote Treaty implementation and universality” amongst other things, NPT states were unable to reach a consensus at the 2015 Review Conference. However, parties are bound by the conclusions of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. The concluding document “calls upon States to promote universal adherence to the Treaty and not to undertake any actions that can negatively affect prospects for the universality of the Treaty.” Thus, examples of efforts to universalize this treaty could include, but are not limited to, unilateral or joint statements pressuring non-party states to join (or re-join) the NPT regime, in addition to not taking actions that are incompatible with the NPT.

On 29 April 1977, the CWC entered into force. This treaty forbids states from making, accumulating, trading, or using chemical weapons, and requires that parties “chemically disarm by destroying any stockpiles of chemical weapons they may hold” The agreement also created the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW), which helps to oversee the implementation of the CWC and promote universality. Currently, only North Korea, Egypt, and South Sudan have not signed the treaty, while Israel has not yet ratified it. In 2003, the First Review Conference on the CWC noted that it “was convinced that universality and full compliance by all States Parties with all the provisions of the Convention are necessary to the achievement of the global ban on chemical weapons, and adopted an action plan to promote universality,” Thus, any efforts by G7 states to promote the CWC will count towards compliance with this aspect of the commitment. This could include, but is not limited to, statements supporting the CWC, cooperation with the OPCW to hold workshops and information sessions on the CWC with non-party states, and other outreach activities.

The BTWC entered into force on 26 March 1975. As of today, it has 172 state parties and nine signatory states. This treaty “prohibits the development, production, acquisition, transfer, stockpiling and use of biological and toxin weapons.” The BTWC is one of the major pillars “in the international community’s efforts to address the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.” Since its inception, the BTWC has undergone several amendment processes, whereby parties to the treaty have convened every five years at

---

BTWC Review Conferences to add additional understandings to the document. In 2011, G7 Foreign Ministers underlined the importance of creating “tangible progress with respect to increasing mutual confidence in compliance [with] the BTWC as one of the most important global arms control treaties.” An eighth review conference took place between 7 and 25 November 2016. Efforts to promote the universalization of this convention could include statements of support to non-party states to sign and ratify the convention as soon as possible, or contributions of support to help developing countries maintain their commitments under the convention through the assistance and cooperation database or through the “sponsorship programme in order to support and increase the participation of developing States parties in the meetings of the intersessional programme.”

Finally, it is important to note that commitment does not limit G7 members to pursuing only the three aforementioned treaties. The G7 pledged to promote “the universalization of the treaties and conventions relevant to … preventing and combating the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.” In the G7’s joint statement to the Disarmament Commission on the Foreign Ministers’ Declaration, they expressed support for the universalization of several additional agreements. These include, but are not limited to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, the Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation, the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism, and the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material.

Thus, G7 members must make efforts to universalize the NPT, the CWC, and the BTWC in order to achieve full compliance with this commitment.

### Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>The G7 member has not undertaken any new efforts to universalize the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC), or related treaties or conventions OR has taken steps to promote the universalization of only one of these treaties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The G7 member has made new efforts to promote the universalization of TWO relevant treaties or conventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>The G7 member has made new efforts to promote the universalization of the NPT, CWC, BTWC, AND at least one additional relevant treaty or convention.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada: +1**

Canada has fully complied with its commitment to undertake new efforts to promote the universalization of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), and the Biological and Toxic Weapons Convention (BTWC), in addition to at least one other relevant convention.

---


According to the Fifth Regional Review Meeting on Radioactive Source Security, which was released in July 2016, Canada remains dedicated to funding CAD73.4 million annually to the Global Partnership Program (GPP). The GPP aims to promote projects that reduce threats from weapons of mass destruction (WMD) related to nuclear security, biological security, and the destruction of chemical weapons.

On 19 August 2016, Canada “voted against the adoption of a United Nations report … that recommended negotiations for a global treaty banning nuclear weapons.” Canada subsequently joined all other G7 members (with the exception of the European Union) in voting against a resolution to “negotiate a legally binding instrument to prohibit nuclear weapons, leading towards their total elimination” in October. The resolution recognized the significance of the NPT and noted that the UN General Assembly “considers that the pursuit of any such measures, provisions and norms should complement and strengthen the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime, including the three pillars of the Treaty.” On 27 March 2017, it was announced that Canada would not be attending UN negotiations on the ban, as part of a joint boycott. While this could be seen as action to weaken the NPT, Canada has justified its position by stating that it believes that this would “not advance implementation of Article VI and the NPT; and [would] impact negatively on the NPT review process, making a consensus outcome in 2020 all the more difficult.” Article VI of the NPT aims to eliminate nuclear weapons in the future, and several former Canadian politicians have expressed concern at the decision.

On 31 August 2016, Minister of Foreign Affairs Stéphane Dion made a statement that “the international community must hold the government of Syria to its obligations under the Chemical Weapons Convention, international humanitarian law and UN Security Council Resolution 2118 (2013).” Dion’s statement to the United Nations came after the release of an OPCW–United Nations Joint Investigative Mechanism report detailing instances of the use of chemical weapons by the Syrian government on its own people.
In August and September 2016, Executive Vice-President of the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission Ramzi Jammal led an Integrated Regulatory Review Service mission to China for the purpose of assessing China’s nuclear regulations on nuclear and radiation security.\textsuperscript{2011}

On 9 September 2016, former Canadian Minister of Foreign Affairs Stéphane Dion announced that Canada had contributed CAD725,000 to a multinational effort that was coordinated by the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) and aimed to remove chemical weapons stockpiles from Libya, and destroy them in Germany.\textsuperscript{2012}

On 21 September 2016, Minister Dion attended the ministerial meeting of the Friends of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty at the United Nations General Assembly. In a statement at the meeting, Dion noted that “North Korea’s most recent nuclear test … has underscored the urgency and vital importance of the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty [CTBT].\textsuperscript{2013} He continued by asking “states to join Canada in securing negotiations on a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and to work toward the adoption of a fissile material cut-off treaty.”\textsuperscript{2014}

On 21 October 2016, Canada adopted a set of amendments to its sanctions against North Korea, to bring its regulations in line with United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 2270.\textsuperscript{2015} This resolution was made in response to the DPRK’s January 2016 nuclear test, and the challenge such a test constitutes to the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to international efforts aims at strengthening the global regime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.\textsuperscript{2016}

On 28 October 2016, the United Nations General Assembly passed a Canadian-led resolution that establishes a high-level preparatory group mandated to recommend elements of a treaty banning the production of fissile material.\textsuperscript{2017}

Between 7 and 25 November 2016, a delegation from Canada attended the Eighth Review Conference of the Biological Weapons Convention.\textsuperscript{2018} On 7 November 2016, a representative spoke on behalf of Japan,


Australia, Canada, the Republic of Korea, Switzerland and Norway (JACKSN). These states specifically noted that “more work is needed to fully universalize the BWC. We renew our call for universality, and continue to urge all States outside of the Convention to ratify or accede to the BWC as soon as possible. JACKSN members have conducted outreach … to grow the number of States Parties and help new members follow through on their national implementation obligations.” They also stressed the need to improve the Assistance and Cooperation database for the BTWC.

On 10 January 2017, Canada created a new grant “to certify the technical competency of individuals engaged in biorisk management practices in the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) region.” This project is listed as an offer on the BTWC Cooperation and Assistance database.

On 4 April 2017, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau condemned the use of chemical weapons in response to the April 2017 chemical attacks in Syria.

On 14 April 2107, Minister of Foreign Affairs Chrystia Freeland released a statement saying that Canada had altered its Special Economic Measures (Syria) Regulations “to list 27 additional individuals who are now subject to an asset freeze and dealings prohibition.” This measure was taken as “part of additional international pressures on the regime to immediately end indiscriminate violence against its own people, like this month’s chemical weapons attack, and engage in meaningful negotiations.”

Therefore, Canada has been awarded a score of +1 for its efforts to counter the proliferation of WMD since the Ise-Shima summit.

Analyst: Maher Sinno

France: 0

France has partially complied with its commitment to counter the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). It has made some efforts to universalize the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC).

On 21 November 2016, France’s Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Development, Jean-Marc Ayrault, met with Director-General of the Organization of the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, Ahmet Üzümçü, during which time he reaffirmed France’s commitment to working with the organization towards
the elimination of chemical weapons worldwide, and reflected on France’s contributions to the international effort against chemical weapons use in Syria and Libya and the promotion of the CWC.\textsuperscript{2026}

On 20 March 2017, France released a statement of support for the European Union’s recent decision to adopt sanctions against a number of Syrian officers who were involved in chemical attacks against Syrian civilians.\textsuperscript{2027} France noted that “through this decision, the EU signals its resolute commitment to ensuring respect for the Chemical Weapons Convention.”\textsuperscript{2028}

Between 7 and 25 November 2016, a delegation from France attended the eighth Biological and Toxin Weapons Review Conference.\textsuperscript{2029} France acted as a facilitator during these meetings,\textsuperscript{2030} and France’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs addressed the issue of enhancing national implementation of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC).\textsuperscript{2031} Alice Guittion, the Permanent Representative of France to the Conference on Disarmament, also delivered an address at the conference’s closing session. Guittion expressed disappointment at the conference’s outcome, but emphasized that the conference had agreed on some “meaningful initiatives” such as “the need to do more in order to enhance cooperation and assistance.”\textsuperscript{2032} This action demonstrates France’s support for helping states fulfill their obligations under the BTWC.

On 30 November 2016, France, as a member of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), adopted Resolution 2321 in reaction to nuclear tests by North Korea.\textsuperscript{2033} The resolution, which strengthens sanctions against North Korea, noted that the UNSC was “expressing its gravest concern … at the challenge such as test constitutes to the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (‘the NPT’).”\textsuperscript{2034} The implementation of sanctions demonstrates support for universal adherence to the NPT. French representative François Delattre noted that the resolution “sent a message about the international community’s unity in punishing any


 unacceptable questioning of the non-proliferation regime, and its goal was a radical policy change in Pyongyang.”

France has not taken any steps to reduce its own nuclear arsenal. However, France has deposited its protocol to the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone treaty.

In response to its refusal to partake in the UN conference to negotiate a treaty to completely ban nuclear weapons, France’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs responded that it would prioritize instead the negotiation of a fissile material cut-off treaty and the forcible entry of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. This would preserve France’s existing strategic nuclear arrangements, but limit the qualitative and quantitative development of nuclear arsenals.

France has partially complied with its commitment to the universalization of the NPT, CWC, BTWC and another relevant treaty. It has, therefore, been awarded a score of 0.

**Analyst: Jodi Euteneier**

**Germany: 0**

Despite Germany’s long-standing commitment towards non-proliferation efforts aimed at nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, it has only partially complied with its commitment to enact new measures aimed at universalizing the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC).

On 27 October 2017, during a First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly meeting, Germany voted against resolution L.41; a proposal aimed at developing “a legally binding instrument to prohibit nuclear weapons, leading towards their elimination.” The Permanent Representative of Germany to the Conference on Disarmament, Michael Biontino, validated Germany’s position by stating that “negotiations on a nuclear ban treaty without the involvement of nuclear weapon states will be ineffective, [and that in order for] nuclear weapons to disappear nuclear weapon states will have to engage in the process.” He also suggested that, “an immediate ‘ban’ of nuclear weapons without verification mechanisms or restrictions on the production of fissile material bears the risk of weakening the NPT — contrary to the intention of its proponents.” His proposed alternative was to restrict the production of fissile material, referencing a tabled resolution on fissile material cut-off that would aim to facilitate new efforts to renegotiate a treaty on fissile materials.
Indeed, the day before, on 26 October 2016, Germany presented resolution L.65/Rev.1 in cooperation with Canada and the Netherlands. One of the reasons for tabling this resolution was in order to follow the agreement that states made at the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT to “immediately begin negotiation of a treaty banning the production of fissile material for use in nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.” This resolution was adopted on 28 October 2017, and created “a high-level preparatory group” to work on outlining the treaty.

It has also, since 2013, contributed EUR5 million to Syria to destroy Syrian chemical weapons.

On 8 September 2016, Ahmet Üzümçü, Director-General of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) announced that a multi-country effort aimed at removing Libyan chemical weapon precursors — for the purpose of destruction — out of Libya to Germany had successfully been completed. Üzümçü thanked “Germany for its leadership and contributions, which are indispensable for the successful conclusion of this operation.” Germany formally proposed that “the chemical weapons … be destroyed at a highly-capable specialised destruction facility operated by GEKA in Munster.

On 13 April 2017, German Foreign Minister Sigmar Gabriel released a statement on the Khan Sheikhoun chemical weapons attack in Syria. He noted Germany’s support for the CWC, stating that “it is vital to investigate this incident as rapidly as possible and to send a clear signal that the international community will not tolerate the use of such illegal and inhumane weapons.” He continued by emphasizing that “We express the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons … and call on the Syrian regime to grant the organisation access with immediate effect.”

---


With regards to biological weapons, Germany has consistently been a frontrunner in compliance. Though all signatories to the BTWC have agreed to publish their confidence-building measure returns, Germany is one of a few states to permit their returns to be published to the BTWC’s Implementation Support Unit website, and has campaigned with several Scandinavian states to ensure that returns are published and comprehensible in all UN languages.

Between 7 and 25 November 2016, a delegation from Germany attended the eighth Review Conference of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention. On the opening day of the conference, the delegation made a statement in which it emphasized the importance of universalization as an effort to strengthen the BTWC. The next conference is to have a German vice-chair, where Germany will report on its priorities of improving national implementation of the Convention, strengthening confidence-building measures, and improving the operationalization of the UN Secretary General’s Mechanism through concrete measures such as expert training sessions and workshops.

Germany has also taken steps to support the universalization of other related treaties during the compliance period.

On 2 September 2015, Germany opened up an exhibition on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty at the German Federal Foreign Office. The purpose of this exhibition was to spread awareness about the treaty amongst the public, and encourage other states to agree to it. In his opening statement, Minister of European Affairs Michael Roth urged others to adopt the treaty, saying that “The contract must enter into force as soon as possible in order to develop its full normative power. Eight countries have still not ratified the treaty including the US, Israel, China, Iran and North Korea.”

On 21 September 2016, Germany met with other “Friends of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty” at a ministerial meeting to call for the agreement’s entry into force. Minister for Foreign Affairs Frank-Walter Steinmeier attended, where a joint statement was released. This document noted that “We urge all States that have not yet done so to sign and ratify the Treaty without delay, in particular the remaining eight States listed in Annex 2 of the Treaty. We appeal to all States to make the utmost efforts to achieve its prompt

---
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entry into force." The statement continued, “We dedicate ourselves individually and jointly to continuing to raise awareness among the general public and to advocate at the highest political levels.”

Thus, Germany has been awarded a score of 0 for its efforts to universalize at least two of the relevant treaties aimed at preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

*Analyst: Kristen Shi*

**Italy: 0**

Italy has partially complied with its commitment to take new steps aimed at universalizing the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT), the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), and the Biological Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC).

Italy has taken steps to promote the universalization of the NPT during the compliance period. The Permanent Representative of Italy to the Conference on Disarmament, Vinicio Mati, participated in the 71st United Nations General Assembly’s Thematic Discussion on Nuclear Weapons on 17 October 2016. In a statement at the First Committee Meeting, Mati declared that “We emphasize the importance of its [the NPT’s] universalization and call upon States that have not yet done so to join the NPT as Non-Nuclear Weapon States without delay and without conditions.”

