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

G7 summits are a moment for people to judge whether aspirational intent is met by concrete commitments. The G7 Research Group provides a report card on the implementation of G7 and G20 commitments. It is a good moment for the public to interact with leaders and say, you took a leadership position on these issues – a year later, or three years later, what have you accomplished?

Achim Steiner, Administrator, United Nations Development Programme, in G7 Canada: The 2018 Charlevoix Summit
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3. Terrorism: Syria

“We are determined to increase our efforts to defeat international terrorism in Syria, in particular ISIS/ISIL/Da’esh and al Qaeda.”

G7 Taormina Leaders’ Communiqué

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>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>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

The Syrian Conflict is a complex social, military and political situation that has evolved from its early stages as a protest into a multidimensional proxy war fought by several international parties and groups. The ongoing conflict arose out of the Arab Spring in Tunisia in December 2010 with protests against Syrian President Bashar al-Assad and his government and allies. What started as anti-government protests has now turned into a full-scale civil war. The parties involved in the conflict, including the governments of the United States, Russia, Iran, Iraq, Turkey, the Gulf States, the Lebanese militia, Hezbollah, the Kurdish army, Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), also referred to as Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) or Da’esh, al-Qaeda and the Syrian rebel forces, have a wide range of national interests guiding their involvement in Syria.

The root causes of this conflict run deep and have been a result of long-term religious and political tension in the region, exacerbated by the intervening of foreign nations and their own specific agendas. Global warming is even said to have played a role in the uprising: from 2007 to 2010 there was a severe drought in the Syrian region causing a migration of more than 1.5 million people from the arid countryside into urban centres, putting pressure on the social infrastructure and increasing poverty levels countrywide, leading to the protests in 2011.

ISIS/ISIL/Da’esh has become one of the main aggressors in the Syrian conflict, attempting to carve out its own geographic territory from Syria and Iraq to establish a caliphate. ISIS/ISIL/Da’esh originated in 1999 and was involved in the 2003 Iraq insurgency, pledging allegiance to al-Qaeda and

---

then proclaiming itself a worldwide caliphate that continues to operate today.\textsuperscript{272} The origins of the ISIS versus ISIL name comes from the group’s original Arabic name: al-Dawla al-Islamiya fil Iraq wa al-Sham, where al-Sham can be translated in several different ways including “the Levant” “Syria” and even “Damascus,” and now referred to as Da’esh by the world’s political leadership, with a distinct pejorative connotation. Regardless of which name the group is referred to as, ISIL/ISIS/Da’esh has been designated a terrorist organization by the United Nations.\textsuperscript{273} Beyond their actions to claim areas of the region, the group is known in the West for actions like uploading videos of beheadings and destruction of world heritage sites.\textsuperscript{274} In recent years, ISIL/ISIS/Da’esh has lost many of its earlier victories, allowing al-Qaeda to now emerge as a dominant player in the conflict.

Human Rights Watch has reported that as of 2016 more than 100,000 individuals are claimed to be missing and the death toll reached more than 470,000 people as a result of the Syrian conflict itself.\textsuperscript{275}

While none of the G7 members are directly involved in the Syrian conflict, its nature as a proxy war, which is defined by the Cambridge English Dictionary as “a war fought between groups or smaller countries that each represent the interests of other larger powers,”\textsuperscript{276} means that financial and military support as well as action taken towards creating a stable solution to the conflict come from several international sources including foreign governments. The international terrorism seen both in the conflict area within Syria and abroad has not been defeated as of 2017. However, progress has been made through previous military, social and political efforts, demonstrating a global consensus to end the atrocities and have a stable resolution to the Civil War. Furthermore, the global political community has taken action against the international terrorist forces active in the region on several occasions through policy procedures, sanctions and military actions, but the conflict still remains active today.

The discussion and commitment to involvement in the Syrian conflict, and specifically international acts of terrorism perpetrated by transnational terrorist groups, has been on the agenda of every G7/8 summit since the Arab Spring began in 2011, and has been more concentrated on the direct influence of international terrorism in Syria at the more recent conferences.

At the 2012 Camp David Summit declaration, the member states: “pledge[d] to enhance [their] cooperation to combat threats of terrorism and terrorist groups, including al-Qaeda, its affiliates and adherents, and transnational organized crime.”\textsuperscript{277}

At the 2013 Lough Erne Summit, the leaders’ communique states: “We strongly support the proposal for a conference to reach a political solution to the appalling conflict in Syria through full implementation of the 2012 Geneva Communiqué.”\textsuperscript{278}

\begin{flushleft}


\textsuperscript{277} Camp David Declaration, G8 Summit. G8 Information Centre (Toronto) 19 May 2012. Access Date: 15 October 2017. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2012campdavid/g8-declaration.html.
\end{flushleft}
At the 2014 Brussels Summit, leaders “call[ed] on Iran to play a more constructive role in supporting regional security, in particular in Syria, and to reject all acts of terrorism and terrorist groups.”

At the 2015 Elmau Summit, leaders stated in their declaration: “In light of the Foreign Terrorist Fighters phenomenon, the fight against terrorism and violent extremism will have to remain the priority for the whole international community. In this context we welcome the continued efforts of the Global Coalition to counter ISIL/Da’esh.”

At the 2016 Ise-Shima Summit, the leaders’ communique states: “the attacks, atrocities and abuses of human rights targeting civilians and other victims perpetrated by ISIL/Da’esh, Al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations pose serious challenges to peace and international security.”

Furthermore, the 2016 Ise-Shima Action Plan on Countering Terrorism calls to attention the importance of communication in defeating terrorism: “Underline the importance of strategic communication as a tool in fighting terrorism and countering ISIL (Da’esh)’s propaganda.”

**Commitment Features**

International Terrorism is defined by the United Kingdom’s Security Service Military Intelligence 5 as “terrorism that goes beyond national boundaries in terms of the methods used, the people that are targeted or the places from which the terrorists operate.” Seeing as both ISIS/ISIL/Da’esh and al-Qaeda exist without traditional national boundaries, any acts of terrorism perpetrated by or claimed by these organizations are considered international attacks in Syria.

The G7 has thus agreed to increase its efforts in order to defeat international terrorism in Syria, specifically al-Qaeda and ISIS/ISIL/Da’esh, by creating a viable and stable outcome with minimal risk. This can come to fruition in several different forms:

- Military force, such as an increase in targeted airstrikes, troop presence and a change in assets to provide more protection for civilians;
- Financial impact, including changes to international funding frameworks and restructuring financial initiatives in the region;
- Political pressure applied to other world leaders and nations through means such as embargos, policy enactments and public condemnations to craft a viable solution that will end the conflict.

Military force can be exerted from both G7 members and non-member actors, as well as non-state actors in an attempt to stop the international acts of terrorism carried out both in the conflict region and abroad. There is wide range of actions that will qualify as military force is quite wide, however an increase in targeted airstrikes, ground forces, or a redirection of foreign military assets that focuses on protection of civilians and decrease tension demonstrate this desire to end the conflict. Although

---


it must be noted that, in many instances, brute force can worsen already very tense political and social situations.

A majority of the financial impact applied from member states takes the form of increased funding initiatives to repair the acts of terrorism within the conflict area, and decreasing financial support of any programs or measures that further enable acts of terrorism to continue. There are several key avenues in which it can be demonstrated such as the creation of hospitals, schools, employment opportunities, training and practical education programs, refugee and migration assistance, and financial initiatives to rebuild stability in the region. In his paper on the Financial Weapons of War for the Minnesota Law Review, Tom Lin provides an apt description of this relatively new yet extremely effective phenomenon: “In this new mode of war, finance is the most powerful weapon, bullets are not fired, financial institutions are the targets, and almost everyone is at risk. Instead of smart bombs, improvised explosives, and unmanned drones — economic sanctions, financial restrictions, and cyber programs are the weapons of choice.”

