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

Chancellor Angela Merkel, Schloss Elmau, 8 June 2015
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Preface

Each year since 1996, the G7 and G8 Research Group has produced a compliance report on the progress made by the G7/8 members in meeting the commitments their leaders issue at each summit. Since 2002, the group has usually published an interim report to assess progress during the transition from one host to the next, as well as the final report issued just before the annual summit. These reports, which monitor each G7/8 member’s implementation of a carefully chosen selection of the many commitments announced at the end of each summit, are offered to the general public and to policy makers, academics, civil society, the media and interested citizens around the world in an effort to make the work of the G7/8 more transparent and accessible, and to provide scientific data to enable meaningful analysis of this unique and informal institution. Compliance reports are available at the G7 Information Centre at 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 an global network of scholars, students and professionals. The group oversees the G7 Information Centre, which publishes freely available research on the G7/8 as well as official documents issued by the G7/8.

For the 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 376 commitments made. This version of the interim report includes assessments for 11 of those commitments as of 31 January 2017 and includes stakeholder feedback on eight of them.

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 led by Sarah Beard, chair of summit studies, as well as the co-directors of the Compliance Unit: Sophia Glisch, Humayun Ahmed, Katie Andrews and Emily Scrivens. It would also not be possible without the support of Dr. Ella Kokotsis, director of accountability, and Brittaney Warren, senior researcher. We are also indebted to the many people who provide feedback on our drafts, whose comments have been carefully considered in this report.

John Kirton
Director, G7 Research Group
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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 376 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 31 January 2017. Eight of the 11 commitments included here have received stakeholder feedback. The final compliance report, which will be released on the eve of the 2017 Taormina Summit in May 2017, will assess compliance over the full year between May 2016 and May 2017.

The Interim 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 interim compliance scores for Part I are listed in Table B.

For the assessment period of 28 May 2016 to 31 January 2017, the average compliance score for these eight commitments was +0.51 (76%), a decrease from the interim score of +0.60 (80%) and 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
The European Union received the highest compliance score of +0.91 (95%), followed by the United States at +0.82 (91%) and the United Kingdom at +0.64 (82%) (see Table C). Japan and Italy with +0.18 (59%) each had the lowest score.

Compliance by Commitment
The commitment on the Paris Agreement on Climate Change 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). The two lowest-scoring commitments were on corruption and judicial reform in Ukraine at +0.25 (63%) and the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction at 0 (50%).

The Compliance Gap Between Members
These initial results from the Ise-Shima Summit show a difference of 0.73 between the highest and lowest compliance scores. This gap is smaller than the gap at the same midway point between the 2014 and 2015 summits, although much higher than earlier years. The final spread for the 2015 summit was 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 11 commitments during the 2016–17 period, which spans from 28 May 2016, immediately following the 2016 Ise-Shima Summit, to 31 January 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, especially with regard to the three comments that have not received stakeholder feedback. Please send your comments to g8@utoronto.ca.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>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>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>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>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>
</tbody>
</table>
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)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>1 Trade: Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 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>+1</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Food and Agriculture: G7 Vision for Action on Food Security and Nutrition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Crime and Corruption: International Cooperation on Anti-Corruption Initiatives</td>
<td>0</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Terrorism: Combatting terrorist financing</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Syria: Refugees</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Non-proliferation: Weapons of mass destruction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 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>+1</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 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>10 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</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Ukraine: Corruption and judicial reform</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Average</td>
<td>+0.55</td>
<td>+0.27</td>
<td>+0.55</td>
<td>+0.18</td>
<td>+0.18</td>
<td>+0.64</td>
<td>+0.82</td>
<td>+0.91</td>
<td>+0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 Final Compliance Average</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Interim Compliance Average</td>
<td>+0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Final Compliance Average</td>
<td>+0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Final Compliance Average</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Interim Compliance Average</td>
<td>+0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Final Compliance Average</td>
<td>+0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Final Compliance Average</td>
<td>+0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C: 2016 G7 Ise-Shima Interim Compliance Scores by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+0.39</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>+0.22</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>+0.91</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>+0.95</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+0.81</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>+0.82</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>+0.81</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>+0.65</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>+0.64</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>+0.86</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>+0.55</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>+0.86</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>+0.55</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>+0.18</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>+0.69</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>+0.27</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>+0.67</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>+0.59</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>+0.18</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>+0.24</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>+0.18</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>+0.18</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>+0.48</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>+0.47</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>+0.44</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>+0.51</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>+0.65</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>+0.60</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spread</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D: 2016 G7 Ise-Shima Interim Compliance Scores by Commitment

| 1 | Climate Change: Paris Agreement | +1.00 | 100% |
| 2 | International cyber stability   | +0.88 | 94%  |
| 3 | Terrorism: Combating terrorist financing | +0.75 | 88%  |
| 4 | Syria: Refugees                 | +0.63 | 81%  |
| 5 | Development: Addis Tax Initiative | +0.50 | 75%  |
| 6 | Food and Agriculture: G7 Vision for Action on Food Security and Nutrition | +0.50 | 75%  |
| 7 | Trade: Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership | +0.38 | 69%  |
| 8 | Health: Global Health Security Agenda | +0.38 | 69%  |
| 9 | Crime and Corruption: International Cooperation on Anti-corruption Initiatives | +0.38 | 69%  |
| 10| Ukraine: Corruption and judicial reform | +0.25 | 63%  |
| 11| Non-proliferation: Weapons of mass destruction | 0     | 50%  |
| Compliance Average | +0.51 | 76%  |
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>−1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</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></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

The Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) is a trade and investment agreement that is currently being negotiated between the European Union and the United States. 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. 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.

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. They will also be able to import more of the goods and services they require to make an assortment of products. 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.

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.” The G7 remains supportive of TTIP, as this commitment illustrates.

Commitment Features

There are two different aspects to this commitment. The first is the pledge to apply “the necessary political will to reach a TTIP agreement as early as this year.” This agreement is contingent on the second aspect of the commitment, which is that the TTIP must be an “ambitious, comprehensive, high-standard and mutually beneficial agreement.”

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.” 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.”\textsuperscript{14} 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.”\textsuperscript{15} 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.”\textsuperscript{16} Ambitious outcomes in addressing regulatory issues would involve greater regulatory harmonization and the reduction of non-tariff barriers.\textsuperscript{17} In this area, the European Commission has committed to maintaining its “high standards” on issues like food safety, environmental protection, and the precautionary principle.\textsuperscript{18} 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.”\textsuperscript{19} This includes issues of transparency, intellectual property rights, and sustainable development, amongst other concerns.\textsuperscript{20} 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>

Canada: 0

Canada has partially complied with its commitment to bring about the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP). It has applied the necessary political will to achieve an ambitious, comprehensive, high standard and mutually beneficial agreement that harnesses the potential of the transatlantic economy. Although the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) and TTIP are not explicitly linked, both trade agreements reflect a commitment to fostering free trade relations in the transatlantic economy.

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.21

On 30 October 2016, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau signed CETA at the European Union-Canada Leaders’ Summit.22 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 2017.23

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.24 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.”25

---


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 (TTIP) 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.34

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.”35

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.36

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.37

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.38 The press release stated that the negotiations addressed the key TTIP pillar of regulatory co-operation. 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.39

---

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.\(^{40}\)

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.”\(^{41}\) 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.\(^{42}\)

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 has reached a difficult negotiation and the outcome needs to be approved.\(^{43}\) He stated that Italy will provide the “maximum supports to the European Commission” to help to finalize the negotiation and reach the agreements.\(^{44}\)

On 22 February 2016, Italy attended the 12th TTIP meeting in Brussels and participated in discussions regarding how to push the agreement further forward.\(^{45}\) 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-sea investment between 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.46

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.47

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.

Analyst: Yujing (Carina) Chen

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.48 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.”49

On 26 September 2016, Japan and the EU engaged in the 17th round of negotiations on a free trade agreement (FTA) in Brussels.50 The Japanese government referred to the Japan-EU Economic Partnership Agreement as one of the “mega FTAs” along with the Trans-Pacific Partnership and TTIP.51 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.52


---

“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.53

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 25 April 2016, the UK Department of Business, Innovation and Skills commented on TTIP negotiations, dispelling the arguments publicized by critics of the agreement.54

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.”55

In September 2016, Prime Minister Theresa May was quoted as saying that the UK was “open for business” and supports free trade.56

On 27 October 2016, the UK trade minister signed a letter in favour of continued TTIP talks.57 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.58

On 24 April 2016, UK Trade and Investment, the primary government body aimed at regulating international trade for British firms, expressed explicit support for TTIP. The department was quoted as saying, “Negotiations between the US and EU for the TTIP should generate even more opportunities for the UK. This will remove trade barriers by lowering tariffs and making regulations similar.”59

---

The UK has 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: +1**

The United States 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 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.60

On 15 July 2016, Dan Mullaney, Chief Negotiation 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.”61

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.”62

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.”63

On 3-7 October 2016, the 15th round of negotiations took place in New York City, New York. EU Chief Negotiator Ignacio Garcia 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.\textsuperscript{64}

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.”\textsuperscript{65} 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.”\textsuperscript{66}

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.\textsuperscript{67}

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.\textsuperscript{68}

The US 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 US has been awarded a score of +1.