Italy has also openly expressed concern at North Korea’s continued absence in the NPT and its militant nuclear testing procedures during the compliance period, and has also expressed its support in renegotiating trade deals with Iran in light of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

On 27 October 2017, during a First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly meeting, Italy voted against resolution L.41; a proposal aimed at developing “a legally binding instrument to prohibit nuclear weapons, leading towards their elimination.” In a joint statement to the chair of the First General Assembly, Italy highlighted its belief that “without the support of nuclear weapon states and a large number

---


of other countries with specific security interests, [resolution L.41] would be premature.”\footnote{2066} Italy asserted “a prohibition treaty would only engage those states that are already bound by the NPT and would likely mirror existing obligations, without any mechanism to ensure any new treaty obligations were being fulfilled.”\footnote{2067}

Between 7 and 25 November 2016, a delegation from Italy attended the eighth Review Conference of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention.\footnote{2068} On 8 November 2016, the Permanent Representative of Italy to the Conference on Disarmament, Vinicio Mati, made a statement emphasizing that “Universalization of the BTWC remains one of Italy’s top priorities. The broader the membership of the Convention, the more effective its regime. Therefore, we urge, once again, the States that have not yet acceded to or ratified it to do so without delay.”\footnote{2069}

Italy has robust reviewing procedures for its nuclear energy programs, which are overseen by theAdvanced Institute for Environmental Protection and Research and one of its subcommittees, the Integrated Regulatory Review Service.\footnote{2070} As of December 2016, it concluded a review of its four soon-to-be-decommissioned nuclear reactors, along with numerous other nuclear resource management and waste facilities. The service is composed of representatives from other NPT signatories and representatives of the International Atomic Energy Agency; they praised “state-of-the-art standards in decommissioning and waste management,” but highlighted areas for growth in legal frameworks, and a proposed regulatory body called the Inspectorate for Radiation Safety and Radiation Protection in the near future.\footnote{2071}

Italy is also one of five European states participating in a nuclear-sharing program in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and purportedly has US nuclear resources in domestic territory.\footnote{2072}

Throughout 2016, Italy has “actively participated in planning and carrying out the removal of the remaining precursors of chemical weapons still present in Libya in order to destroy them.”\footnote{2073} In addition to collecting samples of the chemical substances, Italy has also provided ships from its Navy and Coast Guard in order "to


escort ... Danish vessels [transporting] chemical agents out of the country to Germany, where they will be disposed of."  

Moreover, Italy has contributed to the universalization of other relevant treaties.

Italy expressed its support for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty during the eighth ministerial meeting, which was held on 21 September 2016. Italy indicated its approval of the Joint Ministerial Statement that was released at this conference. Moreover, in an additional statement that was sent to the meeting, Italy declared that "we call for a prompt signature and ratification of the Treaty by those States that have not done so, in particular by the remaining eight Annex-2 States."  

Thus, Italy has been given a score of 0 for its effort at universalizing at least two of the relevant treaties aimed at preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

**Analyst: Kristen Shi**

**Japan: 0**

Japan has partially complied with its commitment to undertake new efforts to universalize the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC).

On 13 June 2016, Seiji Kihara, State Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, expressed support for the universalization of the CTBT at the CTBT 20th anniversary meeting in Vienna. In his remarks, Kihara stated that the CTBT has contributed to helping consolidate universal norms against nuclear testing and that the development of the verification system under the Treaty has shown remarkable progress. Kihara announced that Japan “will double the number of trainees they invite to the Global Seismological Observation Training course, which provides knowledge and techniques for detecting nuclear tests and an opportunity for outreach to non-singatory states." Kihara stressed the importance of the early entry into force of the CTBT. “We are all fully aware that this is not an easy task, but we should keep in mind that the CTBT is a most practical and effective measure for a world free of nuclear weapons.”  

On 19 August 2016, Japan abstained from voting on “a report recommending that negotiations on a nuclear ban treaty should be launched next year [2017].” Japan subsequently joined all other G7 members (with the exception of the EU) in voting against a resolution to “negotiate a legally binding instrument to prohibit

---


nuclear weapons, leading towards their total elimination” in October.\textsuperscript{2081} The resolution recognized the significance of the NPT and noted that the UN General Assembly “considers that the pursuit of any such measures, provisions and norms should complement and strengthen the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime, including the three pillars of the Treaty.”\textsuperscript{2082} On 27 March 2017, it was announced that Canada would not be attending UN negotiations on the ban, as part of a joint boycott.\textsuperscript{2083} While this could be seen as action to weaken the NPT, Japan has justified its position by stating that it believed that negotiations on a nuclear weapons ban “would undermine the progress of effective nuclear disarmament” because it would damage attempts at cooperation between nuclear weapon and non-nuclear weapon states.\textsuperscript{2084}

On 21 September 2016, Fumio Kishida, Minister for Foreign Affairs, promoted the universalization of the CTBT at the eighth ministerial meeting in New York. Kishida stated that “universal condemnation by the international community demonstrates that prohibition of nuclear testing is a de facto international norm. In order to make this prohibition a legal obligation, early entry into force of the CTBT is imperative.”\textsuperscript{2085} In his closing remarks, Kishida called upon the remaining non-ratifying states to sign and ratify the CTBT.\textsuperscript{2086} The CTBT has been recognized as an instrument that “constrains the development and qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and thereby provides and effective disarmament and non-proliferation measure.”\textsuperscript{2087}

On 18 October 2016, Japan’s Toshio Sano stressed the importance of universalizing the CWC at the 21st Session on Disarmament and International Security. Highlighting the deep concerns associated with the danger of non-state actors’ and terrorist groups’ obtaining and using chemical and biological weapons, Sano emphasized that “we must definitely prevent chemical weapons and toxic chemicals from falling into the wrong hands.”\textsuperscript{2088} Sano stated that Japan was ready to work with the Security Council and offer its cooperation and assistance for those state parties in need.\textsuperscript{2089} Reporting on Japan’s efforts to fulfill its Chemical Weapons Convention obligations, Sano stated that consistent progress was being made in destroying abandoned chemical weapons in China.\textsuperscript{2090}

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
On 11 November 2016, Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe and Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi signed a nuclear cooperation agreement in which Japan agreed to sell India civil nuclear power equipment and technology. This is Japan’s first such deal with a non-signatory of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. The nuclear pact has raised concerns about a risk of Japan’s technology being diverted to India’s nuclear weapons program. Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe insisted that the agreement “is in line with Japan’s position to promote non-proliferation to create a world without nuclear weapons.” This agreement sets a legal framework to assure that India acts responsibly for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy,” Abe said, adding that it gets India to effectively participate in the non-proliferation treaty framework.

Between 7 and 25 November 2016, a delegation from Japan attended the Eighth Review Conference of the Biological Weapons Convention. On 7 November 2016, a representative spoke on behalf of Japan, Australia, Canada, Korea, Switzerland and Norway (JACKSN). These states specifically noted that “More work is needed to fully universalize the BWC. We renew our call for universality, and continue to urge all States outside of the Convention to ratify or accede to the BWC as soon as possible. JACKSN members have conducted outreach … to grow the number of States Parties and help new members follow through on their national implementation obligations.” They also stressed the need to improve the Assistance and Cooperation database for the BTWC.


representative Koro Bessho stated that the sanctions were meant to encourage North Korea to “abandon its nuclear ambitions and to return to the negotiating table.”

Thus, Japan has been awarded a score of 0 for its efforts to promote the universalization of two treaties or conventions relevant to preventing and combating the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, particularly, the CWC and the CTBT.

**United Kingdom: −1**

The United Kingdom has not complied with its commitment to undertake new efforts to universalize the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC). However, the UK has continued to pursue its long-term Counter-Proliferation Strategy, which is of some relevance to nuclear and biological security objectives.

The Counter-Proliferation Strategy has several programs under its umbrella including the Global Threat Reduction Programme and the International Biological Security Programme. The UK also has a broader Security Programme in place, part of which relates to its Counter-Proliferation Strategy. Furthermore, the UK has no biological or chemical weapons but has a small maritime nuclear arsenal that was recently reduced.

During 2014 and 2015, the UK spent GBP14.1 million on matters related to chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear security. The Global Threat Reduction Programme focuses on nuclear and radiological security objectives. Notable projects have included combating the illicit trafficking of radiological and nuclear materials along the border regions in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, initiating a nuclear security culture programme and security workshops, as well as implementing secure and safer nuclear technologies in Ukraine and neighbouring countries.

On 19 August 2016, the UK boycotted a vote on a report recommending negotiations on “a legally binding instrument to prohibit nuclear weapons, leading towards their total elimination.” The UK subsequently joined all other G7 members (with the exception of the EU) in voting against a resolution to “negotiate a legally binding instrument to prohibit nuclear weapons, leading towards their total elimination” in

---

October. 2107 The resolution recognized the significance of the NPT and noted that the UN General Assembly “considers that the pursuit of any such measures, provisions and norms should complement and strengthen the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime, including the three pillars of the Treaty.” 2108 On 27 March 2017, it was announced that Canada would not be attending UN negotiations on the ban, as part of a joint boycott. 2109 While this could be seen as action to weaken the NPT, Japan has justified its position by stating that it believed that negotiations on a nuclear weapons ban “would undermine the progress of effective nuclear disarmament” because it would damage attempts at cooperation between nuclear weapon and non-nuclear weapon states. 2110

On 14 October 2016, Matthew Rowland, the British Permanent Representative to the Conference on Disarmament, made a statement at the 71st United Nations General Assembly First Committee during the Thematic Debate on Nuclear Weapons. 2111 Rowland emphasized that the UK would “continue to press for key steps toward multilateral disarmament, including the entry into force of the comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty and for successful negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty.” 2112

On October 17, 2016, the UK released a joint statement with several states on the BTWC. Within the statement, the foreign ministers “underline[d] the fundamental importance of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention as a key pillar of international security and of the pressing need to enhanced its effectiveness.” 2113

Between 7 and 25 November 2016, a delegation from the UK attended the eighth Review Conference on the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention. 2114 On the opening day of the conference, Director of Defence and International Security Peter Jones made a statement in which he emphasized the need to “meet as States Parties … to address universality, national implementation and other means for enhancing compliance with the Convention’s obligations.” 2115


On 30 November 2016, the UK, as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), adopted Resolution 2321 in reaction to nuclear tests by the North Korea. The resolution, which strengthens sanctions against North Korea, noted that the UNSC was “expressing its gravest concern … at the challenge such as test constitutes to the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (‘the NPT’).” The implementation of sanctions demonstrates support for universal adherence to the NPT.

The International Biological Security Programme focuses on projects that promote biosafety and biosecurity systems, establish biorisk management training, combat infectious diseases, and improve education related to the misuse of biological science. Notable projects have included strengthening biological security and safety in former Soviet Union countries, developing educational resources on biosecurity and dual-use issues, training six Iraqi chemists in detecting chemical weapons, funding of the annual conference on Chemical Weapons Demilitarisation, funding the plant pathogen security project in the Middle East and North Africa, as well as the construction of a regional biosafety training centre in Jordan.

The security program focuses on creating conditions for successful diplomatic engagement with states on security issues and large-scale non-material interventions with regards to non-proliferation. The objectives of this programme include: ensuring priority countries strengthen their capacity to secure chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear materials and expertise from acquisition by non-state actors; ensuring priority countries strengthen their export control regimes; strengthening international regimes, treaties, and initiatives that underpin global non-proliferation, security, and disarmament objectives; supporting the NPT; progressing towards the establishment of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East; and reducing the threat posed by conventional weapons to UK, regional and global stability.

To conclude, the United Kingdom has been awarded a score of +1 for failing to undertake any new non-proliferation initiatives since the conclusion of the previous G7 summit. However, it continues to pursue its long-term Counter-Proliferation Strategy.

**Analyst: Jaspreet Khela**

**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to undertake new efforts to universalize the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC).

On 2 June 2016, the US Department of State welcomed a step by India to subscribe to the Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation (HCOC) and called on all countries who have not done so to

---
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2016 G7 Ise-Shima Final Compliance Report
25 May 2017
286
subscribe to the HCOC as well.\textsuperscript{2121} The State Department defines the HCOC as “a voluntary mechanism that has built a broad international predisposition against ballistic missile proliferation and promotes transparency and confidence building.”\textsuperscript{2122}

On 8 June 2016, President Barack Obama announced his support for India to join the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), a 48 nation body that governs trade in nuclear-related exports and that requires its members to be a party to the NPT. If India’s application to the NSG is accepted, it will be the first member of the NSG that is not a party to the NPT.\textsuperscript{2123} It has been reported that the Obama administration has not exerted any pressure on India to join the NPT regime in exchange for the benefits of NSG membership.\textsuperscript{2124} In fact, “President Obama is lobbying for India to win membership through a special exception.”\textsuperscript{2125}

On 24 August 2016, Ned Price, Special Assistant to the President, Spokesperson, and Senior Director of the National Security Council at the White House, issued a statement in support of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW). Responding to a UN-OPCW report on the investigation into the allegations of chemical weapons use in Syria, Price stated that the United States will work with their international partners to hold accountable those involved in the use of chemical weapons in Syria in 2014 and 2015 “through appropriate diplomatic mechanisms, including through the United Nations Security Council and the OPCW.”\textsuperscript{2126} “The findings by the UN and the OPCW present yet another opportunity for all nations to speak with one voice to address these heinous crimes and to make it clear that the use of chemical weapons is intolerable,” said Price.\textsuperscript{2127}

On 11 October 2016, Secretary of State John Kerry announced at the 30th anniversary of the Reykjavik Summit that the United States is dedicated to promoting the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). In his speech, Kerry stated that the United States is committed to pursuing a vision that would see a world without nuclear weapons.\textsuperscript{2128} “Stopping the spread of nuclear weapons and achieving a world where they no longer threaten our existence will require hard work, cooperation, and patience among all nations. It also requires all countries to abide by and fulfill their obligations,” said Kerry.\textsuperscript{2129} The CTBT is regarded as a core element of the non-proliferation regime and its entry into force as a major contribution to international peace and security.\textsuperscript{2130}

On October 17, 2016, the US released a joint statement with several states on the BTWC. Within the statement, the foreign ministers “underline[d] the fundamental importance of the Biological and Toxin

Weapons Convention as a key pillar of international security and of the pressing need to enhanced its effectiveness.”

On 7 November 2016, Thomas Countryman, Acting Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security, called on all State Parties to the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) to enact measures that would reduce the threat of biological weapons at the Eighth Review Conference of the BWC in Geneva. Countryman urged the state parties “to take steps to enhance national and international capabilities to detect, investigate, and respond to the use of such weapons rapidly and effectively.” Such measures should include developing approaches to coordinate international assistance and response, and providing access to an investigation team. Countryman further assured member states to the BWC of Washington’s commitment towards universalization of the treaty, stating that, “we must take the necessary and pragmatic steps to make the convention stronger and more effective.”

Between 7 and 25 November 2016, US officials participated in the eighth Review Conference of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention. US Ambassador Robert Wood released a statement noting that his delegation’s “goal... [was] to strengthen BWC States Parties’ ability to cooperate and to take effective action together.” He also expressed regret at the Conference’s failure to “reach agreement on a substantive program of post-RevCon work.”

On 30 November 2016, the US, as a member of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), adopted Resolution 2321 in reaction to nuclear tests by North Korea. The resolution, which strengthens sanctions against North Korea, noted that the UNSC was “expressing its gravest concern... at the challenge such as test constitutes to the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (the NPT).” The implementation of sanctions demonstrates support for universal adherence to the NPT.

On 26 January 2017, the US launched an offer of assistance on the BTWC’s database. The state is providing funds “to cover costs associated with participation in a training workshop and examination session geared towards obtaining an IFBA [International Federation of Biosafety Associations] Professional Certification in
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Biorisk Management.” This program is for individuals who are in charge of “biosafety, biosecurity, and biorisk management programs” and who are located in the Middle East or North and West Africa.