Political pressure as a distinct form of soft power is notably the most public way to defeat international terrorism. Many foreign governments, while not necessarily directly involved in the conflict, do carry significant clout and influence in the global community enabling them to create the necessary pressures to enact change. This can include public press releases from governments and/or nationally sponsored news media condemning these acts of terrorism, dissemination of information that counters ISIS/ISIL/Da’esh or al-Qaeda support and ideology, and policy frameworks or agreements that demonstrate the willingness of foreign nations to intervene to end the conflict.

In order to achieve full compliance, member states must have demonstrated quantitative and documented action in all of the three distinct categories of military, financial and political support, in any of the aforementioned ways and/or other qualifying features.

**Scoring Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>−1</td>
<td>Member failed to demonstrate an increase in its efforts towards the defeat of international terrorism acts within Syria by taking steps in NONE of the military, financial, and political avenues or through any tangible documented means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member recognized the need to increase its efforts towards the defeat of international terrorism within Syria through 1 OR 2 of the military, financial or political avenues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member has demonstrated an increase in its efforts towards the defeat of international terrorism acts within Syria through ALL categories of military, financial, and political avenues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada: +1**

Canada has fully complied with its commitment to increase efforts to defeat international terrorism in Syria, in particular ISIS/ISIL/Da’esh and al Qaeda.

On 29 June 2017, Canada’s Defence Minister Harjit S. Sajjan and Foreign Affairs Minister Chrystia Freeland announced that Canada will renew “its military contribution to the Global Coalition against Da’esh” until 31 March 2019. The purpose of the extended military contribution is to display Canada’s commitment to address the violent extremist threats emanating from organizations like

---


Da’esh and to contribute to alleviating the needs of people in Iraq, Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon that are affected by the conflict. Through this extension, Canada reserved the authority to train “new potential partners within the Iraqi Security Forces” and to use a CC-130J Hercules aircraft “for tactical airlift.”

On 3 July 2017, the combined joint task force, specifically the Head of the Ministerial Liaison Team (MLT) Brigadier-General Dave Anderson and Operation Inherent Resolve CJ7, gave the Government of Iraq the Police Presence in a Box (PPIB). The PPIB is aimed to restore stability in Iraq by rebuilding “an effective and trained police force.” This is one of the initiatives undertaken collaboratively by the Canadian-led MLT and the Iraqi government designed to reinstate the rule of law in liberated areas.

On 12 July 2017, a Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) CC-130J Hercules aircraft completed its first sortie as part of Operation IMPACT supporting the Global Coalition to defeat Da’esh in Iraq and Syria.

On 21 September 2017, Canada’s Department of National Defence issued a news release stating that the CAF is now providing advice and assistance to ISF near Hawija, Iraq. These services followed the liberation of Mosul by ISF. This is a part of the CAF’s efforts to enhance the coalition allies’ ability to “adapt to the changing threats” in order to advance its campaign of defeating Da’esh and subdue Da’esh’s control over other Iraqi centres. With the aim of providing training to the ISF, Canada has sent Canadian Army engineers to “observe ongoing explosive threat training” that North Atlantic Treaty Organization has provided to ISF.

---


On 30 October 2017, the CAF announced that it will prolong its military contribution in Erbil, Iraq by continuing to administer the “Canadian-led Role 2 medical facility” until 20 April 2018 or “until no longer required.” The medical facility oversees the provision of emergency and non-emergency medical and surgical care to Coalition forces. This is a part of Operation IMPACT led by the CAF.

On 17 November 2017, Canada’s Department of National Defence and the CAF issued a statement outlining the CAF’s new military capacity-building initiatives in Iraq. The CAF provided “explosive threat training” to the ISF. The CAF also adjusted its air task force contributions as a response to an “evolving military campaign” and to the needs of the Global Coalition against Da’esh. The CAF provided a second CC-130J Hercules aircraft to contribute to the Joint Task Force Iraq (JTF-I). Brigadier-General Daniel MacIsaac, commander of the JTF-I, stated that “the Canadian Armed Forces is adjusting Joint Task Force Iraq’s contributions so our forces can assist in Iraq’s consolidation of the gains as operations continue to destroy Da’esh’s remaining capabilities.”

On 12 February 2018, the Government of Canada announced contributions of approximately CAD 12 million towards initiatives to bring stability to the Iraqi region as part of the Peace and Stabilizations Operations Program and the Counter-Terrorism Capacity Building Training Program (CTCBP). These initiatives include support to the funding facility for stabilization in Iraq, community policing in liberated areas of Iraq, explosive hazard clearance in the Mosul district, as well as training and capacity building of law enforcement officials on human rights, the rules of law and the prevention of terrorism.

On 13 February 2018, Sajjan attended a meeting of defence ministers from contributors to the Global Coalition against Da’esh in Rome, Italy. Minister Sajjan emphasized Canada’s continued

---

commitment to the Global Coalition and the importance of international cooperation to secure lasting stability in the Middle East region.\textsuperscript{304} The defence ministers deliberated “next steps” and “other regional defence and security challenge.”\textsuperscript{305}

On 19 March 2018, Canada’s Department of National Defence issued a statement reiterating Canada’s commitment to defeating Da’esh. The news release outlined Sajjan’s trip to Iraq and Kuwait where he assessed Canada’s involvement and progress in the region.\textsuperscript{306} Sajjan met with Iraq’s Secretary of Defence Erfan al-Hiyali in Baghdad where he underscored Canada’s ongoing commitment to defeating Da’esh as a part of the Global Coalition.\textsuperscript{307} Sajjan stated, “the information I gathered from my meeting with government officials and our troops has been significant in gaining a clearer understanding of the situation on the ground, which will help to better inform the transition to stabilization operations.”\textsuperscript{308}

On 26 March 2018, Freeland issued a statement on seven years of conflict in Syria. Freeland condemned perpetrators of continued violence in Syria and called on “all parties to this conflict to respect their obligations under international humanitarian law, cease attacks on civilians and humanitarian workers and allow rapid, safe and unhindered humanitarian access to populations in need.”\textsuperscript{309}

Canada has fully complied with the commitment through demonstrating quantitative and documenting action in all of the three distinct categories of military, financial and political support.

Thus, Canada has received a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Sharika Khan}

**France: +1**

France has fully complied with its commitment to increase efforts towards the defeat of international terrorism within Syria by means of military, financial or political avenues.

On 29 August 2017, French President Emmanuel Macron said set eradicating “Islamist terrorism” as his core foreign policy goal.\textsuperscript{310}


On 2 October 2017, French Foreign Affairs Minister Jean-Yves Le Drian spoke at the Presidential palace in Abidjan, Ivory Coast. He announced that France will provide EUR 15 million in aid for areas liberated by the United States-led coalition from ISIS/ISIL/Da’esh.\(^{311}\)

On October 3, 2017 French President Emmanuel Macron presented and passed a counter-terrorism legislation in Parliament.\(^{312}\) This legislature works to curb domestic terrorists who may contribute to fueling the spread of ISIL/ISIS/Da’esh ideology and includes measures such as increased power to restrict the movement of people if they are suspected of threatening national security or harboring terrorist ideas.

On 15-16 November 2017, the 13th Morocco-France High Level Meeting took place in Rabat. In the joint statement, Morocco and France vowed to strengthen bilateral cooperation in combating terrorism, particularly in the context of the threat posed by returning Islamic State fighters.\(^{313}\)

On 19 December 2017, Macron publicly denounced Syrian President Bashar al-Assad’s remarks that France supported terrorism within Syria making it unfit to negotiate in peace talks. Macron explained that “On the military front we have a priority which is war against Daesh and that’s why [Assad’s] statements are unacceptable because if there is someone that has fought and can defeat Daesh … it is the international coalition.”\(^{314}\)

On 30 March 2018, the French government put forward an offer to mediate between two groups engaged in a conflict in northern Syria, where Turkey had launched a military offensive against Kurdish fighters in January. Macron said, “France would support the ‘stabilisation’ of the security zone in north-east Syria to stop IS regaining strength.”\(^{315}\)

On 13 April 2018, France along with the United States and the United Kingdom launched an allied airstrike attack on what was deemed three distinct chemical weapon development, production and storage sites within Syria. Macron said he “ordered the French armed forces to intervene” after a “red line set by France” on the use of chemical weapons had been crossed.\(^{316}\)

On 14 April 2018, in response to the previous airstrikes, France’s Ambassador to the United Nations François Delattre called for a dismantling of Syria’s chemical program “in a verifiable and irreversible way,” and urged that “a ceasefire so that humanitarian convoys can reach Eastern Ghouta on a daily basis and a "inclusive political solution" to the conflict.”\(^{317}\)

--


France has taken steps within its borders to increase its efforts towards fighting terrorism by political means, has financially contributed to the aid development of post-Daesh Syria, and has engaged in military airstrikes in conjunction with other world powers to end the use of chemical warfare in Syria.