\textit{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.\textsuperscript{69} A spokesperson detailed that “Juncker felt the EU leaders needed to now establish what they wanted from the TTIP talks.”\textsuperscript{70} Juncker further


\textsuperscript{67} 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/


encouraged European leaders “to reconfirm the Commission’s mandate” in regards to a detailed trade agreement.\textsuperscript{71}

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.\textsuperscript{72}

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{73} 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{74}

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{75}

On 7 October 2016, following the 15th round of negotiations, EU Chief TTIP Negotiator Ignacio García 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{76} 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{77}

---

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.78

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 García 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. Development: Addis Tax Initiative

“[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>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</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.\(^79\) 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.”\(^80\) 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.”\(^81\)

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.”\(^82\) 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


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.\textsuperscript{83,84,85}

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.\textsuperscript{86} 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.\textsuperscript{87} 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.\textsuperscript{88}

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.”\textsuperscript{89} 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.\textsuperscript{90} 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.”\textsuperscript{91} Finally, all involved states promised “to pursue policy coherence for development.”\textsuperscript{92}

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.\textsuperscript{93}


sectors. At the 2013 Lough Erne G8 Summit, commitments were made to tackle BEPS, and the G8 leaders welcomed cooperation with the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and G20 to support the OECD Action Plan to combat BEPS issues. 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.”

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>

*Lead Analyst: Raheeb Dastagir*

---

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. 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.” While there, Karina Gould, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, emphasized “the need for … political support to overcome barriers to change.”

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. 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.

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. Documents published after the Ise-Shima Summit show further action has been taken. The measures put forth in 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.

However, on 26 October 2016, the Canadian Revenue Agency stated that it is “sharing information with international partners,” to prevent tax evasion relating to BEPS. 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. 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.”

France also co-hosted a “Meeting on Strengthening External Support for Building Tax Capacity in Developing Countries” with the Platform for Collaboration on Tax. 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. 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.

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.

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.

---

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.\textsuperscript{110}

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.\textsuperscript{111}

On 25 November 2016, as a member of the OECD, 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 of the world an opportunity to provide views and input on the Inclusive Framework on BEPS.\textsuperscript{112}

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.\textsuperscript{113}

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}

**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 2017.114

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.115 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.”116 This event was organized by the International Tax Compact.

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.

Analyst: Sakithyan Logabalandran

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.117 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 20 October 2016, Italy and Andorra announced the start of preliminary talks for negotiations of a double tax agreement.118 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. 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.

**Analyst: Maryam Saleem**

**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, the Government of Japan signed an agreement with the Government of Panama for the Exchange of Information relating to Tax Matters in Panama City.119 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.”120 This exchange of information is based on the “international standards formulated by the OECD” and aims to prevent international tax evasion and tax abuse.121

According to the official website of the Addis Tax Initiative, Japan has not officially joined the program.122 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 infrastructures 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.

**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 Shading (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.”123

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.124

---

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."\textsuperscript{125}

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.\textsuperscript{126} 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.\textsuperscript{127}

On 11 November 2016, the OECD announced that the TIBW program was expanding into five new countries\textsuperscript{128} 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\textsuperscript{129} 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.\textsuperscript{130} 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” (C5) partnership at the Open Government Partnership meeting.\textsuperscript{131} The C5 is a part of a series of public spending transparency reforms meant to promote anti-tax avoidance reforms. This partnership is between the UK, Mexico, Colombia, France, and the Ukraine.

\textsuperscript{124} Letter from Baroness Verma to Sir William Cash. 4 July 2016. Date of access 13 December 2016.  
\textsuperscript{125} Theresa May Post-G20 Speech at House of Commons. 7 September 2016. Date of access 13 December 2016.  
https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2016-09-07/debates/1609072000001/G20summit?highlight=adds%20tax%20initiative#contribution-16090722000014  
\textsuperscript{126} UK aid’s contribution to tackling tax avoidance and evasion. ICAI, 27 September 2016. Date of access 12 December 2016.  
\textsuperscript{127} DFID Response to the Independent Commission for Aid Impact recommendations on: UK aid’s contribution to tackling tax avoidance and evasion September 2016. ICAI, 7 November 2016. Date of access 12 December 2016.  
\textsuperscript{128} Tax Inspectors without Borders making significant progress. OECD, 11 November 2016. Date of Access 12 December 2016.  
http://www.oecd.org/tax/tax-inspectors-without-borders-making-significant-progress.htm  
\textsuperscript{129} Tax Inspectors Without Borders announces new South-South partnership between Kenya and Botswana. OECD, 1 December 2016. Date of Access 12 December 2016.  
\textsuperscript{131} The Prime Minister’s Anti-Corruption Champion, Sir Eric Pickles, Will Discuss the Importance of Transparency in Exposing Corruption, Tackling White Collar Crime, and Stopping Tax Avoidance. OGL, 7 December 2016. Date of Access: 12 December 2016.  
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 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 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 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 Addis Initiative’s 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 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.”

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.

*Analyst Jonathan Hutton*

**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.

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.139

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.140 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.141

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*

---

3. 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></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>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.50</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 2030.142 The G7 first declared this goal at the 2015 G7 Schloss Elmau Summit.143

The 2030 Agenda was also created in 2015. It comprises 17 Sustainable Development Goals and 169 targets.144 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.”145 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.146

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

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.” \(^\text{155}\)

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].” \(^\text{156}\) 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 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.” \(^\text{157}\)

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. \(^\text{158}\) 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. \(^\text{159}\) 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. \(^\text{160}\)

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>

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 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.

---

Canada has acknowledged the importance of a people-centred approach to development, and the importance of urban and rural food security. However, no concrete initiatives have taken place since the G7 summit in this respect. Thus, Canada has partially complied with its commitments and receives 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.

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 the V4A area. 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. Chancellor Angela Merkel reiterated the importance of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals, notably including “action to tackle hunger and empower women.”

From 22-24 June 2016, the German Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture (BMEL) hosted the 12th Policies Against Hunger conference in Berlin. This conference brought together representatives from various governments, international organizations, civil society, academia, and think tanks from 35 countries. The focus of the conference 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.

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. 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. 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.

---

In October 2016, BMZ published its report, Climate Change — Time to Act, which recognized the “water — energy — food security nexus.”\(^{181}\) 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.\(^{182}\) 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.\(^{183}\) BMZ demonstrated its application of the G7 V4A through its Responsible Land Policy program, as part of the broader initiative One World — No Hunger.\(^{184}\) 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.\(^{185}\)

On 11 November 2016, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations released a report celebrating its collaboration with the BMEL through the Bilateral Trust Fund (BTF).\(^{186}\) In the month of September 2016, an online course on nutrition and food systems was launched with the BMEL’s support. 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 EUR9.6 million.\(^{187}\) It is also notable that this year marks the fifteenth anniversary of the BMEL und FAO collaboration through the BTF.\(^{188}\)

---


From 19–21 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.

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 of the United Nations (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, with the aim of developing 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. 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. Within this framework, Italy and the FAO have agreed to work to increase recognition and to promote better stewardship of traditional agricultural systems across member countries.

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: 0

Japan has partially 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.

In August 2016, Japan’s International Cooperation Agency (JICA) launched a new support program entitled the Initiative for Food and Nutrition Security in Africa (IFNA). The overarching purpose of the initiative is to “accelerate the international efforts to alleviate hunger and malnutrition on the African continent.” IFNA emphasizes “facilitating people-centered and practical activities, through empowerment of women, as well as action-oriented policy enhancement, in order to achieve inclusive nutritional improvement with an impact.” The program also integrates short-term humanitarian interventions with the promotion of sustainability in the African region.

On 20 September 2016, Japan and the World Food Programme (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.”

In September 2016, Japan contributed USD21.5 million to the 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.”

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

---


---
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effects of “droughts and floods” and to ensure long-term sustainability of food resources in Guyana.  

The Japanese government has initiated measures for improving women’s participation in food systems, the durability of food systems, and nutritional standards in rural areas, but does not adequately meet the needs of urban populations. Therefore, Japan has been awarded a score of 0.

**Analyst: Joe Zi Wu**

**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. Furthermore, DFID 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.

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.

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.

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

---
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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 aid funds 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. 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. 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.”

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. 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 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.

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. 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.” UNICEF’s Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Director Leila Gharozloo-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.”

---


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. 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.

DFID also gave GBP24 million to Malawi’s National Disaster Response Plan on 29 June 2016. 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.

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. 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. 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.”

Thus, the UK is awarded a score of +1 for its ongoing and increased investment in global nutrition and agricultural standards.

Analyst: Chadwick Meyers

United States: +1

The United States has fulfilled its commitments 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{235}

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{236} Most importantly, the Act empowers marginalized communities, small farmers, and women in agriculture.\textsuperscript{237}

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{238}

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{239}

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{240}

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.

\textit{Analyst: Sixbert Himbaza}

**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


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.\footnote{JRC and IFPRI join efforts on food security and nutrition for vulnerable communities (Brussels) 14 June 2016. Date of Access: 11 December 2016. https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en/news/jrc-and-ifpri-join-efforts-food-security-and-nutrition-vulnerable-communities.}

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.\footnote{Ministry of Health and EU working together to improve nutrition status (Ottawa) 6 July 2016. Date of Access: 11 December 2016. https://eas.europa.eu/delegations/canada/6264/ministry-of-health-and-eu-working-together-to-improve-nutrition-status_en.}

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.\footnote{Commission proposes first comprehensive fisheries plan for the North Sea basin (Brussels) 4 August 2016. Date of Access: 11 December 2016. https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en/news/commission-proposes-first-comprehensive-fisheries-plan-north-sea-basin.}

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.\textsuperscript{247}

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.\textsuperscript{248}

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 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.\textsuperscript{249}

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.\textsuperscript{250}

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 (IFAD), the World Food Programme (WFP) and UN Women, organized a high-level discussion called \textit{Step It Up Together with Rural Women to End Hunger and Poverty}.\textsuperscript{251} 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.”\textsuperscript{252} 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.\textsuperscript{253}

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

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
partnership between the EU and African CSOs (civil society organizations). One of the chosen projects seeks to “improve women’s access to and control over their land resources.”