On 6 April 2017, the US launched a missile attack on a Syrian airbase in retaliation for a chemical weapons attack by the Syrian government on Syrians in the northern Idlib province. President Donald Trump noted that “there can be no dispute that Syria used banned chemical weapons, violated its obligations under the Chemical Weapons Convention and ignored the urging of the UN Security Council. Years of previous attempts at changing Assad’s behavior have all failed and failed very dramatically.” International law expert Stefan Talmon has noted that this response did not follow the procedures outlined by the CWC, which requires an international investigation, followed by a conference of the signatories, who “can then recommend measures, but only non-violent ones.” Moreover, the action was taken unilaterally, and thus without the support of the UNSC, which could have permitted military action under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. However, the UNSC has been unable to take action on Syria due to conflicting international interests in the region. Since this action was taken as an effort to deter the further use of chemical weapons, it does represent an effort to encourage universal adherence to the norms of the CWC.

Thus, the United States has been awarded a score of +1 for its efforts to promote the universalization of three treaties or conventions relevant to preventing and combating the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, namely the CWC, the NPT and the BTWC.

Analyst: Duja Muhanna

European Union: +1

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). It has worked to support the universalization of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC). It has also supported these instruments through statements denouncing noncompliant countries.

The EU has worked to encourage the universalization of the NPT. On 3 November 2016, the EU Non-Proliferation Consortium held a conference in Brussels for Europe’s non-proliferation community. The meeting focused on deterrence and disarmament, analysis of the Iran nuclear deal, and the role of disruptive technologies in non-proliferation. These talks also discussed the threat of non-state actors, regional concerns in Asia, missile defense, and the disarmament of chemical and biological weapons. This conference was the

largest iteration to date, attended by approximately 300 participants from over 60 countries and international organizations, including Kim Won-soo, UN High Representative for Disarmament Affairs.\textsuperscript{2147}

On 24 October 2016, the EU co-sponsored a seminar on the nuclear weapons crisis in North Korea with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of South Korea in Seoul. Approximately 60 governments and think-tanks from Europe, North-East Asia, and the United States participated. Participants assessed the capacity of North Korea’s nuclear and ballistic programs, reiterated their grave concern about the threat the programs constituted, and discussed how the international community should best respond. Key topics included the effectiveness of a diplomatic response, including sanctions, as well as counter-proliferation options and solutions. Participants agreed that the seminar had been useful, and expressed the hope that dialogue on the issue would continue, particularly in the EU and the South Korea’s bilateral relations.\textsuperscript{2148}

The EU has also made a number of statements encouraging compliance with the NPT and support for the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). On 13 September 2016, the EU condemned “in the strongest terms the nuclear test carried out by the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea [DPRK] on 9 September 2016.” \textsuperscript{2149} The EU demanded that North Korea completely, verifiably and irreversibly abandon its nuclear weapons and programs, stating that it “fully supports the international community’s demand for the DPRK to return to compliance with the NPT and IAEA safeguards at an early date.”\textsuperscript{2150}

The EU again condemned North Korea’s nuclear test at the IAEA’s 19-23 September 2016 meeting, asserting that “the DPRK cannot have the status of a nuclear-weapons State in accordance with the NPT,” and recalling the associated responsibility of all UN Member States to “do their utmost to contribute to curbing proliferation flows from and to the DPRK and their financing.”\textsuperscript{2151} At the same meeting, the EU also reaffirmed its support for a WMD-free zone in the Middle East,\textsuperscript{2152} and urged Iran and, in November, Syria,\textsuperscript{2153} to comply with their Comprehensive Safeguard Agreements helping to ensure compliance with the NPT. Finally, the EU restated that they view the NPT as “the cornerstone of the global nuclear non-


proliferation regime," and reaffirmed “the essential responsibility and the central role of the IAEA in strengthening the international nuclear security architecture.” The EU restated these views on 31 January 2017 at the Conference on Disarmament and emphasised their intention to uphold and preserve its central role during the upcoming May review cycle.

On 8 December 2016, and later on 27 February 2017, the EU adopted further sanctions against the DPRK in compliance with United Nations Security Council resolution (UNSCR) 2321. The sanctions “target North Korea’s nuclear weapons and nuclear programmes, other weapon[s] of mass destruction and ballistic missile programmes.” The Council of the EU released a statement of support for UNSCR 2321 on 12 December 2016, and noted that the DPRK’s actions “underline the necessity of universalisation of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.” This action also represents support for the universalization of the NPT, as Resolution 2321 was adopted in part due to the negative impact that the DPRK’s nuclear tests have on the treaty.

The EU has worked to encourage universalization of and compliance with the CWC. On 6 October 2016, the European Union Parliament denounced the alleged use of chemical weapons by the Sudanese government, following an Amnesty International report that over 200 people had been killed in Darfur Jele Marra since January 2016. The EU Parliament also “recalls that Sudan is a party to the Chemical Weapons Convention and calls for an international investigation into these allegations led by the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW).”

On 8 November 2016, it funded the Stakeholders Forum in Africa, a pilot event initiated to provide legislative support to CWC states. More than 45 participants from 11 African member states attended the event in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, discussing relevant challenges of the CWC’s legislative adoption and associated approaches for mitigation.

---

On 11 November 2016, the EU Delegation to the UN worked with the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs to organize a panel discussion on EU support for the BTWC. It presented the results of four EU-sponsored regional workshops, which occurred in Astana, Kazakhstan, in June 2016, and in India, Ethiopia and Brazil in August and September. It also informed new and interested state parties of forthcoming EU assistance activities from which they could potentially benefit.

The EU also participated in the eighth Review Conference of the BTWC, which took place from 7 to 25 November 2016. During the Conference, representatives reiterated their support for the BTWC as “the cornerstone of efforts to prevent biological agents and toxins from ever being developed of used as weapons,” confirming that all 28 EU members remain party to the Convention. The EU also called for “universal adherence to the Convention,” recommending the adoption of an action plan aimed at universalization, to be coordinated by the Implementation Support Unit and supported via efforts to strengthen the UN Secretary General’s mechanism for investigating allegations of biological and chemical weapons use.

In February 2017, the Implementation Support Unit for the BTWC announced that they were launching “EU projects to support BWC universalization and implementation,” and were accepting applications “from Signatory States and States not party which would be willing to host in-country awareness-raising activities with a view to promoting BWC universalization.” These projects will be funded by the EU.

Additionally, the EU has expressed support for several other non-proliferation treaties. The Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) has been supported by EU statements. When denouncing North Korea’s
September nuclear test, the EU urged them to ratify and comply with the CTBT, arguing that North Korea’s “irresponsible behavior” demonstrated the importance of achieving universalization of the CTBT, calling all other non-member states to ratify the treaty. Furthermore, at the Carnegie Nuclear Policy Conference in Washington DC on 20 March 2017, High Representative Federica Mogherini stated that the DPRK’s recent tests have underlined the importance of the CTBT coming into effect.

The EU has also supported a UN General Assembly Resolution to begin the negotiation of a new treaty to prohibit the existence of nuclear weapons. On 27 October 2016, the European Union Parliament passed a joint motion welcoming a 2017 conference to begin negotiations, inviting EU members to support its convening and to participate constructively in its proceedings. It also called on all nuclear weapons states to reaffirm existing security assurances as outlined by relevant UN Security Council resolutions in order to help strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime.

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to the universalization of the NPT, CWC, BCTW and another relevant treaty. Therefore, it has been awarded a compliance score of +1.

Analyst: Karen Holstead

---


17. Ukraine: Corruption and Judicial Reform

 “[We urge Ukraine to maintain and enhance the momentum in its fight against corruption and its judicial reform, including the Prosecutor General’s office.] We are fully committed to providing long-term support to this end.”

G7 Ise-Shima 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></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>−1</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>+0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

On 2 March 2014, in reaction to Russian interference in Crimea, the G7 issued a statement condemning, “the Russian Federation’s clear violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine, in contravention of Russia’s obligations under the UN Charter and its 1997 basing agreement with Ukraine.”

Further, the joint statement issued on 2 March noted that, “Russia’s actions in Ukraine also contravene the principles and values on which the G7 and the G8 operate,” and as such, the G7 chose to, “suspend our participation in activities associated with the preparation of the scheduled G8 Summit in Sochi in June, until the environment comes back where the G8 is able to have meaningful discussion.” The statement concluded with the assertion that the remaining G7 members would, “support Ukraine in its efforts to restore unity, stability and political and economic health to the country. To that end, we will support Ukraine’s work with the International Monetary Fund to negotiate a new program and to implement needed reforms.”

In reaction to the escalating tensions in Crimea, the Hague Declaration was issued on March 24, 2014 condemning, “the illegal referendum held in Crimea in violation of Ukraine’s constitution” and “Russia’s illegal attempt to annex Crimea in contravention of international law and specific international obligations.” The Hague Declaration also declared the G7 members’ intention to impose collective sanctions against Russia and their decision to suspend Russia from future G7 meetings. The declaration of March 24, once more confirmed the G7 members’ commitment to supporting, “the Ukrainian government’s 2177 Statement by G7 Nations, G7 Information Centre (Toronto) 2 March 2014. Date of Access: 22 January 2017. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2014sochi/ukraine_140302.html.
ambitious reform agenda” in order to create a society, “grounded on a broad-based constitutional reform, free and fair presidential elections in May, promotion of human rights and respect of national minorities.”

At the close of the June 2014 Brussels Summit, a joint statement by G7 leaders commended the Ukrainian election, which had occurred a month previous, and once again encouraged “the fulfilment of Ukraine’s commitment to pursue the difficult reforms that will be crucial to support economic stability and unlock private sector-led growth.”

On July 30, 2014, G7 members issued a joint statement in reaction to the downing of Malaysia Airlines Flight 17 over eastern Ukraine which caused the deaths of 298 people. The G7 called for Russia “to suspend its support for illegal armed groups in Ukraine, secure its border with Ukraine, and stop the increasing flow of weapons, equipment and militants across the border in order to achieve rapid and tangible results in de-escalation.”

Due to these mounting tensions in Crimea, the Minsk II Agreements were negotiated in February 2015 with the aim of reducing violence between Ukrainian forces and pro-Russian rebels. The Normandy Contact Group, comprising the leaders of Germany, France, Ukraine, and Russia, agreed upon a “Package of Measures for the Implementation of the Minsk Agreements.” Minsk II called for a ceasefire, the removal of heavy weapons, exchange of prisoners, withdrawal of foreign forces, constitutional reform by the Ukrainian government, and free elections in Donetsk and Lugansk. However, while there have been no large-scale military operations since Minsk II, elections have failed to materialize and ceasefire violations have continued, with the OHCHR reporting that the highest levels of civilian causalities since August 2015, occurred in June and July 2016.

At the Schloss Elmau Summit in June 2015, the G7 leaders called “on all sides to fully implement the Minsk agreements including the Package of Measures for their implementation signed on 12 February 2015 in Minsk, through the established Trilateral Contact Group and the four working groups.” In conjunction with this attempt to resolve military tensions, G7 members once again emphasized the importance of and affirmed their continued commitment to “comprehensive structural reforms” on the part of the Ukrainian government.

As such, over the past four years, the G7 has been preoccupied by two distinct, yet mutually harmful, issues: the Russian annexation of Crimea, which perpetuated the ongoing military conflict in eastern Ukraine; and

---

deep-rooted corruption within the Ukrainian system. Defined as the “use of power or public office for personal gain,” structural corruption remains a key barrier to restoring Ukrainian sovereignty, given honest infrastructure’s centrality to a well-functioning liberal democratic nation-state. While Ukraine has made progress in the areas of public access to information and governmental transparency, institutional corruption persists and little progress has been made in regards to judicial reform. According to Reuters, “bribery in the court system is seen as a major obstacle to Ukraine’s broader reform effort under a $17.5 billion International Monetary Fund bailout program that political infighting has threatened to derail.” In June 2016, the Ukrainian parliament adopted a bill aimed at reducing police influence in the judicial system. Specifically, the bill aimed to restrict the political appointment of judges and to hold judges accountable in the case of malpractice.

Looking to bolster the above-mentioned judicial reforms, at the 2016 Ise-Shima Summit, the G7 leaders reaffirmed their long-held commitment to supporting Ukraine’s reform efforts. G7 members specifically called on Ukraine to “continue and accelerate” economic and governmental reforms.

Commitment Features
At the 2016 Ise-Shima Summit, the G7 leaders commended ongoing reforms in Ukraine and reasserted their full support of further “comprehensive structural, governance and economic reforms.” The G7 specifically stressed the importance of combating corruption and enacting judicial reform, including within the Prosecutor General’s office. G7 members asserted that they were “fully committed to providing long-term support to this end.”

As such, to achieve full compliance with this commitment, G7 members would need to take substantive action to aid in Ukraine’s structural reforms. Given the ambiguous wording of the commitment, this aid could take many forms. Monetary aid is one possible avenue. In reference to the G7 Action to Fight Corruption, published at Ise-Shima on May 27, 2016, there are many ways in which G7 members can help to combat corruption globally. The G7 Action to Fight Corruption asserts that, “effective law enforcement cooperation requires solid technical capacities worldwide and that building the capacity of countries that are vulnerable to corruption is essential in curbing corruption worldwide, both on the preventive and curative

side, we endeavor to support capacity building. More specifically, the document suggests the importance of strengthening “auditing and accounting processes, civil service integrity reform, anti-money laundering” as well as the importance of transparency. In addition, the G7 Action to Fight Corruption emphasizes the importance of a strong civil society and community of journalists to “expose corruption and bribery.”

While there are a multitude of potential forms of action, the goal, as outlined in the Ise-Shima leaders’ declaration, is to facilitate structural reform in Ukraine in order to combat corruption. As stated at Ise-Shima, the primary targets for this specific anti-corruption commitment are the judicial system and the Prosecutor General’s office.

### Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member fails to take substantive actions towards combatting corruption in Ukraine AND fails to help facilitate judicial reform, particularly in the Prosecutor General’s office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member takes substantive action towards combatting corruption in Ukraine OR helps to facilitate judicial reform, particularly in the Prosecutor General’s office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member takes substantive action towards combatting corruption in Ukraine AND helps to facilitate judicial reform, particularly in the Prosecutor General’s office.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lead Analyst: Sanjana Shah**

### Canada: +1

Canada has fully complied with its commitment to uphold regional security in Ukraine by combatting corruption and facilitating judicial reform.

On 11 July 2016, Prime Minister Trudeau signed the Canada-Ukraine Free Trade Agreement (CUFTA). The CUFTA’s anti-corruption measures obligate both Ukraine and Canada to sanction any form of “undue advantage” given to a public official. Such measures include monetary sanctions that must be appropriate to the gravity of the offence committed. Canada’s Minister of International Trade François-Philippe Champagne noted that “this agreement … includes comprehensive provision in the areas of labour, environment, transparency, and anti-corruption.”

In July 2016, Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau intentionally visited the staff of the Anti-Corruption Action Centre during his first official visit to Kyiv.