Thus, France has received a score of +1

Analyst: Sara Fallaha

Germany: 0

Germany has partially complied with its commitment to increase efforts towards the defeat of international terrorism within Syria by means of military, financial or political avenues.


On 12 April 2018, as other states and governments prepared to take military action against Syrian President Bashar al-Assad, Merkel publicly stated that “Germany would not participate in an attack on Syria over the suspected use of chemical weapons by President Bashar al-Assad’s government.”\footnote{Merkel rules out German participation in military strike on Syria, Politico (EU) 12 April 2018. Access Date: 20 April 2018. https://www.politico.eu/article/chancellor-angela-merkel-rules-out-german-participation-in-military-strike-on-syria-bashar-al-assad-chemical-weapons/.} Despite the decision against participating in the allied airstrikes, Merkel subsequently acknowledged the necessity of the military act, saying that the United States, United Kingdom, and France had taken “responsibility in this way as permanent members of the UN security council ... to maintain the
effectiveness of the international rejection of chemical weapons use and to warn the Syrian regime against further violations.”

Germany has taken steps within its borders to increase its efforts towards fighting terrorism by means of political avenues, specifically the public support of military action taken against chemical weapon production in Syria. While Germany has taken some action, it has not yet adopted measures towards the defeat of international terrorism through military or financial avenues.

Thus, Germany receives a score of 0.

**Analyst: Meagan Byrd**

**Italy: 0**

Italy has partially complied with its commitment to increase efforts towards the defeat of international terrorism within Syria by means of military, financial or political avenues.

On 6 September 2017, United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) representative in Jordan, Robert Jenkins, noted Italy’s support of UNICEF’s efforts to ensure Syrian child refugees do not form a “lost generation.”

On 28 September 2017, representatives from Italy spoke at the UN Security Council meeting. Sebastiano Cardi, the permanent representative of Italy to the UN in New York, noted that Italy, through training of law enforcement and enhancing border control, was contributing to the fight against ISIS/ISIL/Da’esh. Cardi also emphasized the importance of providing resources to the Executive Directorate for them to continue work in “identifying gaps, challenges and good practices.”

On 27 October 2018, Minister of Foreign Affaris and International Cooperation Angelino Alfano met with the European Commissioner for Humanitarian Aid and Crisis Management Christos Stylianides during a Conference on International Humanitarian Rights. Alfano noted Italy’s contribution of humanitarian aid to Syria had totalled EUR 147 million to date, and that Italy’s humanitarian budget would be increased further beyond the 18.7% increase seen in 2017.

On 16 November 2017, Italy sent multiple shipments of humanitarian aid to the Kurdish Region. This humanitarian aid was in response to a request from the Kurdistan Region administration following a 7.2 magnitude earthquake.

On 19 December 2017, Italian representative Inigo Lambertini spoke at a Security Council meeting to renew authorization for cross-border, cross-line humanitarian access to Syria. Though Lambertini

---

welcomed the extension, he noted that it did not address the failure of cross-line provision of urgent aid to certain areas.\textsuperscript{331}

On 13 February 2018, Italy’s Defense Ministry announced that it would be halving its military deployment to 750, “on the basis of future common objectives agreed during an anti-ISIS ministerial,” which took place in Rome in February.\textsuperscript{332}

On 5 March 2018, the Italian government committed EUR 1 million to the UN Relief and Works Agency’s 2017 Emergency Appeal for Syria.\textsuperscript{333} The funds will go towards supporting education of Palestine refugee children in Syria.

On 13 March 2018, Italy participated in an interactive dialogue with the Human Rights Council and the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on Syria.\textsuperscript{334} Italy was vocal about encouraging other parties to comply with relevant Security Council resolutions.

On 13 April 2018, Paolo Gentiloni, who is caretaker prime minister after the inconclusive general election, said Italy would not participate in any bombing campaign against Syria.\textsuperscript{335} In a statement Gentiloni concluded that “Italy will not participate in Syrian military actions” and “based on current international and bilateral accords, Italy will continue to offer logistical support to allied forces.”\textsuperscript{336}

Though Italy has been publicly vocal about and engaged in efforts to address ISIS/ISIL/Da’esh and has contributed to humanitarian relief, it has diminished its military support on the ground in the conflict zone.

Thus, Italy receives a score of 0.

\textit{Analyst: Claire Robbins}

\textbf{Japan: 0}

Japan has partially complied with the country’s commitment to increase efforts towards the defeat of international terrorism within Syrian through financial means and political advocacy.

On 7 July 2017, the Government of Japan released a statement supporting the ceasefire agreed between Jordan, the United States, and Russia in southwest Syria, stating that this agreement will ensure “rapid, safe, and unhindered humanitarian access.”\textsuperscript{337}


On 21 February 2018, the Government of Japan released a press statement saying that the situation in Syria cannot be resolved by military means. Instead, the Government of Japan calls on all parties to stop military action to enable humanitarian assistance.338

On 16 March 2018, during the Ministerial Meeting in Support of Lebanon’s Armed Forces and Internal Security Forces, Parliamentary Vice-Minister Manabu Horii explained the three approaches Japan has been taking to promote stabilization in Lebanon. First, Japan is providing training programs to the Internal Security Forces to counter international terrorism in Lebanon. Second, Japan is supporting Lebanon’s effort in bomb disposal. Third, Japan is implementing training programs to improve Lebanese border control.339

On 28 March 2018, Japan held a kick-off ceremony for the provision of JPY 575 million for humanitarian assistance in cooperation with the United Nations Industrial Development Organization. The provision aims to improve the livelihood of refugees and internally displaced persons through vocational training, higher income, and employment generation. Furthermore, it aims to strengthen the humanitarian-development nexus. The assistance will be implemented in Liberia, Nigeria, Somalia, Ethiopia, Syria, Iraq, and Jordan.340

On 5 April 2018, the Government of Japan and Government of the Republic of Iraq held a joint Senior Officials Meeting on security and job creation. At the meeting, Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe emphasized the importance of weapons reduction and vocational training as means to prevent violent extremism in Iraq.341 The two countries are planning to initiate analytic work with international organizations, particularly the World Bank, to conduct a pilot initiative for security-development nexus in Iraq.342

Japan has taken steps to comply with the financial and political commitment, but it did not comply with the military commitment to combat international terrorism, specifically ISIS/ISIL/Da’esh and al Qaeda.

Thus, Japan receives a score of 0.

**Analyst: Lilin Tong**

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to substantially increase its efforts to defeat the growing threat of international terrorism in Syria.