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.

*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>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.38</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 have shown 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. 68 per cent of Countries are classified as having a serious corruption problem, which amounts to an estimated total of more than six billion people living in corruption-ridden states. 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 USD2.6 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 internationally 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 Evian Summit.\textsuperscript{270}

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].”\textsuperscript{271} 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 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.\textsuperscript{272}

**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”;\textsuperscript{273}
2. The OECD, In the G7 Action to Fight Corruption, the G7 defines its shared priorities as:
   a) “enhancing prevention of corruption in public procurement and enhancing fiscal transparency”;\textsuperscript{274}
   b) “strengthening law enforcement cooperation on corruption”;\textsuperscript{275}
   c) “enhancing anti-corruption capacity-building support”;\textsuperscript{276} and,
   d) “promoting the global effort to fight corruption.”\textsuperscript{277} 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,”\textsuperscript{278} and promoting the involvement of civil society members in anti-corruption efforts.\textsuperscript{279}

3. The Declaration Against Corruption adopted at the Anti-Corruption Summit; Examples of the
days 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.”  

4. The Ministerial Declaration adopted at the OECD Anti-Bribery Ministerial Meeting.  
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.”

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 UNCAC 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>
</table>
| -1    | 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. |
| 0     | Member has worked with other G7 members and independently to advance at least two of
their four shared priorities for combating corruption. |
| +1    | Member has worked alone AND with other G7 members to advance three OR more of their
four shared priorities. |

*Lead Analyst: Bryan Roh*

**Canada: 0**

Canada has partially complied with its commitment to fostering international cooperation where
crime and corruption is concerned.

---
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282 OECD Anti-Bribery Ministerial Meeting: Ministerial Declaration, the OECD (Paris) 16 March 2016. Access Date: 15
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 Action Plan on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) devised by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). 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 13 July 2016, the 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 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 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.

---


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: 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 facilitate 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 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.298 The final draft of the bill rejected the Senate’s recommendation that the CDA not have financial prosecution power.299 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.300 The implementation of these DPAs applies only to corporations, not individuals.301 According to the new draft, individuals prosecuted for corruption will undergo criminal sanctions in accordance with the Criminal Code of France.

On 8 November 2016, the final draft of the Sapin II bill was passed in the French Parliament with a majority vote of 308-171.302 The new law includes protection for whistleblowers to ensure their safety and anonymity remains intact in the face of any possible retaliation attempts.303 The Sapin II law also establishes the formation of a new prosecution agency to replace the Service Central de Repression de la Corruption.304 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.305 Additionally, under the new Sapin II law, all companies with “more than 500 employees and annual revenue of at least 100 million €”306 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.307

In October 2016, France took over as Lead Chair of Open Government Partnership (OGP).308 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. The OGP Global Summit 2016 was held in Paris on 7-9 December, with additional events on 5 and 6 December.

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. France has also taken 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**

**Germany: 0**

Germany has partially complied with its commitment to combat global anti-corruption.

On 4 June 2016, 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.”

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.

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 South 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.”

---


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.\textsuperscript{315}

Germany has taken some 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. It has not worked collectively in this regard. Germany has not worked individually or collectively to advance shared priorities through the United Nations Convention against Corruption or the OECD. It has therefore received a score of 0 for partial compliance.

\textit{Analyst: Hivda Ates}

**Italy: 0**

Italy has partially complied with its commitment to advance the global anti-corruption agenda.

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.\textsuperscript{316} 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.”\textsuperscript{317} The decree has also appointed the ANAC, Italy’s National Anti-Corruption Authority, to monitor the reconstruction to ensure compliance with anti-corruption commitments.\textsuperscript{318} 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.\textsuperscript{319}

On 11 October 2016, Chief of the ANAC Raffaele Cantone pledged to “wage war on nepotism and cronyism”\textsuperscript{320} in Italian universities by “introducing meritocracy and transparency and wiping out the ‘barons’,”\textsuperscript{321} who he describes as corrupt, well-networked scholars.\textsuperscript{322} In speaking with La Republica,  
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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.\(^{323}\)

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,\(^{324}\) a scandal now known as the Mafia Capitale scandal.\(^{325}\) Raqi came in as Rome’s new mayor on 20 June 2016\(^ {326}\) after taking over from 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.\(^{327}\) 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,”\(^{328}\) and has expressed her desire to work closely with the ANAC.\(^{329}\)

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.”\(^{330}\) 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.”\(^{331}\) Cantone stated his wish for the two agencies to work together given that “Italy is, unfortunately, very familiar with corruption.”\(^{332}\)

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.\(^{333}\)

---


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.\(^{334}\)

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.”\(^{336}\) Italian support for the project was announced on International Anti-Corruption Day.\(^{337}\)

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.

**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”\(^{338}\) 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” in fulfilling the Working Group’s suggestions, which include creating an “Action Plan” 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,” and the OECD itself plans to follow up with another evaluation of Japan in March 2019.

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. These guidelines, supplementing the statements issued a year prior by the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry, aim to increase overall fiscal transparency by 1) encouraging companies to implement their own “internal control system” to “better detect and prevent bribery,” including a specific emphasis on accurately recording “relevant commercial activity and transactions,” and 2) by promoting greater involvement in the anti-corruption agenda on part of lawyers and related legal counsel, providing a “practical” approach which can be used to advise companies on how to best conduct their businesses abroad in compliance with anti-corruption laws.

On 23 August 2016, the JFBA announced the establishment of a relief fund for victims of embezzlement by “fraudulent lawyers.” The relief fund, to be implemented starting in April 2017,

---

is being created in response to a “growing problem” in the country where many legal professionals, particularly lawyers, are abusing the “guardian of adult system,” 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” 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.

On 30 September 2016, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) released a press statement announcing the signing of a tax convention between Japan and Slovenia. The convention aims to foster a closer, more transparent economic relationship between the two countries by 1) clarifying “taxation on cross-border investments”; 2) “adjusting international double taxation” by clarifying the “taxable scope” in the two countries; and 3) introducing new dispute resolution methods such as “arbitration proceedings” 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. The convention is to become applicable on the taxable period starting on 1 January 2017 in both countries.

On 18 November 2016, the Osaka Prefectural Police established a new 140-person “emergency unit” to combat recent “proliferation of fraud cases.” 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{365} The emergency team hopes to increase law enforcement cooperation in anti-corruption efforts by tackling issues that were previously not addressed “sufficiently”\textsuperscript{366} due to a lack of available manpower, such as “tracing the bases of fraud groups”\textsuperscript{367} and raising exposure to the public of names found on fraud lists.\textsuperscript{368}

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.

\textit{Analyst: Apanubha Mahmood}

\textbf{United Kingdom: 0}

The United Kingdom has partially complied with its commitment to moving the global anti-corruption agenda forward.

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{369} released a Consultation Paper intended to review the current law on misconduct in public office.\textsuperscript{370} It criticizes the current law as unclear and insufficient on many fronts.\textsuperscript{371} 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; and third, the abolition of the current law with no immediate replacement; while this latter route is not heavily endorsed, it is still addressed fully.\textsuperscript{372}

On 13 October 2016, the Criminal Finances Bill was introduced to the House of Commons.\textsuperscript{373} 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{374} 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{375} which includes “reforming the Suspicious Activity Report”\textsuperscript{376} and “increasing … international reach through events like the Anti-Corruption Summit”\textsuperscript{377} to build cooperation with overseas partners, reflecting the international nature of the issue.\textsuperscript{378}

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.\textsuperscript{379} The allegations have already caused the resignation of Sam Allardyce as the national team manager.\textsuperscript{380} A further eight current or previous players are involved in these allegations among several other front office employees.\textsuperscript{381}

On 13 July 2016, the Serious Fraud Office (SFO) of the United Kingdom 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.\textsuperscript{382} Specifically, the indicted were charged with allegedly bribing an official of Sonangol, an Angolan state oil company, to further their company’s businesses operations in the Republic of Angola.\textsuperscript{383} The case was accepted by the SFO in September 2014 but charges were not laid until July of 2016.\textsuperscript{384}

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.\textsuperscript{385} 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.\textsuperscript{386} The agreement requires all 13 countries to ratify before the plans can move forward; they are still waiting on Germany who is expected to ratify by early

There are still logistical issues that need to be resolved concerning Britain’s eventual implementation of Brexit.\textsuperscript{388}

The United Kingdom has taken some action individually that aligns with the goals of the Declaration Against Corruption and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s Anti-Bribery Ministerial Meeting declaration. It has not complied with the other aspects of this commitment. Thus, it has earned a score of 0.

**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 USD 220 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.\textsuperscript{389} 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.”\textsuperscript{390}

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),\textsuperscript{391} a five-year, USD20.8 million program designed to strengthen Indonesia’s anti-corruption efforts.\textsuperscript{392} “Through our work together, we hope to advance transparency, accountability, fairness, and justice,”\textsuperscript{393} 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.”\textsuperscript{394} Overall, the CEGAH project aims to prevent corruption by “providing ongoing
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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 USD12 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.

**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 spanning 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.

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. 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.” The ITCO intergroup has also called for transparency registers for lobbyists in a press statement released on 28 September 2016. In the press statement, ITCO Co-President Dennis de Jong reinforces the importance of reliable information from lobbyists, and in cases of fraud, “sanctions based on criminal law should be imposed.”