On 12 July 2016, Prime Minister Trudeau visited a military base near Lviv to witness the progress of 200 Canadian soldiers who have been training the Ukrainian army as a part of Operation UNIFIER. Since

---
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January 2015, when Canada joined the Joint Commission, Canadian troops have worked in conjunction with troops from the United States and the United Kingdom to provide training for Ukrainian soldiers, including weapons training, tactical movement, communication, and ethics training. As of February 2017, the joint operation trained over 3,100 Ukrainian soldiers.\(^{2211}\)

In October 2016, Minister Stéphane Dion announced that Canada would be donating CAD8.1 million to support the National Police of Ukraine. Up to CAD6.6 million will be distributed over three years in the form of police training assistance, and up to CAD1.5 million will be used to improve Ukraine police equipment “to make Ukraine’s national police service more effective.”\(^{2212}\)

On 28 November 2016, Canada amended the Special Economic Measures (Ukraine) Regulations to add 15 Crimean officials to the sanctions list. These sanctions were imposed in order to exert pressure on Russia to comply with its international obligations to respect Ukraine’s sovereignty.\(^{2213}\)

On 9 December 2016, the Embassy of Canada, in conjunction with the Embassy of the United States and the EU Delegation to Ukraine, produced a joint statement encouraging Ukraine’s anti-corruption reforms. The statement applauded the creation of the High Anti-corruption Court, new financial police, and “the independent and credible verification of submitted e-declarations.”\(^{2214}\)

On 31 January 2017, Jill Sinclair, Executive Director, Directorate of Strategic Concepts, Leadership and Engagement at the Canadian Defence Academy, was appointed as Canada’s representative on the Ukrainian Defence Reform Advisory Board (DRAB). The Ukrainian DRAB was established to provide expertise and recommendations to the Reform Committee as well as to the senior Ukrainian political leadership, including the President of Ukraine, the Minister of Defence of Ukraine, and the Chief of Staff — Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of Ukraine.\(^{2215}\)

In October 2016, representatives of the Canadian judicial authorities met with members of the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine for seven days. The meetings were “organized in the framework of the Ukrainian-Canadian Support to Judicial Reform Project” and were meant to provide a forum for discussing Ukraine’s judicial reform.\(^{2216}\) During these meetings, members of the Canadian delegation discussed several particularities of the Canadian judiciary: on 3 October Senior Legal Counsel of the Office for the Commissioner for Federal Judicial Affairs Canada Ms. Veronique Joly described the process

---


of judge selection and appointment in Canada; and on 5 October the Hon. Paul Crampton, Chief Justice of the Federal Court of Canada, discussed the communication of the judges of Canada, including communication to the public regarding particular events.

On 6 March 2017, Canadian Minister of National Defence, Harjit Sajjan, and Canadian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Chrystia Freeland, declared the extension of operation UNIFIER until the end of March 2019. The purpose of this operation is to “support Ukraine forces by providing military instruction and capacity building in order to maintain the sovereignty of Ukraine.” Some training activities used to increase the Ukrainian Armed Forces’ capabilities include military policing and logistics system modernization. As of September 2015, the Canadian Armed Forces have trained over 3200 Ukrainian Armed Forces. On 3 April 2017, Canadian Defence Minister Harjit Sajjan and Ukrainian Defence Minister Stepan Poltorak met to sign the Canada-Ukraine Defence Cooperation Arrangement. This arrangement further solidifies Canada’s both continued cooperation between the two countries, and Canada’s commitment to Ukraine’s sovereignty, security and stability.

Canada has actively pursued regional security in Ukraine by taking substantive action toward limiting corruption and facilitating judicial reform. Measures taken to combat corruption in Ukraine include the Canada-Ukraine Free Trade Agreement and Canada’s continued commitment to increasing the capacity of Ukrainian troops and law enforcement. To facilitate judicial reform, Canada continues to participate in a knowledge exchange program between Canadian judicial authorities and the High Qualification Commission of Judges of Ukraine. Therefore, Canada has earned a score of +1.

**Analyst: Rebekah Hwang**

**France: −1**

France has not complied with its commitment to take substantive actions in the areas of combating corruption in Ukraine and facilitating judicial reform, particularly in the Prosecutor General’s office.

There is little evidence that France has taken independent actions since the 27 May 2016 Ise-Shima Summit to fulfill the calls of the G7 Action to Fight Corruption. The issue of assisting Ukraine with reforms

---


necessary to counteract corruption has only been addressed in meetings and sub-groups at the European Union. Bilateral relations between France and Ukraine have instead remained focused on the issue of resolving Russian aggression in the Donbas through the Normandy format.\textsuperscript{2225} France has made no public statement since the Ise-Shima Summit that it has committed resources to combating corruption in Ukraine.

On 6 February 2017, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs Jean-Marc Ayrault, took part in the European Union’s Foreign Affairs Council. It was reported in a press release prior to the meeting that one of the topics in discussion would be the positive reforms initiated by the Ukrainian government with respect to corruption.\textsuperscript{2226}

On 28 October 2016, the European Commission, of which France is a member, published a fact sheet stating that the Support Group for Ukraine, established in 2014, has supported reform by providing hands-on advice, expertise and financial support.\textsuperscript{2227} These efforts are a result of the Support Group’s establishment rather than the Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration as they began in 2014.

On 27 October 2016, during a meeting between the Ukrainian Prime Minister Volodymyr Groysman and French Minister of Foreign Affairs Jean-Marc Ayrault, Minister Ayrault was briefed on the Ukrainian Government’s reforms and informed that Ukraine had fulfilled the requirements set by the EU for visa liberalization. France did not offer direct support to combat corruption during the meeting.\textsuperscript{2228}

On 14 September 2016, French Minister of Foreign Affairs Jean-Marc Ayrault visited Kiev with his German counterpart. Meetings conducted during this visit focused on the peace process in Donbas, with only brief mention of France’s “determination to support the necessary changes in the country.”\textsuperscript{2229} No direct support to combat corruption was offered during this visit.\textsuperscript{2230}

France has also not independently acted since the 27 May 2016 Ise-Shima Summit to facilitate judicial reform in Ukraine. Efforts to facilitate judicial reform as of late have taken place through the European Council and the Support Group for Ukraine, rather than through the direct actions of France.\textsuperscript{2231}

On 20 June 2016, French Minister of Foreign Affairs Jean-Marc Ayrault attended the EU’s Foreign Affairs Council in Luxembourg. One of the issues discussed was visa liberalization in the wake of efforts by Ukraine to reform its justice system. France did not offer direct support to reform Ukraine’s justice system.\textsuperscript{2232}

France has failed to take substantive action towards both combating corruption and facilitating judicial reform in Ukraine. Therefore, France has been awarded the score of -1.

*Analyst: Ivan Hsieh*

**Germany: +1**

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to combat corruption and to facilitate judicial reform in Ukraine. Germany complied with its commitment to combat corruption, but did not comply with its commitment to facilitate judicial reform. It has created incentives to help decentralize the energy sector to combat endemic corruption within Ukrainian institutions. In addition to this, it provided consulting services to the Ukrainian government to help address deep-rooted corruption issues and design capacity building systems. Germany has also taken action towards facilitating Ukrainian judicial reform.

On 27 June 2016, Chancellor Angela Merkel and Ukrainian Prime Minister Volodymyr Groysman held a press conference in Berlin to announce a new strategic partnership to reinforce Ukrainian capabilities in resisting and combatting corruption. Decentralization played a crucial role in the fight against corruption. Chancellor Angela Merkel announced “unlimited financial credit” for Ukraine’s energy sector to facilitate decentralization. This is intended to improve the autonomy of the energy sector and its resiliency against energy price shocks. This will provide the necessary stability and capacity to decentralize the energy sector.

Further, on 30 January 2017, Chancellor Angela Merkel assisted Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko in achieving required IMF reforms; these reforms are conditional on significant corruption reduction. Germany provided expert “consultation” which allowed Ukraine to undertake significant economic reforms to secure funding from its IMF bailout package. Domestic reforms targeting corruption, therefore, have received substantive support from expertise and knowledge provided by the German government.

Chancellor Angela Merkel reinforced the centrality of corruption in Germany’s bilateral affairs with Ukraine. She reiterated that “the first priority of our agenda is the fight against corruption.” In addition to this, she committed Germany to “concrete cooperation” with Ukraine in this regards. These efforts are in harmony with its commitment to address and weaken Ukrainian corruption. However, there are few details with regards to what exactly comprises this bilateral cooperation.

On 3 June 2016, Press Secretary Steffen Seibert, on behalf of the German government and Chancellor Angela Merkel, congratulated the Ukrainian government on recent judicial reforms. He applauded the “amendments

---

to the Constitution in the area of justice” that reinforced “the independence [and] the transparency of the judiciary in Ukraine.” He concluded by offering German support to Ukraine once again, but failed to mention any specifics. Most mentions of justice reform in Germany appeared to have been made in passing with little mention of policy details or specifics.

State Secretary Stephan Steinmeier and eight colleagues from other federal ministries visited Kiev on 9 and 10 June 2016 to strengthen diplomatic ties with Ukraine and examine reform progress in Kiev. They sought to obtain a “clear picture” of Ukrainian reforms and promised to support them “actively and resolutely” in their efforts. Further, on the occasion of his trip to Kyiv, State Secretary Stephan Steinmeier published an article on German-Ukrainian cooperation in the Ukrainian weekly Zerkalo Nedeli. There was also a Q&A as well as a short report on the visit published on the German Embassy’s Facebook page.

On 18 January 2017, then-Minister of Foreign Affairs Frank-Walter Steinmeier held an interview with Ukrainian Minister of Foreign Affairs Pavlo Klimkin reaffirming Germany’s “great commitment” to Ukraine in the area of political reform and the fight against corruption. However, no specifics of the commitment were mentioned. He applauded the “profound reform” and encouraged a “[modernization]” of “politics, society, and the economy.” The reforms were welcomed by the German Minister who noted the increased relevance of civil society in Ukrainian politics. Finally, he underscored the need for “more transparency and substantial transformation” in Ukraine.

German Foreign Minister Sigmar Gabriel supported Ukrainian judicial reforms in a visit to Kiev on 3 March 2017. Foreign Minister Sigmar Gabriel hinted that additional support may be available to Ukraine when corruption is more effectively addressed. He linked a reduction of corruption and increased service delivery to economic development, emphasizing the interconnected nature of judicial reform. However, he alluded that “it was important to first ensure a sustainable ceasefire.”

Germany’s measures to support the country are combined in the Ukraine Action Plan, which complements German contributions to the EU, IMF, and other multilateral programs. Approximately EUR110 million in bilateral assistance was made available in 2016, alongside a EUR500 million loan guarantee. The Action Plan contains short- and long-term measures to alleviate acute hardship and catalyze structural problem resolution. Germany has focused on providing Ukraine reform-related aid in Germany’s areas of expertise, including

energy and resource efficiency, trade promotion and infrastructure, decentralization and municipal self-government, the rule of law and combating corruption, as well as civil society, education, research, and the media. Further, Germany has also supported Ukraine’s efforts to reform its judicial system. The Federal Ministry of Justice and Consumer Protection of Germany, via the German Foundation for International Legal Cooperation (IRZ), has offered services and support to the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine that focus on constitutional, administrative, and criminal law, as well as judicial reform.

Therefore, Germany receives a score of +1 for its compliance with regards to corruption and justice reform in Ukraine. It succeeded in providing substantive support and action in combating corruption through decentralization and monetary support to build Ukrainian capacity. Further, action was taken to facilitate judicial reform.

Analyst: Ryan Melnik

Italy: –1

Italy has not complied with its commitment to combat corruption and to facilitate judicial reform in Ukraine.

At a national level, Italy has done little to support Ukraine’s fight against corruption and to facilitate judicial reform. The only substantive, publicized action that Italy has taken in relation to Ukraine since the May 2016 Ise-Shima Summit, is the 20 December 2016 announcement of a EUR1 million donation to support humanitarian aid in eastern Ukraine. Specifically, Italy has donated EUR700,000 to the World Food Programme (WFP) in order to “distribute food rations and cash aid to the most vulnerable civilian population” and EUR300,000 to UNICEF to fund “a humanitarian landmine clearance project.” Davide La Cecilia, the Italian Ambassador to Ukraine, asserted that, “Our contribution to WFP and UNICEF operations will help ease people’s suffering, in particular for the most vulnerable, providing food assistance, increasing knowledge and building safe behaviour practices to deal with the risks of mines.” While this donation is commendable, it does not contribute to anti-corruption or judicial reform efforts in Ukraine.

As such, Italy has been awarded a score of –1 for its lack of support for judicial reform and anti-corruption initiatives in Ukraine.

Analyst: Renze Wang

Japan: 0

Japan has partially complied with its commitments in regards to Ukraine, specifically in relation to combatting corruption and facilitating judicial reform.

In January 2017, the Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko acknowledged Japan’s USD1.8 billion contribution from 2014 to 2016 for structural reforms in law-enforcement agencies, the local police force, and the judicial system. As mentioned, this aid program has been in place since 2014; the only new publicized commitment related to this grant money since the Ise-Shima Summit was announced in September 2016 when Japanese Prime Minister Abe, pledged to provide “approximately 9,000 sets of cold...
weather jackets and trousers for police officers, and will dispatch a survey mission on logistics and the transport system, which is scheduled for November.”

While this may tangentially be connected to police reform, it does not specifically contribute anti-corruption initiatives.

Moreover, in October 2016, the Japanese Ambassador to Ukraine, Shigeki Sumi, as part of the G7 Ambassadors, sent a letter to President Poroshenko highlighting the threats to an anti-corruption system and stressed that “full independence from political interference and undisputed competence of these specialized institutions is paramount for the effective fight against corruption.” In the wake of this letter, Ambassador Sumi, in his video address on behalf of the G7 Ambassadors, called for a continuation in Ukraine’s efforts to fight corruption.

While Japan has continued to vocally support anti-corruption initiatives and judicial reform in Ukraine, no new substantive steps have been taken since the Ise-Shima Summit. That being said, Japan’s long-term financial commitment to structural reforms in law-enforcement agencies, the police force, and the judicial system were ongoing until the end of 2016. As such, Japan is awarded a score of 0.

Analyst: Umaima Ghorì

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to take substantive action towards combatting corruption in Ukraine, as well as its commitment to help to facilitate judicial reform, particularly in the Prosecutor General’s office.

As one of the top three issues on the British Foreign Secretary’s list of priorities, Ukraine continues to receive attention from the UK Government. One such area of support is anti-corruption efforts.

On 24 November 2016, representatives from the UK met with the Prosecutor General Yuri Lutsenko for “the exchange of experience in investigating serious financial, economic, and corruption crimes, [and a] discussion of the prospects of establishing joint investigative teams on most actual criminal proceedings.” The UK stated that it was prepared to help the Prosecutor General’s Office with its reforms, and “in prosecution of the former officials in particular.”

In July 2016, the United Kingdom commenced a commitment of funding (GBP564,000) to the National Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine (NABU), to provide a digital forensic laboratory and specialized analytical system. The new digital forensic laboratory will allow Ukrainian detectives to conduct “full

---


evidential analysis of digital devices and media which will further improve evidence gathering and carrying out complex investigations.”\textsuperscript{2259} The overarching purpose of the project is to, “help increase NABU’s analytical and investigative capacity to fight high-level corruption and bribery in the country.”\textsuperscript{2260}

Additionally, from April 2016 to March 2017, UK law enforcement agencies and specialist training services helped to train their Ukrainian counterparts to combat corruption. The British government donated GBP260,000 to the project with the specific purpose of supporting, “anti-corruption efforts of Ukraine’s law-enforcement agencies by strengthening their investigative and prosecutorial capacity to enable them to fight serious economic and corruption-related crimes more effectively.”\textsuperscript{2261} The project is “expected to contribute to corruption reduction, higher public trust and, in a long-term perspective, will have a positive impact on Ukraine’s socio-economic situation.”\textsuperscript{2262}

Between May 2016 and March 2017, the United Kingdom contributed GBP500,000 to the UK-World Bank “Governance Reform Trust Fund” in order to “provide expert analysis and follow-up assistance to promote reforms, including to Ukraine’s National Agency for Preventing Corruption (support to e-declaration system), public expenditure and service delivery assessments in health and social policy, as well as support to the World Bank’s Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) report.”\textsuperscript{2263}

Also between May 2016 and March 2017, the United Kingdom, in partnership with Germany, supported the “Public Finance Management Reform Programme.” The UK donated GBP1,500,000 with the purpose of supporting “the Ukrainian Ministry of Finance’s public financial management reform action plan, developing the capability of the Parliament of Ukraine and other relevant offices to collate, publicise and scrutinise public spending information, to support improved public procurement practices, thus contributing to reduced opportunities for corruption.”\textsuperscript{2264}

The UK has also taken steps to facilitate judicial reform in Ukraine.