---

On 14 June 2017, the UK publishes a briefing paper on its response to the Syrian refugee crisis. The paper details the government action plan for resettling Syrian refugees, the Syrian Vulnerable Person Resettlement Programme, and how UK aid in the region.343

On 27 June 2017, the Defence Secretary Gavin Williamson said the UK will support any United States action against Syria to prevent chemical weapons attacks and that the UK is using cyber warfare to help the battle against Islamic State in Iraq and Syria. Williamson views this action as important for “disrupting the infrastructure that support this terrible regime.”344

On 31 August 2017, the UK boosted troops in Iraq in a final push to wipe out ISIS. Defence secretary said, “We are stepping up our contribution to the fight against Daesh and fulfilling Britain’s role as a key player in the global coalition.” UK soldiers are training and mentoring Iraqi forces as well as providing security at the Al Asad airbase.345

On 19 September 2017, UK Prime Minister Theresa May made a speech at the United Nations General Assembly in New York, urging world leaders to combat terrorism on the streets and online. The UK government is increasing pressure on internet giants (e.g., Microsoft, Twitter, Facebook) to eradicate propaganda online. May added, “we must continue to take the fight to these terrorist groups on the battlefield – and the UK will remain forefront of this effort while also helping to build the capability of our alliances and our partners to better take on this challenge.”346 The UK is said to work with the French and the Italian government to create pressure on international measures to force the rapid removal of online terrorist propaganda if firms do not increase the amount taken down within two hours after publication.347

On 4 November 2017, the International Development Secretary announced a new package of UK aid to help Syrian children survive through winter. UK is to provide immunisation and offer early treatment for coughs and colds, preventing children from suffering life-threatening illnesses and giving then hope for the future. The UK aid will also restore large buildings so that people will have a safe and clean place to live as well as providing more than 100,000 people with hot meals, warm clothes and blankets to stop children from falling ill.348

On 14 April 2018, May announced the UK’s participation in an allied airstrike with the US and France targeting chemical weapons development, production and storage facilities in Syria in an attempt to quell President Bashar al-Assad’s capacity for terrorist activities on his own people, stating “there was no alternative to the action the three countries were taking.”349 May further stressed that

“the aims of the intervention were limited to stopping chemical weapons use, for humanitarian reasons, and to uphold the international norm outlawing their use.”

On 25 April 2018, the UK’s International Development Secretary Penny Mordaunt announced in a press conference that “the UK will provide lifesaving emergency medical support and help protect medical facilities and brave humanitarian workers that are being deliberately targeted with bombs and chemical weapons by the Assad regime.” Ms Mordaunt stated that “the UK will provide at least GBP 450 million this year to alleviate the extreme suffering in Syria, as well as providing vital support to millions of Syrian refugees sheltering in neighbouring countries.”

The UK’s actions demonstrate successful commitment to escalation of its military, financial and political efforts to diminish the threat of international terrorism in Syria.

Thus, the UK receives a score of +1.

Analyst: Wing Ka Tsang

United States: +1

The United States has fully complied with its commitment to increase efforts towards the defeat of international terrorism within Syria by means of military, financial or political avenues.

On 7 July 2017, the US government announced it had reached an agreement with the Russian and Jordanian governments for a ceasefire in southwestern Syria. The agreement came after several weeks of discussions between the respective governments. Secretary of State Rex Tillerson stated that the ceasefire, which began on 9 July 2017, was intended to “de-escalate” the situation in Syria. Furthermore, Tillerson stated that the ceasefire was necessary in maintaining the security of Jordan’s borders that it shares with Syria and that it was symbolic of the developing diplomatic relationship between Russia and the US. The Department of State stated that the purpose of the ceasefire was to act as an “interim” solution in order to “create a better environment to discuss a broader and more comprehensive southwest de-escalation area in greater detail.”

---


On 21 September 2017, the US pledged USD 516 million in humanitarian aid to conflict regions in Syria.\textsuperscript{358} The additional aid to Syria was announced at the United Nations General Assembly by Acting Assistant Secretary Simon Henshaw of the State Department’s Bureau of Population, Migration, and Refugees.\textsuperscript{359} The financial assistance was part of a larger aid package of USD 697 million to other nations, including Lebanon, Turkey, Jordan, Iraq, and Egypt.\textsuperscript{360} With the additional USD 516 million in assistance, this put the total financial aid from the US to Syria at approximately USD 7.4 billion since 2011.\textsuperscript{361} The US delegation remarked that this aid was provided to help those in need with medical, food assistance, and pledged to continue to provide emergency aid to those in conflict zones within Syria.\textsuperscript{362}

On 11 November 2017, President Donald Trump released a joint statement with Russian President Vladimir Putin affirming the two nations’ shared goal of defeating ISIS in Syria.\textsuperscript{363} The statement remarked that the only solution to ending the conflict in Syria is not through military means, but through peaceful dialogue “within the framework” of UN Security Council resolution 2254\textsuperscript{364}, which encourages all parties in the Syrian conflict to cease fire and initiate “formal negotiations on a political transition process.”\textsuperscript{365} The joint statement stressed that the sole method through which Syria can achieve a peaceful outcome is through complete implementation of all the requirements of resolution 2254.\textsuperscript{366} Finally, the statement also remarked on the progress of de-escalation efforts since the 7 July 2017 ceasefire between member states in Syria, and the importance of ensuring that these efforts are maintained.\textsuperscript{367} Both US and Russian presidents agreed to maintain open communication and military channels in order to counter and defeat ISIS forces in Syria.\textsuperscript{368}

On 16 November 2017, White House Press Secretary Sarah Huckabee Sanders released a statement publicly condemning the Russian government for its veto on a US-drafted UN resolution that would have extended the inquest of the Joint Investigative Mechanism regarding the Syrian Assad regime’s

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
use of chemical weapons on its civilians.\textsuperscript{369,370} The White House stated that by using their veto power, the Russian government was making it easier for terrorists and for the regime of President Assad to continue attacking Syrian civilians.\textsuperscript{371} The veto was also condemned by Permanent Representative to the UN Nikki Haley who warned that the Assad regime was being placed “on notice” as a result of their actions in Syria.\textsuperscript{372}

On 17 November 2017, officials from the Combined Joint Task Force at the US Department of Defense announced that they had conducted a series of 34 strikes against ISIS forces in Syria from 13 November 2017 to 16 November 2017.\textsuperscript{373} The strikes were part of Operation Inherent Resolve, whose aim is to rid ISIS forces from the Syrian region, and contributed to a new total of 56 engagements in the region.\textsuperscript{374}

On 13 April 2018, President Trump announced the launch of a series of airstrikes on Syrian land in coordination with the United Kingdom and France.\textsuperscript{375} The strikes were in response to the alleged use of chemical weapons on 7 April by the Bashar Al-Assad regime on Syrian citizens.\textsuperscript{376} President Trump stated that the strikes would be “on targets associated with the chemical weapons capabilities”\textsuperscript{377} of the Syrian regime. President Trump also condemned Iran and Russia as “the two governments most responsible for supporting, equipping and financing the criminal Assad regime.”\textsuperscript{378}

US actions demonstrate full and successful compliance with its commitment to counter terrorism in Syria by military, financial and political means.

Thus, the US has received a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Nadin Ramadan}


European Union: 0

The European Union has partially complied with its commitment to increasing its efforts to defeat international terrorism in Syria through military, financial and political avenues.

On 29 May 2017, the European Council extended the EU restrictive measures that were already in place against the Syrian al-Assad regime until 1 June 2018. The sanctions currently in place include “an oil embargo, restrictions on certain investments, a freeze of the assets of the Syrian central bank within the EU, export restrictions on equipment and technology that might be used for internal repression, as well as on equipment and technology for monitoring or interception of internet or telephone communications.”

On 12 July 2017, the EU “decided to provide EUR 1.5 million to support the International, Impartial and Independent Mechanism to Assist in the Investigation and Prosecution of Persons Responsible for the Most Serious Crimes under International Law Committed in Syria.”

On 31 October 2017, the first financial tracking report of pledges from the first Brussels Conference on Syria “showed that as of that date donors had already contributed 88% of the pledges made to Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey, Iraq and Egypt.”

On 9 April 2018, the EU released a statement that strongly condemned the use of chemical weapons by Syrian government and president Bashar al-Assad, which was reported to kill more than 40 civilians in a suburb of Damascus. The EU has “called for an immediate response by the international community,” stating that the “protection of civilians must remain an absolute priority.”

On 24-25 April 2018, the EU co-hosted the second Brussels Conference on Supporting the future of Syria with the United Nations, reaffirming EU support for a political solution to the Syrian conflict. Furthermore, the leadership of the EU organized a “day of dialogue” on 24 April 2018 between its governing bodies and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) from Syria and the region. Over 200 independent NGOs met in Brussels to give operational and practical recommendations and advice to the implementation of the policy decisions and actions in the region.