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.” 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

---
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tax-evaders.⁴⁰⁸ The adopted proposal includes important updates to previous legislation such as tackling terrorist financing risks linked to virtual currencies, tackling risks linked to anonymous prepaid 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.⁴⁰⁹ This program will be implemented by the Danish Development Cooperation Agency with the support of the EU Advisory Mission (EUAM) Ukraine, and is expected to be worth over EUR16 million. Already aided by EUAM, 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.”⁴¹⁰

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.”⁴¹¹

On 5 October 2016, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development and the Greek government, with the support of the EU, launched a collaborative project to help implement Greece’s National Anti-Corruption Action Plan.⁴¹² 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.”⁴¹³ The 18-month project has ten targeted outcomes and includes modernizing internal and external audit mechanisms, strengthening whistleblower protection, and enhancing the partnership between private and public sectors in combatting corruption.⁴¹⁴

On 16 November 2016, the EU partnered with Albania to establish the largest anti-corruption project in the Western Balkans.\textsuperscript{415} 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.\textsuperscript{416} 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{417}

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.

\textit{Analyst: Gabrielle Lim}

---


5. 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>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></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.\(^{418}\) Combating 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.’\(^{419}\)

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.\(^{420}\) This October 2001 initiative called for immediate and concerted international action to freeze terrorist assets and impose appropriate sanctions.\(^{421}\) 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.\(^{422}\)

---

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.\(^{423}\)

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,”\(^{424}\) and supported the FATF’s decision to expand its mandate “to combat terrorist financing.”\(^{425}\) 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.”\(^{426}\) Since 2001, the G7 members have been working to implement the FATF’s recommendations regarding combatting the financing of terrorist activities.\(^{427}\)

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.\(^{428}\) 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.\(^{429}\)

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.\(^{430}\) At the 2015 Elmau Summit, G7 leaders reaffirmed their commitment to combatting terrorist financing through “coordinated action.”\(^{431}\) 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,”\(^{432}\) 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 framework for combating 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.”

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” regarding CFT; 2) review FATF standards in light of evolving terrorist financing threats; 3) implement coordinated and targeted financial sanctions; and 4) reinforce the FATF to meet “current challenges.”

The first element of this commitment recognizes that information exchange and international cooperation are critical in combatting 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. Member states also commit to exploring “new and innovative forms of information exchange and international cooperation.” 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.”

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 1,000,000⁴⁴³); 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.”⁴⁴⁴

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)⁴⁴⁵. 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 fulfil the requests of other G7 members to freeze the assets of individuals who are suspected of engaging in terrorist financing activities.⁴⁴⁶

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.”⁴⁴⁷ 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.⁴⁴⁸

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 Combatting 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 Terrorism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lead Analyst: Cas Legrand

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 the International Monetary Fund’s report, 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.”

Canada strengthened the FATF network’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.”

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. 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, a partner of the Egmont Group that seeks to facilitate communication among FIUs.

---

452 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/commission/finance/41-2/79/kevin-stephenson-1/only/
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.\(^{453}\) Further, Global Affairs Canada is responsible for enforcing relevant UN Security Council resolutions and the Special Economic Measures Act,\(^{454}\) in particular those articles that sanction the freezing of assets.\(^{455}\) 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 assets and respond to requests.\(^{456}\) The Canadian government continues to adhere to structural frameworks put in place to facilitate the freezing of assets.

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.

*Analyst: Emerson Segismundo*

**France: +1**

France has fully complied with its commitment to continue implementing relevant measures to combat terrorist finance during the compliance period.

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.\(^{457}\) 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.\(^{458}\) According to new data acquired in 2016, the number of reported cases of illicit financing rose by 49 per cent from January to September.\(^{459}\) In December 2016, TRACFIN published a report that outlined the phenomenon of crowdfunding — online donation platforms — as a popular means through which people are financing terrorism.\(^{460}\) According to the report, EUR50 million was made through crowdfunding, a figure that has doubled since 2014.\(^{461}\) TRACFIN has implemented new
legislation within France that is expected to take effect on 1 January 2017, stipulating that those attempting to organize a crowdfunding 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.\textsuperscript{462}

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 AlQaida” was accepted.\textsuperscript{463} 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{464}

On 10 November 2016, the French Government issued a decree pertaining to electronic money which bolsters TRACFIN. The new framework is more stringent than that of the European Union 4th Directive on Anti Money Laundering.\textsuperscript{465}

It has also adopted measures to strengthen its asset freezing regulations. On 24 November 2016, France published “an order bolstering measures for freezing assets.”\textsuperscript{466}

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.”\textsuperscript{467} 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.”\textsuperscript{468}

France has implemented new measures that comply with its commitment to combat the financing of terrorism during the compliance period and has taken concerted effort to facilitate coordinated action through the FATF. Thus, France has been awarded a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Sarah Bear}

\textbf{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 (FATF).”

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 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.

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. 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. As President of the AIF René Brüllhart 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.”

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 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. The meeting provided an opportunity for Coalition members to sharpen their understanding of ISIL’s financial infrastructure 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.

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.” Within this national

framework, Italian FIUs can issue a five-working-day freezing order in case of suspected transactions of terrorist financing.\(^\text{483}\)

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.\(^\text{484}\) Moreover, she reminded the body that in the case of incomplete or false declarations, Italy would act resolute in applying severe administrative sanctions.\(^\text{485}\)

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 sixteenth 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.\(^\text{486}\)

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 (Bianca) 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.”\(^\text{487}\) 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.\(^\text{488}\)

---


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.\(^{489}\)

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.\(^{490}\)

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.\(^{491}\)

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.

\textit{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 terrorist asset freezing.

On 13 October 2016, the House of Commons passed the Criminal Finances Bill\(^{492}\) that is designed 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.”\(^{493}\) The UK reaffirmed its commitment to supporting national charities operating in difficult environments overseas in order to mitigate the risk of their funds being abused for terrorist purposes.\(^{494}\) 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 partnering nations to track terrorist activities.495

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 2017496 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 29 November 2016.497 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.498 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.499 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.500

The UK reaffirmed its commitment to abide by the FATF standards that were revised in 2012.501 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.502 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 arrangements503 and strengthen the enhanced checks (“due diligence measures/counter measures”) for high-risk countries.504

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.

**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. 505 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 Combatting 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. 506 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 terrorist 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. 508 The regulations increased the maximum amount of civil monetary penalties under OFAC regulations. The amended regulations included 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. 509 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.

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. 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. 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. 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. 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.

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.

---
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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.

**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. \(^{517}\)

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. \(^{518}\) 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. \(^{519}\)

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. \(^{520}\) 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. \(^{521}\)

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. \(^{522}\)

---


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 Vra Jourova, 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. 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.

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.

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.

The State of the Union address also reaffirmed the European Commission’s commitment to a platform that would better connect FIUs from EU member states, 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.

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 Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), also referred to as Da’esh.

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.

*Analyst: Courtney Amanda Wong*
6. 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*

### Assessment

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

### Background

Since the beginning of the civil war in Syria in 2011, an estimated 11 million Syrian refugees have fled their homes.\(^{530}\) 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.\(^{530}\) 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.\(^{531}\) Germany and Sweden, which are the European Union’s top refugee-receiving countries, have received approximately 300,000 and 100,000 asylum applications respectively.\(^{532}\) 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.\(^{533}\) This sparked calls for President Bashar al-Assad’s resignation.\(^{534}\) 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.”\(^{535}\) In April 2011, as an attempt to stabilize the protest, President Bashar al-

---


Assad sent tanks into cities, and security forces opened fire. Rebel brigades were formed, and the conflict between rebel and government forces continued. By June 2013, the UN reported that 90,000 people had been killed.

The Syrian conflict has since evolved into a series of at least “four overlapping conflicts.” 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. 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. 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. Finally, the Syrian conflict is also a proxy war between the US and Russia, as well as between the Gulf States and Iran.

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. They note that “civilians and hors 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.” 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 intervened in August 2013 and 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.

---

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.\(^{547}\) Staffan de Mistura, his successor, shifted the focus onto a series of local ceasefires.\(^{548}\) The three-year siege of the Homs suburb of al-War was ended in 2015.\(^{549}\) 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.\(^{550}\) The latest “cessation of hostilities” deal began on 12 September 2016.\(^{551}\) It has since collapsed.\(^{552}\)

**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.”\(^{553}\)

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.”\(^{554}\) 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 Group of industrial powers and Gulf states have allocated 1.6 billion Euros for UN aid agencies in helping Syrian refugees.\(^{555}\) 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.\(^{556}\)

---


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,” while 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.

---


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.”

On 19 September 2016, the Canadian government committed to increasing humanitarian support by 10 per cent this fiscal year. 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. 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.

The Canadian government also announced CAD37.8 million in long-term institutional funding for the United Nations 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

---


568 Canada provides significant support following UN meeting on refugees and migrants, Office of the Prime Minister of Canada (Ottawa) 19 September 2016. Date of Access: 2 December 2016. http://pm.gc.ca/eng/news/2016/09/19/canada-provides-significant-support-following-meeting-refugees-and-migrants.
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Jordon. 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.571

Canada has pledged CAD20 million to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees to support education, health, and social services for Palestinian refugees from the region, including those who fled Syrian refugee camps.572 The government of Canada has earmarked a further CAD5 million to support the agency’s work in helping Syrian refugees exclusively.573 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.574 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.575

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].”576 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.”577

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


574 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;jsessionid=d1f2f89ca48d49cd49a1c55cf5be7d1367f853f24bf78f8edc41c37dc92a685.e38Rbha1b3qNe3eKa3v0?mthd=index&crtr.page=1&nid=1101179.
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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.”  

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.  

The Canadian government has also supported several initiatives to eradicate conditions conductive 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. 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.  

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.  

---


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. 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.

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 fullfillment 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. 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. Starting 24 October 2016, migrants were moved out of Calais, and ushered onto buses destined for shelters across France. Makeshift 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. Additionally, French non-governmental organization Emmaus Solidarité has offered to help set up ten day shelters in northern France, closer to the now-demolished Calais. The shelters will provide medical care and guidance on how to attain asylum before refugees and migrants are processed by the welcome centres.