On 23 January 2017, a project funded in part by the UK hosted an expert discussion that covered “issues of functioning of arbitration institutions in Europe and in Ukraine, an interaction between arbitration


institutions and the judiciary, as well as approaches towards the reform of arbitration institutions in Ukraine.  

On 23 September 2016, a project funded in part by the UK hosted a joint conference for Ukrainian judges in order to help them understand new judicial reforms that had been recently adopted. This workshop was one of the products of a project entitled “Support to the implementation of the judicial reform in Ukraine” was created in early 2016. The purpose of the project is “the implementation of the reform of its [Ukraine’s] judicial system in accordance with the Council of Europe standards and recommendations.” As such, the conference provided Ukrainian judges with information on “the criminal liability of judges for the delivery of knowingly arbitrary decisions, and the disciplinary liability of judges for human rights violations found by the European Court of Human Rights.”

The United Kingdom has actively committed to the aims of the G7 in Ukraine by taking substantive action towards combatting corruption in Ukraine and has committed to helping to facilitate judicial reform, particularly in the Prosecutor General’s office. Thus, the United Kingdom earns a score of +1.

*Analyst: Geneva Calder*

**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to support judicial and anti-corruption reform in Ukraine.

In the FY2017 budget request, the US Administration allocated USD192.4 million of Economic Support Funds for Ukraine. These funds are intended to support the Ukrainian government in continuing to address corruption and government reform, among other initiatives. This is in addition to USD15 million in

---


International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement funds to support reform initiatives in justice and law enforcement.\textsuperscript{2270}

The US is also contributing to the USD6 million of support funds provided by the first Global Anti-Corruption Consortium. This initiative, spearheaded by the Organized Crime and Corruption Reporting Project and Transparency International, will connect investigative reporters to facilitate information-sharing as well as provide funding and mentoring for local investigative centers, creating a strong community of journalists who can more effectively detect corruption.\textsuperscript{2271}

The USAID Fair Justice Project helped to organize an international conference entitled “Constitutional Reform: Promoting an Independent, Accountable, Transparent, and Efficient Judiciary in Ukraine,” which was held on 18 February 2016.\textsuperscript{2272} The American Ambassador of the United States in Ukraine Geoffrey Pyatt spoke at the event.\textsuperscript{2273}

On 30 June 2016, the US Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the National Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine (NABU). Through this document, both groups agreed to exchange information and cooperate to increase the efficacy of work on international money laundering, international asset recovery, and bribery and corruption carried out by high-level Ukrainian officials.\textsuperscript{2274}

On 2 August 2016, US Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) officers conducted training for NABU and National Police Officers. This training encompassed weapons training, execution of high-risk warrants and other law enforcement operations, and decision making.\textsuperscript{2275}

On 7 March 2017, the US embassy and EU delegation to Ukraine made a joint statement calling for the establishment of a specialized anti-corruption court. The statement also stressed that the pending National Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine (NABU) audit must be independent and transparent for “an objective analysis of NABU’s operations over the last year.” This statement comes in the wake of the court decision to arrest the Chairman of Ukraine’s Fiscal Service, Roman Nasirov, a decision that the statement lauds.\textsuperscript{2276}

The US has contributed substantially in monetary aid to support structural reform and has strengthened the capacity of reporters and NABU to oppose corruption. Thus, the US has been awarded a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Jeffrey Li}

\textbf{European Union: +1}

The European Union has complied with its commitment to supporting judicial and anti-corruption reform in Ukraine.


In October 2016, the EU reiterated its commitment to “Ukraine’s sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence, and in its undertaking of the necessary political and economic reforms to consolidate a stable, democratic, united and prosperous country.” The Support Group for Ukraine was launched by the European Commission in 2014 in order to provide “hands-on advice, expertise and financial support, and bringing about tangible, positive results for the Ukrainian people.” In 2015/2016 the focus of the EU’s financial support for this initiative was decentralization, economic development, public administration reform, rule of law and anti-corruption. In 2015/2016, the EU contributed EUR15 million to support anticorruption, EUR104 million to support public administration reform, and EUR52.5 million to support the rule of law. These contributions were made with the overarching purpose of increasing transparency.

The European Union’s Anti-Corruption Initiative in Ukraine was officially launched on 1 February 2017. Denmark, specifically the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs or Danida, is serving as the implementing partner of the program. The European Commission has allotted EUR15 million, and the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs has allotted a further EUR1.34 million, over a three-year period to support the program. According to the European Commission, the initiative “constitutes the most comprehensive and robust international support effort in the fight against corruption in Ukraine.” More specifically, it targets four ways to achieve the goal of eliminating corruption: “building and developing institutions to fight corruption; strengthening parliamentary oversight; working with local governments; and supporting civil society organisations and investigative journalists.”

In terms of capacity-boosting, the EU Anti-corruption initiative will strengthen the abilities of newly created Ukrainian anti-corruption institutions (such as, the National Anti-Corruption Bureau, the Specialised Anti-Corruption Prosecution Office, the National Agency for the Prevention of Corruption, and the Asset Recovery and Management Agency) to “investigate, prosecute and sanction corruption.” The initiative will also bolster the existing Verkhovna Rada’s Anti-corruption committee’s ability to “scrutinise corruption-related legislation and to monitor reform implementation.”

In order to facilitate this last commitment, an Advisory Board of international experts will serve as an oversight committee to monitor the Rada’s progress. Finally, civil society and media will be encouraged to participate in anti-corruption initiatives through a series of grants.

Established on 1 February 2016, the Council of Europe project “Support to the Implementation of the Judicial Reform in Ukraine,” was created with the purpose of facilitating judicial reform “in accordance with

---

the Council of Europe standards and recommendations. In conjunction with the program’s continuing efforts in Ukraine, the initiative organized “an expert discussion on the newly adopted law ‘On the High Council of Justice’ and of the Rules of Procedure of the High Council of Justice, and on their compliance with the Council of Europe standards and recommendations” on 24 February 2017. The discussion included members of the High Council of Justice, Supreme Court of Ukraine judges, the High Council of Justice, and members of high specialized courts and appeal courts.

As such, the European Union has fulfilled its commitment to supporting judicial and anti-corruption reform in Ukraine; it is therefore awarded a score of +1.

Analyst: Renze Wang

---

18. Regional Security: Maritime Security

“We reiterate our commitment to maintaining a rules-based maritime order in accordance with the principles of international law as reflected in [United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea], to peaceful dispute settlement supported by confidence building measures and including through legal means as well as to sustainable uses of the seas and oceans, and to respected freedom of navigation and overflight.”

**G7 Ise-Shima 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></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></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>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Background

On 11 April 2016, the G7 foreign ministers stated that “free, open and stable seas are a cornerstone for [the] peace, stability and prosperity of the international community.”²²⁸⁸ "To ensure this outcome, the G7 leaders “reiterate[d] [their] commitment to maintaining a rules-based maritime order in accordance with the principles of international law as reflected in UNCLOS [United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea].”²²⁸⁹

The G7’s reassertion of the need to preserve maritime security builds on the work of previous summits. Academic Magdalena Krakau notes that the issue of maritime security first arose in the 2009 and 2010 G8 declarations, in which member states raised concerns about piracy.²²⁹⁰ At the 2014 Brussels Summit (Belgium) and again at the 2015 Elmau Summit (Germany), member states grappled with the territorial dispute over the East and South China Seas, thus expanding their mandate on maritime security.²²⁹¹,²²⁹²

Most significantly, however, the German government prioritized the issue of maritime security during its presidency in 2015, elevating an issue that had previously been a largely marginal concern on the G7 agenda. The ultimate result of this prioritization was the G7 Foreign Ministers’ Declaration on Maritime Security.²²⁹³

This declaration advocated a collective, integrated approach to maritime security, stating that member states were “convinced that we can comprehensively counter threats to maritime security only if we follow a

cooperative, rules-based cross-sector approach and coordinate our actions nationally, regionally and globally.\textsuperscript{2294} Within this document, G7 members outlined their overarching commitments to maritime security including: “the freedoms of navigation and overflight,” “the rights of innocent passage, transit passage and archipelagic sea lanes passage consistent with international law,” “unimpeded lawful commerce,” “the safety and security of seafarers and passengers,” and “the conservation and sustainable use of natural and marine resources including maritime biodiversity.”\textsuperscript{2295} In conjunction with these commitments, the G7 reiterated its support of the UNCLOS.\textsuperscript{2296}

The G7 Foreign Ministers’ Declaration on Maritime Security (2015) vowed to take action in several specific ways: facilitating regional cooperation to overcome existing tensions and security threats; ameliorating the capacity of states combating piracy; combating human trafficking and migrant smuggling; securing international commerce; and increasing information sharing.\textsuperscript{2297}

At the 2016 Ise-Shima Summit in Japan, G7 leaders reaffirmed, “the importance of strengthening maritime safety and security … through international and regional cooperation.”\textsuperscript{2298} As a result of the emphasis placed on collective action, combined with the enduring concern with piracy, G7 members recognized the importance of regional frameworks such as the Contact Group on Piracy off the Coast of Somalia (CPGS), the G7 Friends of the Gulf of Guinea Group, and the Regional Cooperation Agreement on Combating Piracy and Armed Robbery against Ships in Asia (ReCAAP).\textsuperscript{2299}

In addition, G7 leaders continue to be concerned over the territorial disputes in the South China Sea. The G7 leaders “emphasize the fundamental importance of peaceful management of settlement of disputes” in the region.\textsuperscript{2300} The G7 Foreign Ministers specifically emphasized that coastal states should refrain from unilateral actions causing changes to terrain in the region.\textsuperscript{2301}

As outlined in the G7 Foreign Ministers’ Statement on Maritime Security, released at Hiroshima in April of 2016, the G7 placed particular focus on capacity building in its fight for maritime security. In particular, G7 members committed to facilitate capacity building in regards to, “maritime governance, [the] coast guard, disaster relief, maritime search and rescue, and maritime information sharing and integration, as well as legislative, judicial, prosecutorial and correctional assistance in order to help coastal states to deal with their own vulnerabilities.”\textsuperscript{2302} G7 members further support the promotion of international law, including the law of the sea, and maritime conservation.\textsuperscript{2303}

\textbf{Commitment Features:}
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At Ise-Shima, G7 members reiterated their commitment to: 1) “maintaining a rules-based maritime order in accordance with the principles of international law as reflected in UNCLOS”; 2) “to peaceful dispute settlement supported by confidence building measures and including through legal means”; 3) “to sustainable uses of the seas and oceans”; and 4) “to respected freedom of navigation and overflight.”\(^{2304}\)

First, maintaining a rules-based maritime order in accordance with UNCLOS is defined as acting in adherence with the articles of the convention. The state parties to the convention believe that, “codification and progressive development of the law of the sea will contribute to the strengthening of peace, security, cooperation and friendly relations among all nations” and affirm, “that matters not regulated by this Convention continue to be governed by the rules and principles of general international law.”\(^{2305}\) Maintaining rules-based principles does not require new action, but refraining from diverging from these definitions in actions in maritime security. For example, the use of the Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea and the establishment of an effective code of conduct in the South China Sea have been encouraged by the G7 Foreign ministers.\(^{2306}\)

Second, a commitment to peaceful dispute settlements includes, but is not limited, to adhering to Article 279 of UNCLOS, which states that peaceful means for settling disputes must be in accordance with Article 2(3) of the Charter of the United Nations.\(^{2307}\) This defines peaceful settlement as one that does not endanger international peace, security, and justice.\(^{2308}\) G7 members have supported confidence building measures for peaceful dispute settlements through legislative assistance for coastal states, capacity building assistance for maritime governance, and coast guarding.\(^{2309}\) The G7 foreign ministers have also condemned actions not in adherence with security, such as unilateral land reclamation and outpost building in the South China Sea.\(^{2310}\) An example of confidence building measures for peaceful dispute settlement in the South China Sea would be the establishment of the aforementioned code of the conduct in the region.\(^{2311}\)

Third, there are a number of ways in which G7 members could fulfill their commitment to “sustainable uses of the seas and oceans.”\(^{2312}\) While the Leaders’ Declaration does not enumerate any examples of how to fulfill this part of the commitment, the G7 Foreign Ministers’ Statement on Maritime Security notes that members will work towards an agreement that falls under UNCLOS and would cover “the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction.”\(^{2313}\) Alternatively, fulfillment of this commitment could be achieved by adherence to current articles of UNCLOS that concern the sustainability of the seas and oceans. For example, Article 61 of the Convention states that G7 members should take into account scientific evidence to ensure living resources in exclusive economic zones are not endangered by over-exploitation, put into place international minimum standards for populations of harvested species, and
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contribute and exchange relevant scientific information and fishing statistics with international, sub-regional, and regional organizations where deemed appropriate.\textsuperscript{2314} Similar provisions may apply to the living resources of the high seas under Article 119 of UNCLOS.

Finally, a respect for freedom of navigation and overflight is outlined in UNCLOS Article 87(2) for the purpose of allowing all states to freely operate on the high seas. This article does not apply to a state’s “exclusive economic zone, [or] in the territorial seas or in the internal waters of a State, or in the archipelagic waters of an archipelagic State.”\textsuperscript{2315}

### Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member has failed to adhere to any of the aforementioned four components, OR has only adhered to one of the four components (i.e., maintaining rules-based maritime order of UNCLOS, a commitment to peaceful dispute settlements, sustainable use of the seas and oceans, or respected freedom of navigation and overflight).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member has only adhered to TWO of the four components (i.e., maintaining rules-based maritime order of UNCLOS, a commitment to peaceful dispute settlements, sustainable use of the seas and oceans, or respected freedom of navigation and overflight).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member has adhered to three OR four of the four components (i.e., maintaining rules-based maritime order of UNCLOS, a commitment to peaceful dispute settlements, sustainable use of the seas and oceans, and respected freedom of navigation and overflight).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lead Analyst: Alessandra Jenkins*

### Canada: +1

Canada has fully complied with its commitment to maritime security, as evidenced by actions it has taken to support the four components of the commitment outlined at the 2016 Ise-Shima Summit.

Canada continues to contribute to counter-piracy missions in order to maintain the rules-based order outlined in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). Between December 2016 and April 2017, 28 members of the Canadian Armed Forces and two civilian personnel from the Department of National Defence led the Combined Task Force 150 in the Arabian Sea.\textsuperscript{2316} This task force is stationed in Bahrain and commanded by Commodore Haydn Edmundson of the Royal Canadian Navy.\textsuperscript{2317}

The Canadian government has also clearly expressed support for peaceful dispute settlements.