On 24 April 2018, the co-chairs of the Brussels II conference “Supporting the Future of Syria and the Region” released a joint statement on the Financial tracking of the EU’s commitment to defeating international terrorism in Syria stating that to date “The international community [has] pledged USD 3.7 billion for 2018-20 and international financial institutions and donors also announced almost USD 30 billion in loans.”

While the EU has committed to increasing its efforts financially and politically, it lacks any start or increase of military effort and ground support within Syria demonstrating only partial compliance to its commitment.

Thus, the EU receives a score of 0.

Analyst: Michael Johnston

---

4. Non-proliferation: Nuclear Weapons and Disarmament

“We reiterate our commitment on non-proliferation and disarmament.”

G7 Taormina Leaders’ Communiqué

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>No Compliance</th>
<th>Partial Compliance</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</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>+0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

The North Korean regime’s launching of ballistic missiles in March, April, and July 2017, and claims to have tested a hydrogen bomb on 3 September 2017, have global implications that have pushed nonproliferation and disarmament high on the G7 Taormina Summit agenda.\(^{387,388,389,390}\)

The 2017 G7 pledge to combat the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to further global disarmament is a continuation of years-long efforts. Past efforts notably include the 2002 Kananaskis Summit’s Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction, which established measures against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction through terrorists and other violent proliferators.\(^{391}\) The initiative raised USD 20 billion and was extended in 2011.\(^{392}\)

In this year’s G7 commitment cycle, condemnation of the ownership and use of nuclear weapons began before the summit itself. The 2017 G7 foreign ministers’ meeting in Lucca on 10 and 11 April 2017 included a stand-alone statement on nonproliferation and disarmament. The Statement commits the G7 foreign ministers to “full implementation of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action endorsed by [United Nations Security Council Resolution] (UNSC) 2231(2015), as well as to contribute positively to the 2017-2020 review cycle of the [Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons],”\(^{393}\) further noting North Korean violation of UNSC resolutions 1718, 2270 and 2321, and concerning weapons use in Malaysia and the Syrian Arab Republic. The statement

\(^{387}\) North Korea fires four missiles toward Japan, angering Tokyo and South Korea, Reuters (Seoul) 5 March 2017. Access Date: 13 October 2017.


\(^{390}\) North Korea “earthquake” was its most powerful nuclear test yet, Quartz (New York) 3 September 2017. Access Date: 13 October 17. https://qz.com/1068659/north-korea-hydrogen-bomb-its-latest-claims/.


expresses support for the nonproliferation and disarmament of all weapons of mass destruction (WMD), the Chemical Weapons Convention, the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, the Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction and the second Comprehensive Review of UNSC Resolution 1540(2004) which is crucial in combating proliferation of WMD.\textsuperscript{394}

The G7 leaders’ communiqué endorsed the foreign ministers’ statement and further discussed issues and crises that are most seriously threatening “the security and well-being of [their] citizens and global stability.”\textsuperscript{395} North Korea in particular was cited as a “top priority in the international agenda” for its actions against disarmament and nonproliferation. It was the only country mentioned by name that is breaching international law in these two issue areas. G7 members condemned “in the strongest terms” North Korean nuclear tests and ballistic missiles, and called on the rest of the world to do the same while also taking further measures to ensure North Korea’s implementation of the relevant UNSC resolutions.\textsuperscript{396}

Discussion of international security related to nonproliferation permeated bilateral meetings during the Taormina Summit, demonstrated by Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe’s discussion with António Guterres, Secretary-General of the United Nations, who “condemned North Korea’s recent actions, explained that the UNSC possesses tools to increase pressure on North Korea and stated that he will raise the North Korean issue seriously among countries concerned.”\textsuperscript{397} The summit also saw the presentation of the 2017 Report from the Nuclear Safety and Security Group.\textsuperscript{398}

**Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons**

The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is widely considered to be the foundation of the global nuclear nonproliferation regime, and with a total of 191 state signatories, is the most accepted arms control agreement in history.\textsuperscript{399} First entering into force in 1970, the NPT “represents the only binding commitment in a multilateral treaty to the goal of disarmament by the nuclear-weapon states.”\textsuperscript{400} The objective of the treaty is to provide a step-by-step framework towards achieving nuclear disarmament through its three principal pillars:

3. **Nonproliferation:** Nuclear weapons states pledge to not be involved in the transfer of nuclear weapons to any recipient and to not encourage or induce non-nuclear-weapons states to manufacture or acquire nuclear weapons. Non-nuclear-weapons states pledge to forego the development, acquisition and use of nuclear weapons; to not seek or receive assistance in the manufacture of nuclear weapons; and to accept the International Atomic Energy Agency’s (IAEA) safeguards for verification that their nuclear activities serve solely peaceful purposes.\textsuperscript{401}

\textsuperscript{394} G7 Statement on Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, G7 (Taormina) 11 April 2017. Access Date: 11 October 2017. http://www.g7italy.it/sites/default/files/documents/NPDG_Statement_Final.pdf.


4. **Peaceful Use of Nuclear Materials:** acknowledges the rights of all Parties to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes while benefiting from international cooperation, in conformity with their obligation towards the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.402

5. **Disarmament:** all Parties pledge to pursue good-faith negotiations on effective measures towards the goal of nuclear disarmament and cessation of the nuclear arms race.403

Examples of adhering to the NPT include but are not limited to: the promotion and establishment of nuclear-weapons-free zones; reaching bilateral and multilateral agreements regarding the peaceful use and/or trade of nuclear materials; agreeing to IAEA supervision over nuclear materials and energy; unilateral or joint statements pressuring non-Party states to adhere to the NPT; imposing sanctions against states that do not abide by the NPT; and reaffirming commitment towards any of the NPT’s three pillars.

Sanctions against the North Korean regime in retaliation against its escalation of nuclear and missile activities can be implemented by the G7 through unilateral and/or multilateral means.

Unilateral sanctions against North Korea means sanctions imposed by a single country on North Korea. Examples include Japan imposing sanctions on North Korea following its satellite launch in 2010, which banned North Korean nationals from entering Japan as well as North Korean ships from entering Japanese ports404; South Korea imposing sanctions on North Korea in December 2016, which blacklisted dozens of senior North Korean officials from doing business with South Koreans405; and the United States imposing sanctions in December 2016 against North Korean financial, transportation and energy operations.406

Multilateral sanctions against North Korea means sanctions imposed by more than one country on North Korea. Since 2006, the United Nations, specifically the UNSC, has led the multilateral sanction regime against North Korea. In total, the UNSC has adopted eight major sanctions resolutions against North Korea in response to the regime’s nuclear and missile activities, and all eight have been adopted unanimously. The most recent of these UNSC Resolutions (UNSCR) are UNSCR 2371 following North Korea’s two intercontinental ballistic missile tests in August 2017, and UNSCR 2375 in response to North Korea’s sixth nuclear test in September 2017.407

**Commitment Features**

This commitment states that G7 members “reiterate [their] commitment on non-proliferation and disarmament.” Non-proliferation is defined as the “prevention of wider dissemination of nuclear weapons.”408 Disarmament is defined as “[prohibiting the] possession, development, production,

---


acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use or threat of use [of nuclear weapons] and to provide for their destruction.” The term “reiterate” refers to “commitments that have been established in the past. It should not be considered a new initiative; however, new efforts in the area should be made.”

Thus, in order for the G7 member to be found in full compliance with this commitment it must demonstrate that it has continued to work towards non-proliferation and disarmament by adhering to the pillars of the NPT. For partial compliance the G7 member has to do one or the other. For non-compliance the G7 member has not taken action in either nonproliferation nor disarmament, or has taken action that is antithetical to the commitment.

This commitment is understood as a pledge from the G7 to continue supporting the NPT while also enforcing the implementation of relevant sanctions against North Korea.

The compliance period is from 27 May 2017 to 07 June 2018. In order for a G7 member to be recognized as making an effort to adhere to the NPT, it must have made progress in at least two of the three NPT pillars during this time. Similarly, G7 members are assessed by their implementation of unilateral and/or multilateral sanctions during the compliance period.

### Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member has made little to no effort to adhere to the Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) AND did not implement any sanctions against North Korea OR made an effort to adhere to the NPT but did not implement any sanctions against North Korea OR made little to no effort to adhere to the NPT but implemented unilateral or multilateral sanctions against North Korea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member has made an effort to adhere to the NPT AND made an effort to implement either unilateral or multilateral sanctions against North Korea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member has made an effort to adhere to the NPT AND made an effort to implement both unilateral and multilateral sanctions against North Korea.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lead Analyst: Aisha Ryan

### Canada: 0

Canada has partially complied with its commitment on non-proliferation and disarmament.

On 8 June 2017 Canada finalized an agreement to voluntarily contribute CAD 175,000 to the non-profit, non-partisan Nuclear Threat Initiative (NTI). In support of Canada’s contribution, Canadian Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs (Canada-US Relations) Andrew Leslie said “this financial contribution will help the important work being undertaken through this initiative [and] help the international partnership for nuclear disarmament verification continue its critical work.”


---

Canada also reiterated its support for existing sanctions against North Korea, but did not follow this up with any new sanctions. Canada stated, “We cannot ignore the immediate threat of North Korea. Nor can we lose sight of the pressing need to tighten global sanctions against it, counter its proliferation networks, and persuade it to pursue constructive political dialogue.” Canada has not passed any new sanctions against North Korea in support of these words.

On 7 July 2017 the United Nations held a vote on “The Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.” UN Secretary General António Guterres described the treaty as, “an important step towards the universally-held goal of a world free of nuclear weapons,” adding that “it is my hope that it will reinvigorate global efforts to achieve it.” 122 countries voted in favor of the treaty. Canada did not take part in the negotiations or the ratification of the treaty. 416 Global Affairs Canada released a statement on 7 July 2017 stating that the treaty, “will not address concrete measures to eliminate nuclear weapons.”

On 20 September 2017, Mark Gwozdecky, the Canadian Deputy Minister for International Security and Political Affairs, spoke at the UN conference responsible for enforcing the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. Deputy Minister Gwozdecky articulated the reasons for Canada’s absence from the treaty by stating that, “without the support of any nuclear-armed states, it will not result in the elimination of even a single nuclear weapon.” On the question of Canada’s support for disarmament Deputy Minister Gwozdecky stated, “nuclear disarmament remains a priority for Canada, but efforts to this end must meet the dual test of effectiveness and undiminished security for all.”

On 9 January 2018 the Canadian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Chrystia Freeland, announced that Canada was “encouraged by the reopening of talks between North Korea and South Korea.”

---


response to this development Minister Freeland reinstated Canada’s support to a diplomatic solution which would include “sanctions that exert pressure on North Korea to abandon its nuclear and ballistic missile programs verifiably and irreversibly.” To further this aim Minister Freeland announced that Canada and the United States would “co-host a meeting of foreign ministers from across the globe to work together to achieve stringent sanctions implementation, as well as to strengthen diplomatic efforts toward a secure, prosperous and denuclearized Korean peninsula.”

On 16 January 2018 Canada and the U.S. co-hosted the Vancouver Foreign Ministers’ Meeting on Security and Stability on the Korean Peninsula. They addressed “the grave and growing threat posed by North Korea’s nuclear weapons and ballistic missile programs.” Canada’s Foreign Minister Chrystia Freeland said “investing in nuclear weapons will lead only to more sanctions and to perpetual instability on the peninsula.” The meeting provided foreign ministers from 20 countries to coordinate their responses to North Korea’s nuclear program.

Canada has only partially adhered to the NPT and has made effort to implement multilateral sanctions, but has not made any unilateral sanctions against North Korea. Thus, Canada receives a score of 0.

**France: +1**

France has fully complied with its commitment on non-proliferation and disarmament.

On 2 June 2017, France’s Permanent Representative to the United Nations François Delattre voted for United Nations Security Council (UNSC) Resolution 2356. The resolution extends the number of individuals and entities targeted by sanctions for their involvement in North Korea’s nuclear-weapon program and thereby strengthen compliance to Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Delattre stated that “the Council condemns North Korea’s unjustifiable actions and punishes individuals and entities that are central to the operations of the regime and its programmes, in particular the ballistic-missile programme, and their financing.” Delattre also made a statement calling for denuclearization of North Korea.

---


On 7 July 2017, Ambassador Delattre voted, alongside the United States and Britain, against a treaty banning the use of nuclear weapons, citing that the “ban treaty is incompatible with the policy of nuclear deterrence.” Delattre stated that this treaty ban will only weaken countries against a North Korean nuclear threat as it does not address international security concerns that result in the need for nuclear weapons as a deterrent. Delattre also made a statement claiming that this ban will result in the weakening of NPT and non-NPT states. However, he reaffirmed that France will continue in its fight to preserve non-proliferation regimes and its efforts in preventing North Korea from diminishing the unity of non-proliferation regimes.

On 10 July 2017, France reaffirmed its intention to close up to 17 nuclear reactors by the end of the presidency of François Hollande. By the time he left office, Hollande had only finalized plans to close Fessenheim in Alsace, France’s largest nuclear reactor. France continues to reaffirm its promise to convert these reactors into energy saving sources, citing that the reduction of nuclear energy sources will soon be converted to more “diversified energy sources.”

On 29 July 2017, French Foreign Ministry spokesperson Agnès Romatet-Espagne delivered a statement to the press calling on the UN, European Union, and non-proliferation countries to place greater pressure on North Korea, as a result of North Korea’s nuclear ballistic program and nuclear launches. In her press statement, Romatet-Espagne stressed the need for the EU to take part in pressuring North Korea into joining the negotiation table, independent of the UN.

On 3 August 2017, France extended its no fly zone (NFZ) around North Korea, following North Korea’s intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) testing. France already NFZ in place over North Korea. Ambassador Delattre made a statement condemning North Korea’s ICBM testing after the missile landed 100 kilometres from the path of an Air France airplane. Delattre reaffirmed the need for firm sanctions, including sanctions restricting exports of oil resources to Korea, sanctions against North Korean internationals within French borders, as well as sanctions restricting sea and air access.

On 5 August 2017, Ambassador Delattre proclaimed North Korea a 4G threat to international security, Delattre described it as a “threat that is global, grave, given and growing.” France voted for UNSC resolution 2375, a full ban on North Korea’s economic sector. France intends for this resolution, to demonstrate that non-proliferation states are united under one goal of strengthening the non-proliferation regime.


On 3 September 2017, French President Emmanuel Macron condemned North Korea’s testing of its hydrogen bomb on the previous day. President Macron called for prompt response through multilateral sanctions by the international community and non-proliferation countries, in order to pressure North Korea into abiding by NPT.434

On 4 September 2017, in an emergency Security Council meeting, Ambassador Delattre made a statement calling for firm multilateral sanctions led by the Security Council.435 Delattre stated that North Korea is becoming more of a threat to the future of the non-proliferation regime. It was at this meeting that Delattre declared North Korea’s actions as an urgent and pressing matter, a situation that is too late for compromise.436

On 11 September 2017, Ambassador Delattre made a statement congratulating the UNSC’s adoption of resolution 2375, resulting in broader multilateral sanctions against North Korea, specifically economic and sectoral sanctions. It was at this meeting that Delattre proposed three requirements moving forward in dealing with North Korea’s negligence, three requirements being unity, firmness, and diplomacy.437

On 21 September 2017, French Secretary of State to the Minister for Europe and Foreign Affairs Jean-Baptiste Lemoynedelivered a speech to the Security Council reaffirming the importance of unity, firmness, and collective action in order to prompt North Korea towards negotiation and compromise. Lemoyned also highlighted the need to strengthen UN’s Proliferation Security Initiative, as well as strengthening export control regimes, reiterating France’s efforts towards collective non-proliferation and promise to assist in its growth.438

On 9 October 2017, France hosted the International Luxembourg Forum on Preventing Nuclear Catastrophe. The conference highlighted the possible danger of North Korea as a catalyst for nuclear war, deeming it a situation “worse than the Cold War.”439 Diplomats emphasized the need for a broader and stronger united non-proliferation action. The conference also called for firmer economic sanctions against North Korea.440