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{593} 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{594} The minister urged the state, non-governmental organizations, community actors and citizens to band together to expand national participation in this program.\textsuperscript{595}

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{596} The text also called for parties involved in the conflict, in particular the Syrian government, to implement the Council’s previous resolutions.\textsuperscript{597} 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{598} France co-sponsored the resolution set forth, which expresses concern over the human rights violations occurring in Aleppo.\textsuperscript{599} 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{600}

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{601} 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{602}

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 (PVE). The proposal also committed France 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.

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.

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: Sommyyah 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. After the G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration was released on 27 May 2016, Germany disbursed much of this funding.

In 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 World Food Programme (WFP) for Syria and the surrounding region for 2016.

---


In September 2016, Germany funded humanitarian assistance, which was delivered to 60,000 people in Madaya, Zabadani, Foua and Kefraya in Syria by the WFP in coordination with the Syrian Arab Red Crescent.\(^{610}\)

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.\(^{611}\) 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.”\(^{612}\)

On 2 December 2016, Foreign Minister Steinmeier announced that Germany pledged EUR50 million in humanitarian aid to Aleppo, Syria.\(^{613}\) These funds will go to several organizations, and are earmarked to provide “food, accommodation and medical assistance … in and around the besieged city.”\(^{614}\) Minister Steinmeier also urged involved parties to resume discussions of a ceasefire.\(^{615}\)

In 2016, Germany made directed multilateral contributions through the World Food Programme to Iraq in the amount of USD41,340,782 and to the Syrian Arab Republic in the amount of USD259,382,037.\(^{616}\) 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.\(^{617}\)

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.\(^{618}\)

In September, at the UN General Assembly, Foreign Minister Steinmeier condemned the recent attacks which ended the Syrian ceasefire, and reiterated the necessity of a political settlement for Syria.\(^{619}\)


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 2016.620

In 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 and rebuilding it.”621

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.622

On 1 October 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.623

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).624 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.625


---

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.”

On 10 October 2016, Foreign Minister Steinmeier called to extend the mandate of the Bundeswehr to fight IS.

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. 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. 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.

Many Syrian refugees claim that the asylum system in Italy is “notoriously bad.” The refugee registration procedure is inefficient, as none of the authorities present at the port or the asylum centre conduct checks over the refugees. 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, along with allocating them EUR2.50 per day in the form of pocket money. After a period of six months, refugees will also be granted a residence permit along with a work permit.

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.636

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.”637 The World Bank Group has increased funding for refugees to help host countries create jobs and improve their well-being.638 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.639 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.640 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.641 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.”

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.

Analyst: Zaineb Hyder

Japan

Japan 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 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. 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 refugees. 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.\(^{651}\)

On 19 September 2016, at the United Nations Summit for Refugees and Migrants, Prime Minster Abe pledged to provide an assistance package of approximately USD2.8 billion to refugees from 2016 to 2018.\(^{652}\) This package will go towards providing refugees, migrants and their host communities with humanitarian aid and resources that will promote self-sufficiency.\(^{653}\)

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).\(^{654}\) 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.\(^{655}\)

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.\(^{656}\) 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.\(^{657}\)

On 12 September 2016, Foreign Minster Fumio Kishida issued a statement in which he applauded the United States and Russia for coming to an agreement of nationwide cessation of hostilities.\(^{658}\) In conjunction with the improvement of humanitarian efforts, Kishida believed that this would lead to progress in Syria’s political process.\(^{659}\)


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.

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.

**Analyst: Risa Howell**

### United Kingdom +1

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitments to support displaced persons and their host communities, work towards long-term, sustainable, post-conflict stabilization and rehabilitation of Syria and eradicate conditions conducive to violent extremism.

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.\(^669\)

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.\(^670\) 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.\(^671\)

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.\(^672\) 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.\(^673\)

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.

*Analyst: Mariah Stewart*

### 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 conductive 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.\(^674\) 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.\(^675\) 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. In the sense of admitting refugees and aiding burdened regions, the United States has complied 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. 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. 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. 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. 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 also 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 educations, to be used towards countering violent extremism programs. 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.\textsuperscript{686}

As of 27 September 2016, the United States has provided more than USD205 million in aid to NGOs.\textsuperscript{687} 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.\textsuperscript{688} 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.\textsuperscript{689}

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.\textsuperscript{690} “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.

\textit{Analyst: Adit Tandon}

\textbf{European Union: +1}

The European Union has 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.”\textsuperscript{691}

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. Representives 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 head 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."  

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 (ESSN) 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, the ESSN "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 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.

The EU has also taken some action to counter violent extremism during the compliance period. 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.

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. 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.” 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.”

---

Similarly, 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.719 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.”720 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.”721

On 15 December 2016, in a set of meeting conclusions, 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.”722 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.”723 Finally, the European Council signaled its intention to work towards “achieving consensus on the EU’s asylum policy during the incoming Presidency.”724

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.725 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. The initiative’s inaugural meetings had previously taken place in October 2016.

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

---


“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_

### 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>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>0</td>
<td></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.”  

This pledge represents a continuation of the G7’s policy of 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. Having raised USD20 billion, the initiative was later extended in 2011.

As the host country for the 2016 Ise-Shima Summit, Japan ensured that the issue of WMDs 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.”

---


Prior to this, the G7 Foreign Ministers met on 10 and 11 April 2016 in Hiroshima.\textsuperscript{732} During this time, they visited the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum, and the Cenotaph for Atomic Bomb Victims.\textsuperscript{733} They also 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).\textsuperscript{734} 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.”\textsuperscript{735}

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).\textsuperscript{736} 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.”\textsuperscript{737}

**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.”\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{738}} 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.”\textsuperscript{739} Currently, only Israel, India, and Pakistan are not signatories, while North Korea withdrew in 2003.\textsuperscript{740} 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.\textsuperscript{741} The International Atomic Energy Agency has been tasked with the job of


\textsuperscript{734} G7 Foreign Ministers’ Hiroshima Declaration on Nuclear Disarmament and Non-Proliferation, G7/G8 Information Centre (Toronto) 11 April 2016. Access Date: 28 September 2016. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/foreignformin160411-declaration.html.


\textsuperscript{738} G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration, G7 Information Centre (Toronto). Date of Access: 1 October 2016. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2016shima/ise-shima-declaration-en.html


ensuring that states are adhering to this treaty.\textsuperscript{742} Finally, NPT signatories have agreed to work towards disarmament.\textsuperscript{743} 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,\textsuperscript{744} 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.”\textsuperscript{745} 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 1997, the CWC entered into force.\textsuperscript{746} 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”\textsuperscript{747} 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.\textsuperscript{748} Currently, only North Korea, Egypt, and South Sudan have not signed the treaty, while Israel has not yet ratified it.\textsuperscript{749} 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,”\textsuperscript{750} and adopted an action plan to promote universality.\textsuperscript{751} 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.\textsuperscript{752} As of today, it has 172 state parties and nine signatory states.\textsuperscript{753} This treaty “prohibits the development, production, acquisition, transfer, stockpiling and use of biological and toxin weapons.”\textsuperscript{754} 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, this 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>

*Lead Analyst: Mathieu Sitaya*

---

Canada: 0

Canada has partially 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).

Per the Fifth Regional Review Meeting on Radioactive Source Security 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 (WMDs) related to nuclear security, biological security, and the destruction of chemical weapons.

On 21 October 2016, Canada entered into force the amendments to the implementation of the United Nations’ resolutions on the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea.

Canada had previously been a major contributor to the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons missions in Libya. Canada provided further funding in the amount of CAD750,000 to a multinational effort aimed at removing Libyan chemical weapon stockpiles from the country and destroying them in Germany.

The Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission has also been active in several projects on the domestic level. Notably, the CNSC published a document called Environmental Principles, Assessments and Protection Measures, which promotes environmental principles with the use of safe nuclear energy on 19 December 2016. Moreover, in September 2016, Executive Vice-President Ramzi Jamil was the leader of an Integrated Regulatory Review Service mission in China which assessed China’s nuclear regulations concerning nuclear and radiation security.

On the Syrian chemical crisis, Foreign Minister Stéphane Dion made a statement calling for the accountability of those who have committed obvious violations of international treaties related to the use of chemical weapons. Dion’s statement to the United Nations came after the release of the United Nations Joint Investigative Mechanism report, which was funded by several countries, including Canada.

Therefore, Canada has been awarded a score of 0 for its efforts to counter the proliferation of WMDs since the summit. It has not been awarded a fully compliant designation because it is yet to attempt

---

to universalize the BTWC and other relevant treaties, and it is yet to make new efforts in the NPT and the CWC.

**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.769

During the Biological Weapons Convention Review Conference in Geneva, November 2016, France’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs addressed the issue of enhancing national implementation of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC).770

However, no further action has been taken to universalize the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) since the 2016 Ise-Shima summit.

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.”771 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.”772 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.\textsuperscript{773} 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.\textsuperscript{774}

Indeed, the day before, on 26 October 2016, Germany presented resolution L.65/Rev.1 in cooperation with Canada and the Netherlands.\textsuperscript{775} 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.”\textsuperscript{776} This resolution was adopted on 28 October 2017, and created “a high-level preparatory group” to work on outlining the treaty.\textsuperscript{777}

It has also, since 2013, contributed EUR5 million to Syria to destroy Syrian chemical weapons.\textsuperscript{778}

On 8 September 2016, Ahmet Üzümçü, Director-General of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons 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.\textsuperscript{779} Üzümçü thanked “Germany for its leadership and contributions, which are indispensable for the successful conclusion of this operation.”\textsuperscript{780} Germany formally proposed that “the chemical weapons … be destroyed at a highly-capable specialised destruction facility operated by GEKA in Munster.”\textsuperscript{781}

\textsuperscript{775} Treaty Banning the Production of Fissile Material for Nuclear Weapons or Other Nuclear Explosive Devices, United Nations General Assembly (New York) 26 October 2016. Date of Access: 18 February 2017.
\textsuperscript{776} Treaty Banning the Production of Fissile Material for Nuclear Weapons or Other Nuclear Explosive Devices, United Nations General Assembly (New York) 26 October 2016. Date of Access: 18 February 2017.
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.