On 21 July 2016, Foreign Minister Stéphane Dion issued the Canadian Statement on the South China Sea Arbitration, which indicated full support for the UNCLOS-rendered decision, and expressed concern for the mounting tensions in the South China Sea region.\textsuperscript{2318} The statement also urged that, regardless of whether the parties agree or not with the ruling, “Canada believes that all parties should comply with it.”\textsuperscript{2319} While


Canada has remained uninvolved in the confidence-building measures taken by its allies in the Asia-Pacific region, the statement ended with a commitment to contribute to such initiatives in the future.2320

On 19 April 2017, G7 foreign ministers including Canadian Minister Chrystia Freeland gathered in Lucca, Italy.2321 In their final communiqué, the foreign ministers stated their support for the 12 July 2016 decision of the Hague tribunal, which ruled that a disputed area in the South China Seas was part of the Philippine’s exclusive economic zone.2322 China, which had claimed the area, did not accept the ruling.2323 The G7 ministers also noted that they “encourage dialogues based on international law towards early finalization of an effective Code of Conduct in the South China Sea (COC) and we welcome efforts to advance in this direction.”2324

The Canadian government has also taken significant action toward preserving oceans since May 2016. On 7 November 2016, the Canadian government announced a CAD1.5 billion Oceans Protections Plan to ensure marine safety and promote environmental sustainability.2325 The announcement also reiterated the Canadian government’s commitment to implementing a moratorium on crude oil tanker traffic on British Columbia’s north coast.2326

Finally, Canada continues to promote the principles of freedom of navigation and overflight. On 21 July 2016, in the Statement on the South China Sea Arbitration, Minister Stéphane Dion stated that “actions that could jeopardize freedom of navigation and overflight” must be avoided.2327

In sum, Canada has taken some action in terms of all four features of the 2016 Ise-Shima Summit commitment to maritime security. Thus, Canada earns a score of +1.

Analyst: Meghan Harris

France: +1

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

France has been an active party in promoting sustainable development by hosting the International Symposium Human Sea-MARISK on 3-5 October 2016.2328 On 6-8 December 2016, France also held an

international meeting where participants discussed marine ecosystems, coastal management, biodiversity and coastal climate change adaption.2329

On 19 January 2017, France and India signed the White Shipping Agreement. This agreement enables the exchange of information concerning maritime traffic and maritime domain awareness in the Indian Ocean.2330

The Ministry of the Environment, Energy, and Marine Affairs passed several ordinances on 8 December 2016. Ordinance No 2016-1686 calls for the enforcement of additional requirements on the medical fitness of seafarers, and enforces stricter regulation on the consumption of alcohol on ships.2331 Ordinance No 2016-1687 presents clearer definitions of baselines, the exclusive economic zone, the continental shelf, and the contiguous zone.2332

The Government of France declared its commitment to maritime safety on 14 January 2017. France also highlighted its support of the outcome of the Lome Conference that took place between 10-15 October 2016. France committed itself to continuing efforts to improve regional and international cooperation towards ensuring the security of the African maritime domain. France also remains concerned about the resurgence of maritime piracy in the Gulf of Guinea.2333

On 19 April 2017, G7 foreign ministers including French Minister Jean-Marc Ayrault gathered in Lucca, Italy.2334 In their final communiqué, the foreign ministers stated their support for the 12 July 2016 decision of the Hague tribunal, which ruled that a disputed area in the South China Seas was part of the Philippine’s exclusive economic zone.2335 China, which had claimed the area, did not accept the ruling.2336 The G7 ministers also noted that they “encourage dialogues based on international law towards early finalization of an effective Code of Conduct in the South China Sea and we welcome efforts to advance in this direction.”2337

France has been an active party in hosting and attending conferences entered around maritime security. In addition, France has been working with other nations such as India and certain African countries to ensure mutual respect and understanding of maritime security-related issues. Therefore, France earns score of +1.

*Analyst: Aamna Rashid*

---


**Germany: Not available**

The report on Germany’s compliance with the commitment to preserve a law-based maritime order that adheres to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea is not available.

**Italy: +1**

Italy has fully complied with its commitment to preserve a law-based maritime order that adheres to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS).

On 11 July 2016, the Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter, and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated Fishing came into effect. Italy has complied with its commitment to maintaining a law-based maritime order that adheres to UNCLOS by implementing this Food Agricultural Organization agreement. The agreement sets minimal standards for port maintenance, defines mechanisms for preventing the international flow of illegal fish, and promotes increased international and regional cooperation at sea. It is also intended to help protect workers on fishing vessels, as illegal, unregulated fishing practices can create unsafe working conditions and promote forced migration and labour.

On 26 and 27 October 2016, Italian Minister of Defence Roberta Pinotti and Ambassador Claudio Bisogniero took part in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) defence ministers meetings at the Alliance Headquarters in Brussels. The ministers agreed to aid Greece, Turkey and the European Border and Coast Guard Agency FRONTEX by undertaking measures to end human trafficking in the Aegean Sea. The Ministers also reaffirmed their commitment to Operation Sophia, a European Union operation aimed at stopping smugglers from engaging in human smuggling and trafficking in the Mediterranean. Defence Minister Pinotti confirmed that the NATO Joint Force Command in Naples will act as the central sphere for any NATO operations and undertakings in the Mediterranean. Italy will also continue to lead one of NATO’s Spearhead Forces. By 2018, Italy will be leading NATO’s Spearhead Force.

---


2345 Press Conference by NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg Following the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council at the Level of Defence Ministers, 16 February 2017. Date of Access: 8 March 2017.


---
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On 21 November 2016, Director of the International Labour Organization (ILO) Office for Italy and San Marino Gianni Rosas spoke at an event in Rome for World Fisheries Day and reaffirmed the importance of preserving a law-based maritime order, and the end of illegal fishing.2347

Italy has also complied with its commitment to peace, justice, and international security as articulated in UNCLOS. On 14 October 2016, Italian Foreign Affairs Minister Paolo Gentiloni confirmed that Italy plans to participate in patrols of the Baltic Sea to reassure allies that Atlantic borders are defended and secure.2348 Minister Gentiloni also confirmed that Italy has responded affirmatively to a request from the Libyan government to offer assistance for programs that will train the Libyan Coast Guard in international waters.2349

On 19 April 2017, G7 foreign ministers including Italian Foreign Minister gathered in Lucca, Italy.2350 In their final communiqué, the foreign ministers stated their support for the 12 July 2016 decision of the Hague tribunal, which ruled that a disputed area in the South China Seas was part of the Philippine’s exclusive economic zone.2351 China, which had claimed the area, did not accept the ruling.2352 The G7 ministers also noted that they “encourage dialogues based on international law towards early finalization of an effective Code of Conduct in the South China Sea (COC) and we welcome efforts to advance in this direction.”2353

Italy has fully complied with its commitment to use the ocean and marine life sustainably. A High Representative on behalf of the European Union reiterated the EU’s commitment to protecting marine ecosystems, and cooperating on the development of shared responsibilities like fisheries.2354 Part of Italy’s compliance is due to its continuing support and implementation of the Food and Agricultural Organization’s (FAO) Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated Fishing, as this agreement will protect marine life from unsustainable overfishing practices.2355

Between 20 and 21 April 2017, the Italian government collaborated with the United Nations Environment/Mediterranean Action Plan to host the G7 Workshop on Marine Litter. Italian Minister Gian Luca Galletti and Undersecretary Silvia Velo participated in the event, which set out to “discuss the

implementation of the ‘G7 Action Plan to Combat Marine Litter’ … [and] addressed various aspects of the marine litter problem.”

Italy has also complied with its commitment to freedom of navigation and overflight as stated in UNCLOS. On 23 November 2016, Italian Prime Minister Matteo Renzi and Vietnamese President Tran Dai Quang met in Rome and underscored the importance of freedom of navigation and overflight in the South China Sea.

In sum, Italy has fully complied with its commitment to maintaining a law-based maritime order, international peace, justice, and security, and has complied with its commitment to maintaining a sustainable ocean. Thus, Italy has received a score of +1.

**Analyst: Alessia Avola**

**Japan: Not available**

The report on Japan’s compliance with the commitment to preserve a law-based maritime order that adheres to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea is not available.

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitments to maintaining regional maritime security. It has adhered to all four components of its commitment: maintaining rules-based maritime order of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), peaceful settlement of disputes, sustainable use of the seas and oceans, and respected freedom of navigation and overflight.

UK Ambassador to the United States Kim Darroch announced on 2 December 2016 that British fighter aircraft currently stationed in Japan would fly through disputed areas of the South China Sea. The ambassador said this move was geared at asserting international overflight rights, and will be complemented by the presence of aircraft carriers in the Pacific after 2020. Darroch stated, “we absolutely share the objective … to protect freedom of navigation and to keep sea routes and air routes open,” affirming the UK’s commitment to maritime order under UNCLOS and specifically its respect for freedom of navigation and overflight.

The United Kingdom has been devoted to maritime order in the spirit of UNCLOS and the protection of its own sovereign waters. The Royal Navy fired flares at a Spanish research vessel that entered British Gibraltar territory on 20 November 2016. A Ministry of Defence spokesperson stated “the Royal Navy challenges all unlawful maritime incursions into British Gibraltar territorial waters (BGTW). We back this up by making formal diplomatic protests to the Spanish government.” Royal Navy ships also closely shadowed a Russian fleet on its way to the Middle East that was passing by UK waters in October. Vice-Admiral Clive Johnstone,

---

who is also UK Commander of NATO’s Allied Maritime Command, said that “this is in the interest of supporting our overall maritime awareness and safety of navigation in sea lanes of communication.”

The United Kingdom continues to remain neutral — or at least committed to the maintenance of peace — in the East China Sea between China and Japan. This sovereignty dispute stems from a question of ownership of the Senkaku Islands in the East China Sea. The UK’s commitment to maintenance of peace, part of its broader commitment to maritime order under UNCLOS, has consisted of dispelling Chinese aggression through affirming naval defence ties to Japan. On 26 January 2017, Foreign Secretary Boris Johnston confirmed strengthened defence ties, stating, “The UK is working together with Japan as our closest security partner in Asia to promote global security, stability and prosperity.” Defense Secretary Sir Michael Fallon also stated that, “Japan is an important British ally and this treaty will enable closer joint work on operations and exercises, including sharing equipment, supplies and services.”

The United Kingdom requested and undertook a neutral observer role in The Hague’s Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA) tribunal on a dispute between China and the Philippines. The case dealt with issues of sovereignty and respected freedom of navigation in the South China Sea. That tribunal’s findings, released 12 July 2016, back the case made against China by the Philippines in an arbitration procedure constituted under UNCLOS. The UK’s maintenance of a neutral role both before, during, and after the tribunal’s findings is representative of continued commitments to maintaining rules-based maritime order as per UNCLOS and peaceful dispute settlements.

The United Kingdom has also continued to comply with its commitment to the sustainable use of the seas. This has manifested itself in both environmental and security capacities. As a member of the International Maritime Organization, the UK was part of a body that agreed to cap sulphur emissions across the shipping industry by 2020, a move welcomed by environmental campaigners. Between June 2016 and February 2017, the Maritime and Coastguard Agency also detained between seven and nine foreign-flagged ships per month as part of its commitment to “the prevention of pollution from merchant shipping, and in

compliance with the EU Directive on Port State Control. In October 2016, the United Kingdom also partnered with France to build an unmanned mine clearance craft that will work to ensure the safety of personnel and global waterways.

Coastguard and Royal Navy forces have also been paramount to the maintenance of safe navigation in international waters. A Royal Navy warship diverted its path to save yachts in the Atlantic in February. There has been an ongoing commitment to at-sea rescues during the migrant crisis facing Europe, from orchestrating rescues in the English Channel to training the Libyan Coastguard. As Defence Secretary Michael Fallon said in October, “To help prevent more lives being lost, the Royal Navy will provide training support to the Libyan Coast Guard.”

British alliances with other countries over maritime security have been increasing, representative of a firm and broadening commitment to maritime order. The UK and US strengthened maritime aviation cooperation in January 2017 and 2,300 UK maritime forces have taken part in an exercise with Albania as part of efforts to increase cooperation.

The United Kingdom has shown a commitment to maintaining rules-based maritime order as per UNCLOS, positioning itself as a neutral observer in dispute settlements and using its military and diplomatic power to protect the freedom of navigation and overflight. The Maritime and Coastguard Agency’s fidelity in detaining foreign-flagged vessels that breach environmental compliance and its pledge to reduce sulphur emissions show an ongoing commitment to the sustainable use of the seas and oceans.


In sum, the United Kingdom’s adherence to all four components of its commitment at Ise-Shima is evident. As such, the United Kingdom has been awarded a score of +1.

**Analyst: Jack Denton**

**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).

Adherence to a rules-based system has been critical for the United States to further peace, stability, and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region. The United States operates consistently with the UNCLOS, which reflects customary international law with respect to traditional uses of the ocean. The United States also engages in capacity-building exercises with other states to support a rules-based system. For example, on 24-28 of March, the United States Africa Command will support Nigeria in an exercise to counter sea-based illicit activities.

The United States also commended the Philippines’s and Vietnam’s efforts to bring its maritime claims in line with the UNCLOS in matters related to the South China Sea. Consistent with its long-standing Freedom of Navigation (FON) Policy, the United States encourages all claimants to conform their maritime claims to international law, and challenges excessive maritime claims through diplomatic protests and operational activities.

The United States has also advocated the protection of the marine environment from pollution and other anthropogenic threats through the International Maritime Organization, Regional Seas Programs, oil spill response, control of invasive species, and other means. It will also continue to promote marine scientific research with an efficient authorization process and through support of several international scientific organizations. On 29 June 2016, United States President Barack Obama made a joint statement at the North American Leaders Summit in Ottawa which included a commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Maritime shipping.

The FON program involves bilateral and multilateral consultations with other governments to promote maritime stability and consistency with international law. The yearly program includes the United States Military Services and Coast Guard in activities including FON assertion and challenging Maritime claims. It stresses the need for and obligation of all states to adhere to the customary international law rules and practices reflected in the UNCLOS.

---


---
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In sum, the United States has continued to establish itself as a major stakeholder for upholding and maintaining maritime security. Thus, it receives a score of +1.

**Analyst: Cameron Torrens**

**European Union: Not available**

The report on the European Union’s compliance with the commitment to preserve a law-based maritime order that adheres to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea is not available.
19. International Cyber Stability

“We commit to promote a strategic framework of international cyber stability consisting of the applicability of existing international law to state behavior in cyberspace, the promotion of voluntary norms of responsible state behavior during peacetime, and the development and the implementation of practical cyber confidence building measures between states.”

*G7 Ise-Shima 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></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>+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**

While the term “cyberspace” can be interpreted in a range of ways, it can generally be defined as “the online world of computer networks and especially the Internet.” In the context of cyberspace and G7 commitments, it is important to understand how discussions of “cyberspace” have evolved from prior agreements and negotiations concerning information communication technologies (ICTs). ICTs are the “Internet technologies, infrastructure, applications and services” that connect individuals to the internet.

ICTs and the role of the internet have previously been referenced at G7 and G8 summits, although prior summits focused predominantly on how to extend the economic and social benefits made available by the Internet to the general public. The Okinawa Charter on Global Information Society, for example, emphasized the importance of the “principle of inclusion,” which is the idea that “everyone, everywhere should be enabled to participate in and no one should be excluded from the benefits of the global information society.” The 2011 G8 Deauville Summit’s declaration furthered this discussion, with statements regarding the Internet and the importance of “coordination between governments, regional and international organizations, the private sector, civil society … to prevent, deter and punish the use of ICTs for terrorist and criminal purposes.” The importance of ICTs was again affirmed through the Charter for the Digitally Connected World, which was established before the 2016 G7 Ise-Shima Summit on 30 April 2016.

---

The meetings leading up to the 2016 G7 Ise-Shima Summit marked the first time that G7 leaders made a clear commitment in the area of cybersecurity, signifying the growing importance of cyber space, structure, and security for international governance. While the commitment continues to emphasize the importance of topics such as the digital economy, human rights in cyberspace, and the role of ICTs in improving conditions around the world, what differentiates this “cyber” commitment from previous agreements and commitments concerned with ICTs is its specific focus on state behaviours in cyberspace. The obligation of state actors to regulate and coordinate their behaviours, with the explicit confirmation of international law’s application to cyberspace, distinguishes the aims of the cyber commitment made at the Ise-Shima summit from previous commitments concerning ICTs and the Internet.