---

On 24 October 2017, Ambassador Delattre delivered a statement on the achievements of the United Nations towards compliance to the NPT. Delattre reaffirmed France’s commitment to the continuation of actions for non-proliferation in the face of increasing global crisis.\textsuperscript{441}

On 15 December 2017, Mr. François Delattre made a speech to the UNSC calling for firmer sanctions against North Korea. Delattre called for the execution of existing sanctions against North Korea, stating “everyone knows that the uneven implementation of sanctions seriously affects the effectiveness of our collective action.”\textsuperscript{442}

On 11 January 2018, Jean-Yves le Drian, France’s Foreign Minister, reaffirmed France’s commitment to non-proliferation by delivering a defense of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (Iran Nuclear Deal).\textsuperscript{443}

On 9 March 2018, Foreign Minister Le Drian sat for an interview with CNEWS about North Korea and its change of behavior in terms of ending the production and launching of long range missiles. He advised caution but also acceptance to North Korea’s decision to negotiate with South Korea and its willingness to discuss nuclear disarmament with NPT members.\textsuperscript{444} Le Drian was optimistic about North Korea’s decision to participate in the nuclear disarmament discussion, stating that “the sanctions against North Korea which were decided at international and European levels remain in place, but dialogue is resuming.”\textsuperscript{445}

France has fully complied with its commitment by implementing multilateral sanctions against North Korea and, as an EU member whose sanctions policy is conducted by the European Union, by encouraging the EU to pursue further sanctions independently. France also made efforts to comply with non-proliferation standards through declarations against nuclear proliferation and for disarmament.

Thus, France receives a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Jamela Salman}

**Germany: +1**

Germany has fully complied with its commitment on non-proliferation and disarmament.


On 3 September 2017, German Chancellor Angela Merkel called for the European Union to impose harsher sanctions against North Korea in response to the regime’s nuclear test on 2 September 2017.\(^{446}\)

On 4 September 2017, German Spokesman Steffen Seibert stated that Merkel and South Korean President Moon Jae-in urged other states to “quickly decide on further and stricter sanctions”\(^{447}\) against North Korea.\(^{448}\)

On 11 September 2017, Seibert stated that Merkel “was lobbying at international level for a further tightening of sanctions against North Korea.”\(^{449}\) Merkel was said to have also tried to influence leaders in Tokyo, Paris, Beijing, Washington DC and Russia to tighten sanctions.\(^{450}\)

On 21 September 2017, German Foreign Minister Gabriel co-hosted with the Japanese Foreign Minister a Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative Ministerial meeting in New York.\(^{451}\) Through this initiative, Germany is currently working to strengthen the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) by “[exploring] further collaboration, in keeping with relevant UN Security Council Resolutions, [and] address subsequent North Korean provocations.”\(^{452}\)

On 26 September 2017, a representative of Germany made a statement at the high-level plenary meeting of the Assembly stating that, Germany, since July 2017, has been involved in a “high-level preparatory group” with a goal of starting “early negotiations on an FMCT (Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty).”\(^{453}\) According to the Arms Control Association, the FMCT, if adopted, “would prohibit the production of the two main components of nuclear weapons: highly-enriched uranium (HEU), and plutonium.”\(^{454}\)

On 12 October 2017, German Ambassador and the Permanent Representative of Germany to the United Nations Conference on Disarmament, Michael Biontino, stated, “we [United Nations members] need to redouble our efforts when it comes to strengthening the NPT in its three equally


important pillars.” He validated Germany’s commitment of the NPT by stating that Germany “would like to contribute [further work on the International Partnership for Nuclear Disarmament and Verification (IPNDV)] by focusing on practical measures. The IPNDV aims “to identify potential tools and technologies that will be needed to support future nuclear disarmament verification efforts.” He also stated, “[Germany] strongly supports Norway’s initiative which aims at establishing a GGE [group of government experts] on these issues.” Regarding the NPT pillar ‘Peaceful Use of Nuclear Materials,’ he stated that “the peaceful use of nuclear energy must rest on the highest possible levels of nuclear safety and nuclear security.”

On 13 October 2017, Germany, in a joint statement with French and British leaders, stated that they continue to “stand committed to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) [also known as the Iran Nuclear Deal] and to its full implementation by all sides” to ensure Iran’s nuclear program is not being used for nuclear weapons.

On 16 October 2017, the European Union Foreign Affairs Council (including Germany) adopted new sanctions “to further increase the pressure on the DPRK to comply with its obligations” in response to North Korea’s nuclear weapons programs. These sanctions include a “total ban” on EU investment in all sectors in North Korea, a “total ban on the sale of refined petroleum products

---


and crude oil” to North Korea, and “lowering the amount of personal remittances transferred” to North Korea from EUR 15,000 to EUR 5,000.

On 11 January 2018, Sigmar Gabriel, Germany’s foreign minister, reaffirmed Germany’s commitment to non-proliferation by delivering a defense of the JCPOA.

On 4 February 2018, former Foreign Minister Gabriel condemned the United States after it proposed upgrading and expanding its nuclear arsenal. This proposal was regarding US tensions with China and Russia surrounding potential nuclear weapon re-armament. Rather than agreeing with the US proposal, Gabriel said Germany would press “with its allies and partners” for further global disarmament and for “existing arms control treaties to be upheld unconditionally.”

On 21 March 2018, German Foreign Minister Heiko Maas, referencing international tensions with Russia, stated that that there is danger of a new arms race in Europe due to security environment changes. Maas further reiterated Germany’s commitment to non-proliferation, stating it “must be put back at the very top of the agenda.”

On 16 April 2018, Jasper Wieck, Deputy Head of the German mission in India, stated that “Germany has strongly supported India in its efforts to become a member of the export control regimes just as we continue to strongly support India’s membership in the Nuclear Suppliers Group.” Control regimes such as the Nuclear Suppliers Group, which include nuclear supplier countries, seek to add extra measures to ensure the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

---

On 21 April 2018, Maas welcomed North Korea’s announcement to suspend nuclear tests. He further stated that “in order to enter into a serious political process towards the complete denuclearisation of North Korea, it is necessary for Pyongyang to follow this up with concrete steps and to disclose its entire nuclear and missile programme in a verifiable way.”

On 27 April 2018, Minister Maas made a statement in response to the inter-Korean summit and the potential peace agreement between North Korea and South Korea that was proposed during the summit. Although Maas welcomed the development between the two states, he reiterated Germany’s commitment to denuclearization and non-proliferation in North Korea. He also stated that Germany supports a process of North Korea entering talks about its nuclear programs. However, with such talks, Maas stated that the goal must be to irreversibly denuclearize North Korea.

Germany has made an effort to adhere to the NPT and has made an effort to implement multilateral sanctions against North Korea. While Germany has not made an effort to implement unilateral sanctions against North Korea, the issue of sanctions is conducted by the European Union. Therefore, Germany’s push for the EU to engage in sanctions against North Korea would constitute unilateral sanctions.

Thus, Germany receives a score of +1.

**Analyst: Tyler Rae McMurdo**

**Italy: 0**

Italy has partially complied with its commitment on non-proliferation and disarmament.

On 4 September 2017 Prime Minister Paolo Gentiloni and several other leaders part of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) stated their commitment to push North Korea to comply with all resolutions set forth by the council.

On 11 September 2017, Italy supported multilateral sanctions through the UNSC, supporting resolution 2375 to sanction North Korea after the violation of the resolution established by the UN on 2 September 2017.

On 21 September 2017, Italian Foreign Minister Angelino Alfano reiterated Italy’s commitment towards championing the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) at the UNSC meeting on the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Minister Alfano stated that the NPT “has become a pillar of our collective security” such that “collective security cannot be guaranteed without non-

---

proliferation.” Alfano also reiterated Italy’s condemnation of North Korea’s continuation of its nuclear and ballistic missile programs, and Italy’s support of the UNSC’s sanctions regime against North Korea.

On 1 October 2017 the Washington Post reported that Angelino Alfano, the Italian foreign minister, stated that the North Korean ambassador, Mun Jong Nam, must leave Italy due to North Korea’s progression with its nuclear program. Alfano emphasized this move was necessary to pressure North Korea into compliance with non-proliferation regulations.