After the eighth Review Conference held in Nov 2016, the ISU mandate was renewed for another five years while all states committed to at least one annual meeting. The next conference is to have a German vice-chair, where Germany will report its priorities as 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 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 the gathering, 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 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.

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 exhibit 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.\(^{790}\)

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.\(^{791}\) 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.”\(^{795}\)

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,\(^{793}\) and has also expressed its support in renegotiating trade deals with Iran in light of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.\(^{794}\)

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.”\(^{795}\) 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.”\(^{796}\) Moreover, 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.\textsuperscript{797}

Italy has robust reviewing procedures for its nuclear energy programs, which are overseen by the Advanced Institute for Environmental Protection and Research and one of its subcommittees, the Integrated Regulatory Review Service (IRRS).\textsuperscript{798} 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 IRRS is composed of representatives from other NPT signatories and representatives of the International Atomic Energy Agency; of their review 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.\textsuperscript{799}

Italy is also one of five European nations participating in a nuclear-sharing program in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and purportedly has US nuclear resources in domestic territory.\textsuperscript{800}

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.”\textsuperscript{801} 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.”\textsuperscript{802}

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 help on 21 September 2016. Italy indicated its approval of the Joint Ministerial Statement that was released at this conference.\textsuperscript{803} 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.”

In November 2016, Permanent Representative of Italy to the Conference on Disarmament, Ambassador Vinicio Mati, spoke during the general debate at the Eighth Review Conference of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC). Mati emphasized Italy’s support for the universalization, full implementation and strengthening of the Convention.

In January 2017, Vinicio Mati spoke at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, at which point he stressed Italy’s commitment to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), particularly in relation to Italy’s G7 Presidency in 2017.

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 Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC).

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.  

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.” Sano stated that Japan was ready to work with the Security Council and offer its cooperation and assistance for those state parties in need. 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.

On 21 September 2016, Fumio Kishida, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, 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.” In his closing remarks, Kishida called upon the remaining non-ratifying states to sign and ratify the CTBT. The CTBT has been recognized as an instrument that “constrains the development and qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and thereby provides an effective disarmament and non-proliferation measure.

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 outreaching to non-signatory states.” Kihara stressed the importance of the early entry into force of the CTBT. “We are all fully aware that this is not an
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.

Analyst: Duja Muhanna

**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.

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.\textsuperscript{825}

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.\textsuperscript{826}

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.

\textit{Analyst: Jaspreet Khela}

**United States: 0**

The United States has partially 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).

On 7 November 2016, Thomas M. 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.\textsuperscript{827} 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.”\textsuperscript{828} Such measures should include developing approaches to coordinate international assistance and response, and providing access to an investigation team.\textsuperscript{829} Countryman further assured member states of the BWC of Washington’s commitment towards the universalization of the treaty, stating that “we must take the necessary and pragmatic steps to make the convention stronger and more effective.”\textsuperscript{830}


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 its 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.”

“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.

On 8 June 2016, President Obama announced his support for India’s intent to join the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), a 48-state 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.

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. In fact, “President Obama is lobbying for India to win membership through a special exception.”

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 subscribe to the HCOC as well. 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.”

Thus, the United States 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, namely the CWC and the BTWC.

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). It has worked to support the universalization of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), and the Biological and
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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.838 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.839

On 24 October 2016, the EU co-sponsored a seminar on the nuclear weapons crisis in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea in Seoul. Approximately 60 governments and think-tanks from Europe, North-East Asia, and the United States participated. Participants assessed the capacity of the DPRK 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 Republic of Korea’s bilateral relations.840

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 on 9 September 2016.”841 The EU demanded that the DPRK 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.”842

The EU again condemned the DPRK’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{843} At the same meeting, the EU also reaffirmed its support for a WMD-free zone in the Middle East,\textsuperscript{844} and urged Iran\textsuperscript{845} and, in November, Syria,\textsuperscript{846} 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,”\textsuperscript{847} and reaffirmed “the essential responsibility and the central role of the IAEA in strengthening the international nuclear security architecture.”\textsuperscript{848}

The EU has worked to encourage universalization of and compliance with the CWC. 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. Additionally, 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 Jel 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).”\textsuperscript{849}

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,\textsuperscript{850} 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.

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 the DPRK’s September nuclear test, the EU urged them to ratify and comply with the CTBT, arguing that the DPRK’s “irresponsible behavior” demonstrated the importance of achieving universalization of the CTBT, calling all other non-member states to ratify the treaty.

Additionally, the EU has 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.

---


---
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*
8. 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 state interaction within cyberspace rather than on more technical areas (such as infrastructure-building or increasing accessibility). Given the normative element of this commitment, there are a number of 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 [confidence building measures], which can help to ensure stability in cyberspace by reducing the risk of miscalculation and escalation.” Thus, the G7 commitment appears to have been heavily influenced by US policy.

The first element of this framework involves support for the idea that international law is applicable in cyber space. This is something which the G7 explicitly confirmed in the G7 Principles and Actions on Cyber. Prior to this, it was affirmed by the 2013 United Nations Report of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security (GGE), and later confirmed by the 2015 GGE. GGEs are the

---

main instrument that the international community has used to discuss international law’s applicability to cybersecurity, though their reports are non-binding.\textsuperscript{873} 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{874} 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{875} 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{876} The US has labelled this commitment such a norm and called for its adoption in the past.\textsuperscript{877} 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{878} 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{879} 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{880} 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{881} Therefore, examples of compliance could include, but are not limited to, agreements


\textsuperscript{874} 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.
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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 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. Finally, 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. 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.

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,” 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. 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” as well as encouraging “responsible reporting of ICT vulnerabilities.”

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 this commitment.

---

On 28 September 2016, France introduced the “Loi Numérique.”894 The law established the Internet as being a fundamental right for French people four years after the UN recognized it as such.895 This has also been promoted as an initiative for increased access to data and transparency, which was written into France’s digital strategy in 2015.896 These two elements contribute to the application of international law and norm-building in cyberspace.

On 7 October 2016, the “Loi pour une Republique Numérique,” which aimed to increase transparency and democratize cyberspace, was adopted.897 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).898 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).899

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.900

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.901 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.”902

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.903 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.\textsuperscript{904}

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.

\textit{Analyst: Helena Najm}

\textbf{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.\textsuperscript{905} 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.\textsuperscript{906} 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{907}

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{908} 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. 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 further shape the supplement and application of international law in the cyber sphere. Additionally, it outlines the foundation of a German institute for international cyber security. This action falls within efforts to apply international law in cyberspace and introduce confidence building measures between states.

Germany has started to take 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. 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 EU 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.

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. 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.915

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.916 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.917

On 12 January 2017, the Italian Minister for the Interior Marco Minniti met with European Commissioner for Migration, Home Affairs, and Citizenship Dimitris Avramopoulos.918 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.”919

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). However, Japan has not elaborated enough on the actions that it will take under these initiatives to achieve full compliance.

On 12 July 2016, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs announced the establishment of the Cyber Security Policy Division.920 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.  

On 27 July 2016, Japan and the United States conducted their fourth Cyber Dialogue in Washington DC. 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.” In discussions, “both sides also committed to continue their dialogue and to enhance the importance of cyber issues in our bilateral cooperation.”

On 2 August 2016, Japan and Australia conducted their second Cyber Policy Dialogue in Tokyo. Building on 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.

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.

---


Having successfully implemented 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 cybersecurity and Internet governance.946 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.947 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.948 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 Directive), the first ever EU-wide legislation addressing cybersecurity.949 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.950 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.951

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.952

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.953

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.954

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.955

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.956 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.957

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*

---


9. 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

Note: This commitment has not been reviewed by stakeholders.

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></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, the Director of Accountability for the G7 Research Group, has noted that the G7 first addressed the problem in...

---


962 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.
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 carbon-producing powers.”

During this time, the G8 committed to undertaking robust aggregate and individual mid-term reductions in carbon emissions. At the Camp David Summit in 2012, G8 leaders reiterated their commitment to the reduction and mitigation of carbon emissions and other particulate air pollution. 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.

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. 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.” The 2016 G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration explicitly characterized the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21) at Paris and the Paris Agreement as key to the post-2016 development agenda and the G7 efforts to reach climate-related targets. 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.”

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

---

963 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.

964 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.


to be bound by the treaty at a later date." 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. 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.

**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. It ratified the document in parliament on 5 October 2016. 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 per cent of global greenhouse gas emissions needed to bring the Paris Agreement into force.”

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. The framework details how the Government of Canada will meet its commitment to reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions 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

---

975 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=62da77ccc5cc1ce6ba606e6816e24a9e3c2a1ab15a8a159eb4f02ba57ea85f3.e34Rc3IMbx8Oai0Tbx0Saxur=fn0?mthd=advSr&ct=crtr&crtr.page=1&crtr.dpt1D=6672&nid=1133599&crtr.tp1D=980.
976 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=62da77ccc5cc1ce6ba606e6816e24a9e3c2a1ab15a8a159eb4f02ba57ea85f3.e34Rc3IMbx8Oai0Tbx0Saxur=fn0?mthd=advSr&ct=crtr&crtr.page=1&crtr.dpt1D=6672&nid=1133599&crtr.tp1D=980.
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.” The ministers also agreed to adopt policies that would help reduce greenhouse gases (GHGs) so that Canada can fulfill its obligations under the agreement. 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.