At the 2016 G7 Ise-Shima Summit, a new G7 working group was established to “enhance our policy coordination and practical cooperation to promote security and stability in cyberspace.” This occurred alongside the adoption of the G7 Principles and Actions on Cyber, which provide a concise description of the G7’s aims of “promoting digital economy” alongside the social values that will accompany the growth of ICTs, while also “promoting security and stability in cyberspace” as described in the 2016 Ise-Shima commitment.

### Commitment Features

This commitment focuses on state behaviour and interaction rather than on more technical areas (such as infrastructure-building or increasing accessibility). Given the normative element of this commitment, there are several actions that G7 members can take to comply. To help narrow the scope, it is necessary to consider the source of this commitment. The United States has taken a leadership role in this area, and has been “promoting a strategic framework of international cyber stability … [with] three key elements … (1) global affirmation of the applicability of international law to state behavior in cyberspace; (2) the development of international consensus on additional norms and principles of responsible state behavior in cyberspace that apply during peacetime; and (3) the development and implementation of practice CBMs [confi...
community has used to discuss international law’s applicability to cybersecurity, though their reports are non-binding.\textsuperscript{2399} While statements confirming the applicability of international law to cybersecurity are one means by which G7 states could comply with this aspect of the commitment, G7 members have also noted that they “look forward to the work of the new GGE, including further discussions on how existing international law applies to cyberspace.”\textsuperscript{2400} Thus, participation in the 2016 GGE or other initiatives with the goal of enhancing dialogue in this area could also count towards compliance.

The second element of this commitment requires that G7 members to take steps to support a framework that involves “the promotion of voluntary norms of responsible state behavior during peacetime.”\textsuperscript{2401} Although the G7 does not clearly define what these norms are, they do “reaffirm that no country should conduct or knowingly support ICT-enabled theft of intellectual property, including trade secrets or other confidential business information, with the intent of providing competitive advantages to its companies or commercial sectors.”\textsuperscript{2402} The US has labelled this commitment such a norm and called for its adoption in the past.\textsuperscript{2403} Thus, compliance with this part of the commitment requires the G7 member to make efforts to affirm and uphold this norm or others like it.

The last element of this commitment involves a pledge by G7 members to take steps to support an international cyber stability framework that involves the “development and the implementation of practical cyber confidence building measures between states.”\textsuperscript{2404} This aspect of the commitment was affirmed by the 2015 UN GGE Report, which recommended “the development of and support for mechanisms and processes for bilateral, regional, subregional and multilateral consultations” in the area of ICTs.\textsuperscript{2405} The US has noted that “examples of cyber CBMs include: transparency measures, such as sharing national strategies or doctrine; cooperative measures, such as an initiative to combat a particular cyber incident or threat actor; and stability measures, such as committing to refrain from a certain activity of concern.”\textsuperscript{2406} In addition, parties to the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), which includes the G7 members, agreed on a clear set of CBMs in March 2016.\textsuperscript{2407} Therefore, examples of compliance could include, but are not limited to, agreements referring to cyber cooperation or cybersecurity building, information-sharing measures, measures increasing transparency on cyber policy, the promotion of public-private partnerships, or measures to increase awareness about the security of industrial infrastructure.

To fully comply with this commitment, G7 members must take action in all three areas. Members who take action in only one or two of these areas will be considered to have partially complied with the commitment and will be given a score of 0. Members who do not take action in any of the three areas specified by the

---

\textsuperscript{2399} Elaine Korzak, Cybersecurity at the UN: Another Year, Another GGE, Lawfare, 10 December 2015. Date of Access: 20 November 2016. https://www.lawfareblog.com/cybersecurity-as-a-international-law

\textsuperscript{2400} G7 Principles and Actions on Cyber, G7 Information Centre (Toronto) 27 May 2016. Date of Access: 20 November 2016. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2016shima/cyber.html.


commitment, or take actions that seriously undermine any of the areas will have failed to comply with the commitment, and will be assigned a score of −1.

**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 promote the application of international law in cyberspace AND does not support “the promotion of voluntary norms of responsible state behavior during peacetime” AND takes no confidence building measures to strengthen cyberspace stability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member takes steps to promote the application of international law in cyberspace OR supports “the promotion of voluntary norms of responsible state behavior during peacetime” OR takes confidence building measures to strengthen cyberspace stability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member takes steps to promote the application of international law in cyberspace AND supports “the promotion of voluntary norms of responsible state behavior during peacetime” AND takes confidence building measures to strengthen cyberspace stability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada: +1**

Canada has fully complied with its commitment to promote a strategic framework for international cyber stability.

On 27 May 2016, in a shortened response to the United Nation’s resolution 70/237, the Government of Canada informed the UN Secretary General that the Canadian government believes existing international law should be applicable to a state’s use of information and communications technologies. The Canadian government also recognized that a robust framework of peacetime norms helps facilitate an international order in which states are able to support a stable cyberspace. The Canadian government expressed its belief in confidence building measures, as they are a proven method to reducing tensions and the risk of conflict.

On 29 June 2016, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau released a press statement outlining the Canadian position on the major talking points of the 2016 North American Leaders’ Summit. On the subject of cybersecurity, Prime Minister Trudeau noted that “[Canada] commits to promoting stability in cyberspace based on the applicability of international law, voluntary norms of responsible state behaviour during peacetime, and practical confidence building measures between states.” In particular, he wrote that “no country should conduct or knowingly support cyber-enabled theft of intellectual property, including trade secrets or other confidential business information, with the intent of providing competitive advantages to its companies or commercial sectors” and that “every country should cooperate, consistent with its domestic laws and international obligations, with requests for assistance from other states in mitigating malicious cyber activity emanating from its territory.”

---

On 5 August 2016, Canada published its official Cyber Security Strategy, in which the government announced that it will help less developed states and foreign partners develop cyber security capacities.2414 In addition, Canada will continue to take part in training and exercise programs on the topic of cyber security, which the Canadian government believes will help improve the understanding of the dynamics among cyber security partners.2415

On 6 October 2016, Finance Minister Bill Morneau endorsed the G7 Fundamental Elements of Cybersecurity in the Financial Sector document at a G7 meeting in Washington DC.2416 He stated that Canada will continue to support the G7’s work to protect financial systems from cyber threats.2417

On 14 October 2016, Finance Minister Bill Morneau released a statement including that “Canada is committed to safeguarding the integrity of its world-class financial sector so Canadians can continue to prosper and be confident digital innovators.”2418 Minister Morneau also stated that Canada’s “work with other advanced, industrialized economies on cyber security in the financial sector shows that [it is] following through on [its] pledge to make Canada a global centre for innovation.”2419 In a statement issued on the same day, the Canadian Department of Finance announced that it is committed to addressing the issue of securing the Canadian financial system from cyber threats and promoting public confidence in the financial system.2420

On 16 October 2016, a consultation published by the Government of Canada outlined key action areas moving forward on the issue of cyber. Recognizing the “importance of cyber security for businesses, economic growth, and prosperity,”2421 the Canadian government’s first key action area was entitled “Resilience.” By certifying businesses that meet cyber security standards and by encouraging executives in private sector companies to report on the cyber security health of their organizations, the Government of Canada hopes to better prevent, mitigate, and respond to cyber attacks targeting Canadian corporations.2422 This would also establish a normative structure consistent with the UN Group of Governmental Expert’s 2015 cyber stability report, ensuring the “integrity of the supply chain so that end users can have confidence in the security of ICT products”2423 as well as encouraging “responsible reporting of ICT vulnerabilities.”2424

On 13 February 2017, Prime Minister Trudeau and American President Donald Trump released a joint statement in which they pledged to “commit to further cooperation to enhance critical infrastructure security, cyber incident management, public awareness, private sector engagement, and capacity building.

---

initiatives. The statement also mentioned that Canada and the United States will continue to work together to broaden their partnership in the field of cybersecurity.

On 10 March 2017, Minister of Public Safety Ralph Goodale met with American Secretary of Homeland Security John Kelly and, in a joint statement, pledged that Canada and the United States will continue to work together on the crucial issues of cyber stability and the protection of critical infrastructure.

On 17 March 2017, the Government of Canada published its Cyber Review Consultations Report. The consultation stated that “developing standards, best practices, certification and legislation were proposed as ways to protect critical infrastructure, prevent advanced cyberattacks, improve the security of emerging technology, encourage growth and innovation, and increase public engagement.” The report also called for increased public education and awareness on cyber issues, better training for cyber security professionals and Canadian law enforcement, as well as an increase in funding and resources.

On 27 March 2017, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) Public Report for 2014-2016 was published. The report states that CSIS is aware of state-sponsored cyber-espionage that is targeting the private sector in Canada as well as Canada’s advanced technology sector and “throughout the critical infrastructure spectrum.” In response, CSIS pledges to continue to use “specialized collection techniques to report on state-sponsored cyber-espionage or cyber-terrorism activity.” CSIS will also continue to maintain strong relationships with domestic and foreign agencies to keep Canadians safe from cyberattacks.

Canada has made several efforts to promote the applicability of international law in cyberspace, advocate for a system of peacetime cyberspace norms, and take confidence building measures to strengthen cyberspace stability, and has thus been awarded a score of +1.

**Analyst: Bill Xu**

**France: +1**

France has fully complied with its commitment to promote a strategic framework for international cyber stability.

On 28 September 2016, France introduced the “Loi Numérique.” The law established the Internet as being a fundamental right for French people four years after the UN recognized it as such. This has also

been promoted as an initiative for increased access to data and transparency, which was written into France’s digital strategy in 2015.\(^{2436}\) These two elements contribute to the application of international law and norm-building in cyberspace.

On 7 October 2016, the “Loi pour une République Numérique,” which aimed to increase transparency and democratize cyberspace, was adopted.\(^{2437}\) The law’s mandate is structured around liberty (the freedom to innovate), equality (the promotion of confidence building measures) and fraternity (the increased inclusivity of cyberspace).\(^{2438}\) The second theme focuses on protecting individuals and businesses from having their information compromised by strengthening the country’s cyberdefense apparatuses, as recommended in the latest report of the United Nations Group of Governmental Experts (GGE).\(^{2439}\)

On 18 October 2016, President of the Assemblée Nationale Elisabeth Guigou suggested revamping France’s cybersecurity strategy amidst an exponential increase in cyberattacks (up to 400 per second) and suggested a state-wide and Europe-wide coordinated efforts to combat cyber threats.\(^{2440}\)

On 14 December 2016, one report out of the Assemblée Nationale proposed that the 23 November 2001 Budapest convention be adapted to consider a climate of increased cybercriminality and terrorism seen across Europe.\(^{2441}\) This can be interpreted as following a norm described by the UN GGE that “states should cooperate in developing and applying measures to increase stability and security in the use of ICTs [information and communications technologies] and to prevent ICT practices that are acknowledged to be harmful or that may pose threats to international peace and security.”\(^{2442}\)

On 13 January 2017, France and Canada signed a Declaration of Intent to continue to promote the applicability and protection of human rights pursuant to the G7 Principles and Actions on Cyber. This bilateral agreement opens the door for further military and intelligence cooperation and cites Da’esh as a target of their conjoined efforts.\(^{2443}\) This is in accordance with norms around cooperating to exchange information and respecting the application of human rights in cyberspace, as described in the 2015 UN GGE Report.\(^{2444}\)


On March 16 2017, French Minister of Defense Jean-Yves Le Drian, unveiled a national cyber defense strategy, establishing a unit of 3200 soldiers, and 4400 reserve members policing national cybersecurity by 2019.2445 The Minister of Defense first mentioned the initiative in December 2016.2446

On March 18 2017, finance ministers and central bank governors from the G20 countries — of which France is a member — released a statement about the necessity of promoting financial stability through the ethical use of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) and through cross-border cooperation.2447 Though the statement asserted that the ’malicious use of ICT’ posed a danger to data privacy.2448

France’s initiatives focused on treating the human right to online access, opening a dialogue about state-wide and regional efforts governing cyberspace and making its digital infrastructure less prone to cyberattacks that could undermine the public and enterprises’ information — two elements that speak to the applicability of international law in cyberspace and norm-building on the support of critical infrastructure against cyberattacks. France also took confidence building measures to strengthen cyber stability. Thus, France has fully complied with the commitment and has been awarded a score of +1.

**Analyst: Helena Najm**

**Germany: +1**

Germany has fully complied with its commitment to promote international law in cyberspace, support common norms in state behaviour and encourage international communication. The German government has shared its plans and goals for national and international cyber security with the public. Germany’s plan to launch an emergency response team in the case of attacks on federal authorities and critical enterprises highlights the country’s strong stance on responsible state behaviour and intolerance for the theft of intellectual property through information and communications technologies. The plan to develop a German institute for international cyber security in which all international and cross-sector parties can exchange information and questions shows the government’s commitment to cyber cooperation and to further enhancing dialogue.

On 9 June 2016, the German Federal Office for Information Security Technology published its plan to introduce a “cyber fire department” in order to deal with cyber attacks on the federal administration and operators of critical infrastructures.2449 The project will launch in 2017 under the title “Mobile Incident Response Teams” and will help the affected authorities and enterprises to stabilize and restructure their information technology infrastructures.2450 The United Nations had previously outlined in the 2015 report of

---

the United Nations Group of Governmental Experts that there is a normative expectation for states to protect their critical infrastructure from possible cyber attacks.\textsuperscript{2451}

During the Warsaw Summit of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) on 8-9 July 2016, Germany committed itself, together with its fellow NATO members, to the implementation of NATO’s long Enhanced Policy on Cyber Defence. The process will be conducted in accordance with international law and by following "the principle of restraint and support maintaining international peace, security, and stability in cyberspace."\textsuperscript{2452} In her press release from the NATO meeting on 8 July 2016, Chancellor Angela Merkel stressed the importance of the planned creation of an international cyberspace task force within NATO.\textsuperscript{2453} This action addresses both the application of international law in cyberspace and efforts to introduce confidence building measures between states.

On 9 November 2016, the Federal Government of Germany passed the Sicherheitsstrategie für Deutschland 2016 (Security Strategy for Germany 2016). The plan outlines Germany’s goal to create interoperable cyber security architectures and standards and to furthershape the supplement and application of international law in the cyber sphere.\textsuperscript{2454} Additionally, it outlines the foundation of a German institute for international cyber security.\textsuperscript{2455} This action falls within efforts to apply international law in cyberspace and introduce confidence building measures between states.

On 19 March 2017, the UK and Germany announced that they would sign a new defence cooperation deal when the UK leaves the EU, and that this agreement will include cooperation on cyber security.\textsuperscript{2456}

On 21 March 2017, German Chancellor Angela Merkel and Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe signed the Hannover Declaration, which outlines a plan to set common standards regarding several technical sectors, including cyber security.\textsuperscript{2457}

On 1 April 2017, it was reported that Germany was the first member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization launching a “self-contained” cyber command unit.\textsuperscript{2458} The Cyber and Information Space unit’s purpose is to shield the Bundeswehr’s IT and weapons systems from an increasing number of attacks.\textsuperscript{2459}

\textsuperscript{2456} Stefan Wagstyl, Britain and Germany Set to Sign Defense Co-operation Deal, Financial Times, 19 March 2017. Date of Access: 2 April 2017. https://www.ft.com/content/2deb3c7c-0ca7-11e7-b030-768954394623.
Germany has taken the necessary steps to fulfill the requirements of this commitment. Overall, the German government has achieved items that fulfill criteria around international law, normative development, and confidence building measures. Thus, Germany has been awarded a score of +1.

**Analyst: Friederike Wilke**

**Italy: 0**

Italy has partially complied with its commitment to cyber stability. Since the Ise-Shima Summit took place in May 2016, Italy has taken actions towards the promotion of voluntary norms of responsible state behaviour during peacetime and implementing practical confidence building measures between states. However, it has not taken visible action on confirming the applicability of existing international law.