Between 7 and 18 November 2016, a Canadian delegation of 225 members attended the Marrakech Climate Change Conference (COP22). 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 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, making France the first G7 member to adopt the historic treaty. Ségolène Royal, Minister of Ecology, Sustainable Development and Energy and President of COP21, 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 Marrakesh Climate Change Conference (COP22). 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.996

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.997

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.

Lead 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.998 On 6 July 2016, it became “one of the first European Union member states to formally begin the ratification process.”999 This ratification process was completed on 5 October 2016.1000 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.1001

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 (GHG) reductions that will allow Germany to achieve its goal of decreasing GHG levels by “at least 55 per cent 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 per cent compared to 1990 levels by 2050. Federal Environment Minister Barbara 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 Petersberg Climate Dialogue, which engaged representatives of thirty-five countries in discussions of how to implement the Paris Agreement. At this time, the German government committed to working with the World Resources Institute (WRI) to help developing states create plans to meet their obligations under the Paris Agreement.

---


---
A German delegation also attended the Marrakesh Climate Change Conference (COP22), which was held between 7 and 18 November 2016. During the meetings, Germany committed EUR50 million to help developing countries that are suffering the effects of climate change to adapt. 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. 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). 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.” Italy committed EUR4 million to support the efforts of the CBIT.

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 (ENEA). The agency is, for example, implementing underwater robots that monitor the ecosystem, providing a measure of marine biodiversity. 1017

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. 1018 The agreement focused on managing solid waste and coastal areas, preventing carbon pollution, and promoting sustainable development. 1019

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 terminals, storage facilities, hydrocarbons development).” 1020 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. 1021

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 percent for 2020), increasing electrification to reach 38 percent, and closely monitoring the role of gas for the energy transition to take place. 1022

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.

On 8 November 2016, Japan officially accepted the 2015 Paris Climate Change Agreement to cut emissions and prevent climate change. 1023

---

1018 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
1019 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
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.” ¹⁰²⁴

A delegation from Japan attended the Marrakesh Climate Change Conference (COP22), which was held between 7 November and 18 November 2016. ¹⁰²⁵ 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.”¹⁰²⁶ 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.”¹⁰²⁷

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

For example, Japan submitted its Intended Nationally Determined Contributions in July 2015, which includes a commitment to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by 26% compared to its 2013 levels by 2030.¹⁰²⁸

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.¹⁰²⁹ 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 Marukawa 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.”¹⁰³⁰

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.

Analyist: 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 state 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 United Nations Climate Change 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. It has also made considerable international diplomacy efforts to ensure that the Paris Agreement enters into force.

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

Additionally, President Barack Obama and his administration lobbied for the EPA Clean Power Act, a proposal that seeks to regulate and reduce carbon pollution from power plants across the country. The USA has committed to working with Canada and Mexico to achieve a sustainable, low-carbon solution to climate change. Moreover, the USA released a mid-century strategy to

---

significantly decarbonize and reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 80 percent by the year 2050, as compared to levels in 2005.\(^{1037}\)

President Barack Obama first proposed the EPA Clean Power Act on 3 August 2015.\(^{1038}\) States submitted their plans in accordance with the act as of 6 September 2016.\(^{1039}\) 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.\(^{1040}\) There are currently 18 states for the implementation of the plan, while 28 states are against it.\(^{1041}\) 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]."\(^{1042}\)

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.\(^{1043}\) This plan aims to "achieve a goal for North America of 50 per cent clean power generation by 2025."\(^{1044}\) The countries have also agreed to work together to promote other G20 countries to ratify the Paris Agreement.\(^{1045}\) The plan 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."\(^{1046}\)

On 16 November 2016, the USA proposed a mid-century strategy to combat climate change. The USA is currently the world’s second-largest GHG emitter.\(^{1047}\) With this in mind, the proposed

strategy aims to reduce GHG emissions by 17 percent by 2020, 28 percent by 2025, and 80 percent by 2050, all in comparison to levels in 2005.\textsuperscript{1048} 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 CO2 removal technologies, and reducing non-CO2 emissions.\textsuperscript{1049}

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.\textsuperscript{1050} 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.\textsuperscript{1051} The report also analyzes non-CO2 emissions such as methane, nitrous oxide, and HFCs.\textsuperscript{1052} 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.\textsuperscript{1053}

The USA is thus in full compliance with the Paris Agreement commitment, as it has both ratified the agreement and subsequently released a mid-century strategy to target climate change. The USA is working with other countries in North America, through the North American Climate, Clean Energy, and Environment Partnership Action Plan to promote and regulate the usage of renewable energy instead of fossil fuels. President Obama and his administration are also working to pass the Clean Power Act, which regulates carbon emissions from power plants across the country.

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

\textit{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.
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The EU ratified the Paris Agreement on 5 October 2016, ensuring that the agreement successfully passed its legal threshold and entered into force.\textsuperscript{1054} 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.\textsuperscript{1055} It was approved with 610 votes in favour, 38 against, and 31 abstentions.\textsuperscript{1056}

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.\textsuperscript{1057}

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.\textsuperscript{1058}

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.

\textit{Analyst: Rhys Williams}

## 10. 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*

Note: This commitment has not been reviewed by stakeholders.

### 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>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</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 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 the 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 the 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.\textsuperscript{1065} As a result, the WHO called for a move away from state self-assessment of implementation, and introduced the Joint External Evaluation (JEE) tool in 2016.\textsuperscript{1066} The Global Health Security Agenda (GHSA) helped to develop the JEE.

The Global Health Security Agenda 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.\textsuperscript{1067} The Global Health Security Agenda 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.\textsuperscript{1068} The US notes that the agenda “accelerates action and spurs progress toward implementation of the World Health Organization’s International Health Regulations and other global health security frameworks.”\textsuperscript{1069} It also emphasizes the need for assessments of national health capacity in prevention of and preparedness for public health threats.\textsuperscript{1070}

Thus, the JEE tool is a comprehensive assessment tool for the WHO’s 2005 IHR and Global Health Security Agenda–related capacities with measurable targets in preventing, detecting, and responding to public health threats.\textsuperscript{1071}

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 (UHC) … to ensure that all people have access to the health services they need without suffering financial hardship to pay for them.”\textsuperscript{1072} 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.\textsuperscript{1073}

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

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.” This concern has resulted in a focus on the IHR and the Global Health Security Agenda.

**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 the WHO’s IHR objectives, including those effected through the Global Health Security Agenda. The commitment thus requires that G7 states take action in two areas to be considered to be in full compliance: (1) advancing the WHO’s IHR objectives in general; and (2) advancing the WHO’s IHR objectives through the Global Health Security Agenda specifically.

The 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 the WHO. If G7 members take action to help countries develop such plans, it can be seen as an effort to meet the WHO’s IHR objectives.

In order to achieve compliance with the G7’s commitment to advancing IHR objectives through the Global Health Security Agenda, 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 the World Health Organization’s (WHO) International Health Regulations (IHR) objectives, including little to no action through the Global Health Security Agenda OR takes no action to advance the WHO’s IHR objectives, including no action through the Global Health Security Agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member takes action to advance compliance with the WHO’s IHR objectives, but has not done so through the Global Health Security Agenda OR takes action to advance IHR objectives through the Global Health Security Agenda but not through any other means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member takes robust action to advance compliance with the WHO’s IHR objectives, including through the Global Health Security Agenda 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 and 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.\(^{1079}\)

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 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.”\(^{1080}\) At WHA, Health Minister Philpott delivered Canada’s statement in which she brought forward some of Canada’s main priorities in global health.\(^{1081}\)

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, the 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.”\(^{1082}\)

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.”\(^{1083}\)

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 the WHO to assist the comprehensive global approach to fighting antimicrobial resistance AMR.\(^{1084}\)

Canada has also taken steps since the Ise-Shima Summit to advance IHR objectives through the Global Health Security Agenda. Canada is a member of the JEE Alliance,\(^{1085}\) 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.” 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 the WHO’s IHR objectives, including through the Global Health Security Agenda.

**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.

On May 23, 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.” The Muskoka Fund is a joint program operated by four United Nations agencies (WHO, United Nations Population Fund, UN Women and UNICEF) with the specific purpose of ameliorating women’s health worldwide.

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.

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.”

---


In terms of advancing the WHO’s IHR objectives through the Global Health Security Agenda, France has not used the Strategic Partnership Portal or any other assessment tool to reduce fragmentation.\textsuperscript{1092} According to the portal, France has not contributed any funding to the IHR core capacities since 2014.\textsuperscript{1093} In addition, France has failed to utilize the Joint External Evaluation (JEE), a tool used to evaluate compliance with the Global Health Security Agenda.\textsuperscript{1094}

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.

\textit{Analyst: Ambika Varma}

\textbf{Germany: 0}

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

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.\textsuperscript{1095} The program had a budget of EUR25 million between 2013 and 2016, and an extended budget of EUR18 million for 2017-2019.\textsuperscript{1096} 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.”\textsuperscript{1097}

From 1 November to 10 November 2016, laboratory professionals in Mali used equipment donated by the German 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.”\textsuperscript{1098}

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.”

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 Global Health Security Agenda; thus, Germany has been awarded a score of 0 for taking action to advance the WHO’s IHR objectives.

**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 specifically.

On 19 January 2017 Italian Prime Minster Paola Gentiloni signed the National Prevention Vaccine Plan (Piano Nazionale Prevenzione Vaccinale) into action. The plan 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 the WHO, and totalled up to USD250,000.

While Italy has worked towards the objectives of the IHR and is a member of Global Health Security Agenda, 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 the WHO, but not necessarily through the Global Health Security Agenda.

**Japan: 0**

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

At the United Nations General Assembly on 19 September 2016, the Minister of Health, Labour, and Welfare H.E. Mr. Yasuhisa Shiozaki stated, on behalf of Prime Minister Shinzo Abe, that Japan intends to provide ongoing “support for the …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 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 combating 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.”

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 the WHO, but not necessarily through the Global Health Security Agenda.

**Analyst: Jainetri Merchant**

**United Kingdom: +1**

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

The UK showed concrete commitment to furthering the IHR’s objectives by investing GBP112 million in clinical research facilities on 18 November 2016. Minister for Public Health and Innovation Nicola Blackwood stated “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.\textsuperscript{1119} 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.\textsuperscript{1120}

On 1 November 2016, the UK government committed GBP20 million to the UK Public Health Rapid Support Team.\textsuperscript{1121} 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.\textsuperscript{1122} The team will also work with foreign counterparts to train local authorities in controlling and preventing infectious disease abroad.\textsuperscript{1123} 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.”\textsuperscript{1124} The new team complies with IHR objectives to develop national IHR implementation plans and to develop specific national public health capacities.

In addition to taking substantive steps to advance the WHO’s IHR objectives, the UK also served as the volunteer to pilot the Global Health Security Agenda’s Joint External Evaluation (JEE) tool in August 2015.\textsuperscript{1125} 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, being the first country to subject itself to assessment through the JEE, serves as an example for other countries.

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

\textbf{Analyst: Ambika Varma}

\textbf{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 as well as through external means.


The US has engaged in multisectoral efforts to achieve the WHO’s IHR objectives. This concerted effort to develop and strengthen national public health capacities has involved the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the US Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security and other relevant authorities.

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. In addition, the United States has partnered with 30 other countries to facilitate partnerships and design roadmaps to achieve the GHSA targets. 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.

The US is also one of the ten countries that constitute the Global Health Security Agenda 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 targets set by the Global Health Security Agenda. Since the Ise-Shima Summit, the US has also maintained a strong working relationship with its nongovernmental sector to aid in implementation.

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

---


undergo and publish a JEE for IHR implementation on the Strategic Partnership Portal.\textsuperscript{1135} In addition, the United States plays an active role in providing technical and financial resources to implement JEE assessments in countries around the world.\textsuperscript{1136}  

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

\emph{Analyst: Sabrina Lin}

\section*{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.

In September 2016, the EU increased its donation to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. At the Fifth Replenishment Conference of the Global Fund 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 million for 2016.\textsuperscript{1137} The EU and its member states have been the largest contributor to the Global Fund since its creation in 2002.\textsuperscript{1138}

In October 2016, the EU invested EUR45 million through its Horizon 2020 programme to combat the Zika virus and other mosquito-transmitted diseases.\textsuperscript{1139} 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.”\textsuperscript{1140} 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.”\textsuperscript{1141} Due to this emphasis on research and

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
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. \textsuperscript{1142}

The European Union is an advisory partner to Global Health Security Agenda, as such it is slightly unclear to what extent the Joint External Evaluation (JEE) tool could be applied to the EU.\textsuperscript{1143} At this point, the EU has not completed a Global Health Security Agenda 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 Global Health Security Agenda. Thus, the European Union receives a score of 0.

\textit{Analyst: Ambika Varma}


11. 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

Note: This commitment has not been reviewed by stakeholders.

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>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>–1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+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>+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>+0.25</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 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.\textsuperscript{1159}

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 “abuse by leading officials of their public positions for personal enrichment,”\textsuperscript{1160} 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.\textsuperscript{1161, 1162} 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.”\textsuperscript{1163}

In June 2016, the Ukrainian parliament adopted a bill aimed at reducing political 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.\textsuperscript{1164}

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.\textsuperscript{1165}

\textbf{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.”\textsuperscript{1166} The G7 specifically stressed the importance of combatting 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.”\textsuperscript{1167}

As such, to achieve full compliance with this commitment, G7 members would need to take substantive actions 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
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.”\footnote{G7 Action to Fight Corruption, G7 Information Centre (Toronto) 27 May 2016. Date of Access: 23 January 2017. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2016shima/action-plan-corruption.html.} 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.\footnote{G7 Action to Fight Corruption, G7 Information Centre (Toronto) 27 May 2016. Date of Access: 23 January 2017. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2016shima/action-plan-corruption.html.} 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.”\footnote{G7 Action to Fight Corruption, G7 Information Centre (Toronto) 27 May 2016. Date of Access: 23 January 2017. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2016shima/action-plan-corruption.html.}

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

**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 combating 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 combating 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 combating corruption in Ukraine AND helps to facilitate judicial reform, particularly in the Prosecutor General’s office.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada: +1**

Canada has fully complied with its commitment to uphold regional security in Ukraine by
combating corruption and facilitating judicial reform.

On 11 July 2016, Prime Minister Trudeau signed the Canada-Ukraine Free Trade Agreement
sanction any form of “undue advantage” given to a public official. Such measures include monetary
}

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.\footnote{In July 2016, Canadian Prime Minister Justin 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 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 3100 Ukrainian soldiers.
}

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 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 3100 Ukrainian soldiers.

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 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 3100 Ukrainian soldiers.

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.”\footnote{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.”
}

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.\footnote{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.
}

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.”\footnote{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.”
}

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


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.

\textit{Analyst: Rebekah Hwang}

\textbf{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.\footnote{G7 Action to Fight Corruption, G7 Information Centre (Toronto) 27 May 2016. Date of Access: 23 January 2017. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2016shima/action-plan-corruption.html.} 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{1187} 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{1188}

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{1189} 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{1190}

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{1191} No direct support to combat corruption was offered during this visit.\textsuperscript{1192}

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{1193}

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


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.

\begin{flushright}
\textit{Analyst: Ivan Hsieh}
\end{flushright}

\textbf{Germany: 0}

Germany has partially 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. However, Germany did not make any substantive action towards facilitating judicial reform or improving the autonomy of the Prosecutor General’s office.

On 27 June 2016, Chancellor Angela Merkel and Ukrainian Prime Minister Volodymyr Groysman held a joint 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.\footnote{\textit{Pressekonferenz von Bundeskanzlerin Merkel und dem ukrainischen Ministerpräsident Hrojsman, Die Bundesregierung (Berlin) 27 June 2016. Date of Access: 4 February 2017. https://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/Mitschrift/Pressekonferenzen/2016/06/2016-06-27-pk-bkin-mp-ukraine.html.}} This is intended to improve the autonomy of the energy sector and improve 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.\footnote{\textit{Pressestatements von Bundeskanzlerin Merkel und dem ukrainischen Präsidenten Petro Poroshenko, Die Bundeskanzlerin (Berlin) 30 January 2017. Date of Access: 4 February 2017. https://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/Mitschrift/Pressekonferenzen/2017/01/2017-01-30-statement-merkel-poroschenko.html.}} Germany provided expert “consultation” which allowed Ukraine to undertake significant economic reforms to secure funding from its IMF bailout package.\footnote{\textit{Pressestatements von Bundeskanzlerin Merkel und dem ukrainischen Präsidenten Petro Poroshenko, Die Bundeskanzlerin (Berlin) 30 January 2017. Date of Access: 4 February 2017. https://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/Mitschrift/Pressekonferenzen/2017/01/2017-01-30-statement-merkel-poroschenko.html.}} 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.”\footnote{\textit{Pressekonferenz von Bundeskanzlerin Merkel und dem ukrainischen Ministerpräsident Hrojsman, Die Bundesregierung (Berlin) 27 June 2016. Date of Access: 4 February 2017. https://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/Mitschrift/Pressekonferenzen/2016/06/2016-06-27-pk-bkin-mp-ukraine.html.}}
addition to this, she committed Germany to “concrete cooperation” with Ukraine in this regards.\textsuperscript{1199} 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.”\textsuperscript{1200} He concluded by offering German support to Ukraine once again, but failed to mention any specifics.\textsuperscript{1201} 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 Steinlein and eight other colleagues from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs 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.\textsuperscript{1202} However, once again, they failed to mention any specifics regarding the support that would be available to Ukraine. No reports or announcements were made public following State Secretary Steinlein’s trip to Kiev.

Therefore, Germany receives a score of 0 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. However, no substantive action was taken to facilitate judicial reform or to improve the independence of the Prosecutor General’s office.

\textit{Analyst: Ryan Melnik}

\textbf{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.\textsuperscript{1203} 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.”\textsuperscript{1204} Davide La Cecilia, the Italian Ambassador to Ukraine, asserted that,

“Our contribution to WTP 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 Petar 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 Ghori

---


**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to take substantive action towards combating 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.\(^{1210}\) 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.”\(^{1211}\) 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.”\(^{1212}\)

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.\(^{1213}\) 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.”\(^{1214}\) 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.”\(^{1215}\)

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.”\(^{1216}\) 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.”\(^{1217}\)


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.”

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.”

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” 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."\textsuperscript{1223} 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.”\textsuperscript{1224}

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.

\textit{Analyst: Geneva Calder}

\textbf{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{1225}

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{1226}

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{1227} The American Ambassador of the United States in Ukraine Geoffrey Pyatt spoke at the event.\textsuperscript{1228}

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.  

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.

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.

**Analyst: Jeffrey Li**

**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 major focus of the EU’s financial support for this initiative was decentralization, economic development, public administration reform, rule of law, and anti-corruption. To this end, 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. All of 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.”

---

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 February 1, 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
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