On 29 September 2016, Alessandro Pansa, Director General of the Department of Security Intelligence, made a speech at the CyberTech Europe conference referencing Italy's efforts on its national cybersecurity strategy.\(^{2460}\) His speech highlighted the importance of protecting critical infrastructure from cyberattacks, referencing Italy's efforts to align its National Plan for Cyber Security and Internet Safety to the European Union Directive on Network and Information Security, as well as suggesting ideas for the testing of cyber systems for vulnerabilities before implementing them in critical infrastructure.\(^{2461}\)

On 7-9 December 2016, representatives from the Agenzia per l’Italia Digitale (Agency for Italy Digital) and the Department of Public Service took part in the international summit hosted by the Open Government Partnership.\(^{2462}\) Prior to participating in this summit, Italy published its third Action Plan on 20 September 2016. The Action Plan referenced the importance of cooperating with businesses, citizens, and other governments to promote transparency and accountability while preventing corruption.\(^{2463}\)

On 20 December 2016, the Bank of Italy signed an agreement with the Italian Banking Association and the ABI Lab Consortium to strengthen collaboration on cybersecurity between Italian and global banking firms and financial operators.\(^{2464}\) This agreement specifically creates CERTFin, a computer emergency response team, and, as referenced in the press release, is “in line with the [Italian] National Strategic Framework for the Security of Cyberspace” on initiatives such as critical infrastructure protection and cooperative efforts between institutional partners, national experts, and international experts.\(^{2465}\)

On 12 January 2017, the Italian Minister for the Interior Marco Minniti met with European Commissioner for Migration, Home Affairs, and Citizenship Dimitris Avramopoulos.\(^{2466}\) A joint press release alluded to discussions around cybersecurity cooperation between the EU and Italy for security purposes. Specifically,

---


“discussions focused mainly on strengthening cooperation in the areas of counter-terrorism as well as information exchange, radicalisation and cybersecurity. Italy is committed to working with European partners to achieve a genuine and effective Security Union.”2467

On 17 February 2017, the Interministerial Committee for the Security of the Republic approved a new national cybersecurity plan to coordinate responses to cyber events between different national bodies.2468 This program involves coordination between the Agency for Italy Digital, the Ministry of Economic Development, the Ministry of Interior, the Ministry of defence, and the Ministry of Economy and Finance.

On 27 February 2017, the System di Informazione per la Sicurezza della Repubblica (Information System for the Security of the Republic) presented its annual Report to Parliament.2469 The Report included a section on cyber that reflected on the “consequent adaptation of architecture that is increasingly strengthening the capacity to prevent” threats to the national cyber system.2470 Specifically, the Report referenced the role of Italy’s intelligence community in leading, “at both bilateral and multilateral [levels], a leadership role to promote and encourage maximum information sharing.”

Despite having taken action in the realm of cyberspace that promotes the voluntary norms of responsible state behaviour and confidence building measures in cyberspace, Italy has achieved only partial compliance with this commitment because it has not taken visible steps in terms of the applicability of international law. Thus, Italy receives a score of 0.

**Analyst: Eimi Harris**

**Japan: +1**

Japan has fully complied with its commitment to cyber stability. Through a series of bilateral and multilateral negotiations, Japan’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs has been actively coordinating strategies for cyberspace with other countries and addressing all three major elements of the commitment to cyber stability (the application of international law to cyberspace, the promotion of norms for states in cyberspace, and confidence building measures between states for cyberspace).

On 12 July 2016, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs announced the establishment of the Cyber Security Policy Division.2471 The ministry will use the division, which will be housed under the National Security Policy Division in the Foreign Policy Bureau, to “continue to actively conduct foreign policy in the field of cyber from a comprehensive perspective, especially promoting the rule of law in cyberspace, confidence building, and capacity building of developing countries.”2472

On 27 July 2016, Japan and the United States conducted their fourth Cyber Dialogue in Washington DC.2473 The meeting was to build on the third Japan-US Cyber Dialogue from July 2015 and would address

---


“a wide range of Japan-US cooperation on cyber issues, including situational awareness, critical infrastructure protection and bilateral cooperation in the international arena, including capacity building.”

On 2 August 2016, Japan and Australia conducted their second Cyber Policy Dialogue in Tokyo. Building off the first Cyber Policy Dialogue from 2014, Japan and Australia “reaffirmed their cooperation on the elaboration of international law and norms, and confidence building measures in international and regional fora such as UNGGE [United Nations Group of Governmental Experts] and ASEAN [Association of Southeast Asian Nations] Regional Forum.” The two countries also discussed joint efforts to manage regional cyber threats through capacity building and joint exercises.

On 13 October 2016, Japan and the United Kingdom held their third bilateral consultations on Cyberspace in Tokyo. Their discussions were centred on “bilateral cooperation on various issues such as critical infrastructure protection and capacity building as well as … collaboration at various fora such as the United Nations.”

On 20 December 2016, experts from Japan, the United States, and Korea conducted a meeting on cybersecurity of critical infrastructure. At this meeting, representatives from the Foreign Affairs departments from each country “exchanged opinions over the current environment and threats in the field of cybersecurity of critical infrastructure and promised continued trilateral cooperation on issues of cybersecurity.”

On 8 February 2017, Japan, alongside the People’s Republic of China and the Republic of Korea, participated in the 3rd Trilateral Cyber Policy Consultation. The consultations included discussions on “regional and international frameworks and future direction of trilateral cooperation on cyber issues.”

On 24 February 2017, Japan announced it would be attending the 2nd ASEAN-Japan Cybercrime Dialogue on 1-2 March 2017. The dialogue will include a discussion of “ASEAN-Japan cooperation on cybercrime, such as promotion of information-sharing on trends and lessons learned to combat cybercrime, promotion of international cooperation on cybercrime, capacity building to fight against cybercrime, and the direction of concrete activities using Japan-ASEAN Integration Fund.”

---

Japan has been very active in engaging with other states on the key topic of cyber stability; the application of international law to cyberspace, the promotion of norms for states in cyberspace, and confidence building measures between states for cyberspace were all addressed throughout these bilateral and multilateral meetings. Japan has thus fully complied with the commitment and thus receives a score of +1.

**Analyst: Eimi Harris**

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment at the 2016 Ise-Shima Summit to promote international cyber stability and apply international law, endorse state-level normative behaviour and create confidence building measures in regards to cyberspace.

On 13 June 2016, representatives of the United Kingdom met with their counterparts from China to discuss state security. At these meetings, the Chinese and British participants outlined the normative behaviour that both states would adhere to in regards to cyber security. Both China and the UK pledged to “hold discussions on combatting cyber crime … and cyber security … with the aim of sharing intelligence and experience.” They also promised to “increase cooperation on cyber security related incidents … agreeing to respond promptly to any request for information or assistance.”

On 30 September 2016, the United Kingdom announced that the National Cyber Security Centre would become operational on 3 October 2016. The centre is tasked with four main objectives to “understand the cyber security environment,” “reduce [cyber] risks to the UK,” “nurture and grow … national cyber security capability,” and “respond to cyber security incidents.” It purports that it will “work collaboratively” with “international partners” to tackle cyber security. The centre did not address how it will engage with its international partners, or who those international partners are, but did state that the centre will “engage[e] with international partners on incident handling, situational awareness, building technical capabilities and capacity … and contributing to broader cyber security discussions.”

On 1 November 2016, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Philip Hammond, announced the 2016-2021 National Cyber Security Strategy. It is based on three main strategic pillars — defend, deter and develop — and includes the objectives and approaches the government seeks to utilize in order to promote international cooperation and to integrate international law into the field of cyber security. The report stated that the government would ensure that “international law applies in cyberspace,” that “voluntary, non-binding, norms of responsible state behaviour” were upheld, and that they would promote “the development

---


and implementation of confidence building measures.” The UK has promised to supplement the program with GBP1.9 billion in investment.

On 17 February 2017, Sir Mark Lyall Grant and Wang Yongqing met for the second installment of the UK-China High Level Security Dialogue. At this meeting, representatives from both countries discussed a wide-range of security issues, with an emphasis on cyber security. Both parties pledged to further strengthen the cooperation between them. Secretary-General Wang and Sir Mark Lyall Grant agreed to hold another set of talks in Beijing in approximately a year.

The United Kingdom has continued to successfully implement policies that promote the application of international law in cyberspace, engaged in the creation of normative state behaviour in regards to cyber security and cooperation, and enabled the creation of confidence building measures designed to foster a more amicable and cooperative international cyber environment. The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment on cyber stability and receives a score of +1.

Analyst: Nick Allard

**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to implement and promote a strategic framework for increasing international cyber stability.

On 3 June 2016, Christopher Painter, US State Department Coordinator for Cyber Issues, gave a TED talk in which he repeated the commitments agreed to during the Ise-Shima Summit and discussed how the United States was approaching these commitments. Painter emphasized that State Department officials were engaging with diplomats in countries whose code of conduct in cyberspace is deemed unacceptable. Similarly, they are engaging with diplomats in other countries to make them aware of the behaviour expected of States in cyberspace.

On 29 June 2016, the United States held bilateral diplomatic consultations on the topic of cyber stability with Korea. The consultations reaffirmed cooperation between Korea and the United States on international cybersecurity, capacity building and information sharing. It also reaffirmed their commitments to shared principles that support open and secure international cyberspace.

On 19 September 2016, the State Department spoke to a Presidential Commission on Enhancing National Cybersecurity and reaffirmed its policy of promoting the applicability of international law in cyberspace, voluntary norms of responsible state behaviour in cyberspace and confidence-building measures between states.

---

Between 10 October 2016 and 12 October 2016, Christopher Painter travelled to Singapore to represent the United States at the inaugural Singapore International Cyber Week. He delivered a keynote address on international law and cyberspace, and on open and secure international cyberspace.

On 13 October 2016, Christopher Painter travelled to Japan for the inaugural meeting of the Group of Seven Ise-Shima Cyber Group, a working group created at the 2016 G7 summit. The meeting aimed to enhance policy coordination between G7 members on cybersecurity and stability.

On 19 December 2016, the United States held trilateral talks with Japan and Korea. The purpose of these talks was to discuss potential threats to international cyber infrastructure and advance cooperation on cybersecurity.

Between 6 December 2016 and 9 December 2016, US representatives attended the 2016 Internet Governance Forum and reiterated the government’s desire to build coalitions on the matter of cyber security and Internet governance.

On 10 January 2017, Christopher Painter wrote an article for Medium highlighting six cyber diplomacy accomplishments of 2016. Included in that article were that: the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe agreed on cyber confidence-building measures; the United States established the first ever bilateral framework on cyber with India; the US supported the renewed mandate for the Internet Governance Forum; the US developed programs to strengthen global cybersecurity capacity; the US trained cyber policy officers to promote the interests of the United States in cyberspace; and the US coordinated the global effort to raise cybersecurity awareness.

Since President Donald 20 January 2017, the White House has promised to prioritize development of defensive and offensive cyber capabilities for the United States military.

On 13 February 2017, the White House issued a joint statement with Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau reaffirming Canadian and American commitments to joint cyber infrastructure management, incident management, public awareness, and capacity building initiatives.

These examples show that the United States has made efforts towards affirming the application of international law in cyberspace, promoting the building of norms around state behaviour in cyberspace, and taking confidence building measures within cyberspace. The United States has fully complied with its commitment to promoting international cyber security and, thus, receives a score of +1.

**Analyst: Syed Raza**

---


European Union: +1

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to cyber stability through the application of international law within cyberspace, promotion of voluntary norms of responsible state behaviour during peacetime, and establishment of confidence building measures.

On 28 June 2016, the 2016 EU Global Strategy report was released. This report outlines the EU’s principles and goals within the global context. The report states that the EU will strive towards executing “cyber diplomacy” and “digital governance” while engaging in agreements with its allies in using the guiding principles of international law to initiate responsible state behavior in cyberspace. This dialogue also corresponds with the application of international law to cyberspace and the promotion of voluntary norms for responsible state behavior during peacetime.

On 6 July 2016, the European Parliament adopted the Directive on Security of Network and Information Systems (NIS), the first ever EU-wide legislation addressing cybersecurity. The directive contains legal actions to increase the level of cybersecurity by prompting companies in sectors such as transport, energy, health and banking to adopt risk management considerations in the digital economy. Member states are required to be appropriately equipped during cyber incidents with a Computer Security Incident Response Team (CSIRT) and a national NIS authority, while also setting up a cooperation group to oversee the strategic exchange of information among all member states and a CSIRT network to facilitate collaboration on cybersecurity occurrences.

On 5 August 2016, an earlier framework of cooperation between the EU and Canada was upgraded, further embracing their democratic values. This agreement states that the parties acknowledge that cybercrime is a global problem and will work collaboratively to aid other states in developing effective laws while exchanging information on the education of cybercrime investigators, digital forensics, and the conduct of cybercrime investigations.

On 14 November 2016, experts from the EU Co-ordinating Office for Palestinian Police Support provided training to Palestinian lawyers in order to enhance their capacities in dealing with cyber crimes and to strengthen Palestine’s legal system.

On 25 November 2016, officials from the EU and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) met to propose further advancements in cooperation regarding cyber defence including proposals for cooperation in

---


information exchange and combating cyber-attacks, and building on their earlier Technical Arrangement on Cyber Defense.\textsuperscript{2512}

On 2 December 2016, representatives from the EU joined NATO along with other states such as Algeria, Finland, Japan, Austria, Switzerland and Sweden in NATO’s annual Cyber Coalition Exercise in Estonia. More than 700 cyber defenders including legal experts, military officers, academics, and governmental officials gathered to train in combating cyber-attacks by rapidly sharing information about cyber incidents and coordinating their defense tactics effectively.\textsuperscript{2513}

On 16 December 2016, the EU’s cyber partnership with the US was further strengthened during the third meeting of the EU-US Cyber Dialogue in Brussels, during which both parties reaffirmed their support for the continuation of the United Nations Group of Governmental Experts by confirming that the existing principles of international law apply to the conduct of state behavior in cyberspace and that states should commit to following norms of responsible state behaviour.\textsuperscript{2514} Both parties also supported confidence building measures, promoted human rights, affirmed support for the Convention on Cybercrime, and agreed to coordinate their efforts in cyber resilience.\textsuperscript{2515}

On 9 January 2017, experts from the U.S. Treasury Department and EU convened for the EU-U.S. Insurance Project, where they discussed cybersecurity measures relating to financial services and Transatlantic coordination. The participants from both sides informed one another of their ongoing cyber initiatives while sharing information on risk management practices for authorities addressing cyber-related issues.\textsuperscript{2516}

On 20-23 February 2017, members of the European Parliament visited India with the aim of strengthening the EU-India Strategic Partnership.\textsuperscript{2517} One of the three parliamentary delegations that occurred there was the European Parliament’s Committee on Foreign Affairs, which focused on increasing EU-Indian dialogue in cyber-security along with counter-terrorism and other regional security issues.\textsuperscript{2518}

On 24 March 2017, in preparation for upcoming G7 cybersecurity discussion and as a part of the Treaties of Rome’s 60th anniversary, representatives from EU governments attended a high-level roundtable in Rome to address the cybersecurity challenges encountered by the energy sector.\textsuperscript{2519} Participants discussed how to build energy systems that can be resistant towards cyber security attacks, while also addressing topics such as the importance of technology suppliers and striking a balance between cyber security, economic, growth and data protection.\textsuperscript{2520}

The EU has acknowledged the application of international law in cyberspace through its global and domestic dialogue, promoted responsible state behaviour through its interstate partnerships, and taken confidence building measures in enhancing cyberspace stability through data protection and holding data processors accountable. As such, the EU has been given a score of +1.

*Analyst: Fariha Ahmed*