On 26 October 2017, Pressenza reported that more than 200 members of Italian Parliament have promised to ratify the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW) despite its membership with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

On 22 December 2017, Ambassador Inigo Lambertini, Deputy Permanent Representative of Italy to the UN, emphasized Italy’s unified stance on adopting further multilateral sanctions against North Korea. The ambassador also emphasized Italy’s commitment to a long-term peaceful solution while encouraging other UN members to introduce their own sanctions.

On 23 January 2018, Permanent Representative of Italy to the Conference on Disarmament Gianfranco Incarnato reiterated Italy’s commitment to disarmament and non-proliferation, stating that they remain “among the priorities of Italy’s foreign policy.” Ambassador Incarnato praised multilateralism and international cooperation as crucial necessities in the global effort to facilitate nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. On the subject of North Korea, Incarnato stated that Italy strongly condemned the regime’s continuation of its nuclear and ballistic missile programs as a serious threat to both regional and international security.

---


Italy has adhered to the NPT by taking an active role in exploring the possibility of ratifying the TPNW, and strongly condemning North Korea’s continued military provocations and its refusal to cease its nuclear and ballistic missile programs. By consistently supporting UNSC sanctions against North Korea, Italy has shown that it views multilateral cooperation as a key strategy towards global non-proliferation and disarmament. However, Italy has not introduced autonomous measures outside the UNSC’s sanction regime to help pressure North Korea into negotiating with the international community.

Thus, Italy receives a score of 0.

**Analyst: Mariah Stewart**

**Japan: +1**

Japan has fully complied with its commitment on non-proliferation and disarmament.

From 1 to 2 June 2017, the Government of Japan held the Plenary Meeting of the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism in Tokyo. More than 200 representatives from 75 countries attended the meeting. In his keynote address, Japanese State Minister for Foreign Affairs Kentaro Sonoura strongly condemned provocations by North Korea, emphasized the need for capacity building and international cooperation to enhance nuclear security, and presented Japan’s efforts to strengthen measures against nuclear terrorism in view of the Tokyo 2020 Olympic and Paralympic Games. The aim of this meeting was to discuss new strategies to strengthen global efforts to combat nuclear terrorism.491

On 25 August 2017, Japan’s Chief Cabinet Secretary Yoshihide Suga announced that Japan will impose new unilateral sanctions against North Korea. Yoshihide Suga stated that these sanctions will freeze the Japanese assets of four Chinese companies and two Namibian companies, as well as one Chinese individual and another of an unknown nationality for their dealings with the North Korean government.492

On 3 September 2017, Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe released a statement condemning North Korea’s testing of nuclear weapons. In his statement, Prime Minister Abe strongly condemned North Korea’s repeated provocations, including nuclear tests and ballistic missile launches, and urged North Korea to abandon its nuclear weapons and ballistic missile programs. Prime Minister Abe also stated that Japan will further strengthen collaboration with the international community, ensure the effectiveness of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) Resolution 2371, and consider further measures against North Korea, including further action in the UNSC.493

On 20 September 2017, the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons opened for signature at the United Nations headquarters in New York. Japan has not yet signed or ratified the treaty.494

On 28 October 2017, the Japanese government submitted a draft resolution to the First Committee of the UN General Assembly, which handles disarmament and international security, titled “United

---

action with renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons.” 495 Japanese Foreign Minister Taro Kono stated that the draft resolution was intended to provide “a common ground which enables all states … to renew their commitment towards nuclear disarmament.” 496 The draft resolution was adopted by 144 countries, including 77 co-sponsored countries that had nuclear-weapon states like the United States and the United Kingdom giving their approval.497

On 6 November 2017, Japan’s Chief Cabinet Secretary Yoshihide Suga announced another round of unilateral sanctions against North Korea as a result of its continued missile tests and persistence in developing its nuclear program. The sanctions will freeze the Japanese assets of nine organizations and 26 individuals with ties to the North Korean government. 498

On 15 December 2017, Chief Cabinet Secretary Suga announced that the Japanese government will impose new unilateral sanctions in the form of asset freezes against 19 North Korean entities and individuals in response to North Korea’s provocative missile tests and its persistence in developing its nuclear and ballistic missile programs. The blacklist includes businesses such as “banks, coal and mineral traders, and transport firms,” 499 bringing the total number of organizations and people linked to North Korea whose assets have been frozen by the Japanese government to 211. 500 Secretary Suga stated that Japan faces a “pressing threat unseen before” 501 after North Korea launched two intercontinental ballistic missiles over its territory in September and November, and that the new round of unilateral sanctions is intended to “further increase pressure” 502 on North Korea to return to the negotiating table. 503

On 31 January 2018, Japan’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs hosted the 14th Asia Senior-Level Talks on Non-Proliferation (ASTOP) in Tokyo. The meeting brought together senior government officials in charge of non-proliferation policies from China, India, the US, South Korea, Canada, France, New Zealand, Japan, and the members of the Association of South East Asian Nations. 504 The discussions centered on North Korea’s nuclear and ballistic missile programs, the importance in fully implementing relevant UNSC resolutions directed against North Korea, and ways to strengthen counter-proliferation efforts that included “country-specific measures in export control and

cooperation in capacity building.”\(^5\) Japan has been hosting the ASTOP since 2003 for the purposes of bringing senior government officials from around the world together to discuss non-proliferation efforts in Asia.\(^6\)

On 22 April 2018, reacting to North Korea’s suspension of nuclear and long-range missile tests and the shutdown of its principal nuclear test site, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe stated that he “welcome[s] these positive moves,” but “wonder[s] if this will lead to the complete, verifiable and irreversible dismantlement of its nuclear arsenal.”\(^7\) Japanese Defense Minister Itsunori Onodera also implied that more action towards denuclearization was needed.\(^8\)

On 24 April 2018, Foreign Minister Kono attended the Second Session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2020 Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in Geneva to deliver a speech on the importance of the treaty as “a cornerstone of international nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.”\(^9\) He stated that “maintaining and strengthening the NPT will be [at] the core of Japan’s efforts,” and urged all states to stand united in contributing towards the maintenance and strengthening of the NPT.\(^10\) Minister Kono also met with the heads of states of the Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative (NPDI), “a ministerial-level group of states within the framework of the Nonproliferation Treaty,” \(^11\) where he exchanged views with NPDI members on the importance of continuing to strengthen the NPT through various approaches.\(^12\)

Japan has adhered to the NPT by actively promoting international dialogue on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation through public consultations and leading multilateral communication on nuclear terrorism prevention. Japan has also imposed multiple rounds of unilateral and multilateral sanctions against North Korea.

Thus, Japan receives a score of +1.

---

**Analyst: Bryan Rob and Elie Atieh**

---


United Kingdom: 0

The United Kingdom has partially complied with its on non-proliferation and disarmament.

On 8 July 2017, the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office released a statement that the UK will not be signing the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW) because the treaty “risks undermining and weakening” the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and highlighted the importance of upholding and strengthening the treaty. It was further stated that the UK “firmly believes that the best way to achieve a world without nuclear weapons is through gradual multilateral disarmament negotiated using a step-by-step approach, within existing international frameworks,” and that the UK will “continue to work with partners across the international community to press for key steps towards multilateral disarmament, including the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, and successful negotiations on a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty in the Conference on Disarmament.”

On 29 August 2017 Prime Minister Theresa May stated that the UK stood “shoulder to shoulder” with Japan in facing North Korean aggression. She discussed the possibility of new sanctions against North Korea with Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe and stressed the importance of the “show of unity” at the United Nations Security Council.

On 22 September 2017, Mark Field, the Minister of State for Asia and the Pacific, called for all countries to “continue to press North Korea to respect UN’s resolutions and to change its reckless course.” He emphasized that the NPT “sits at heart” of UK’s nonproliferation effort, and stated that the UK does not believe the recent treaty of banning nuclear weapons is helpful as it creates unnecessary divisions and undermines the NPT.

---

On 16 October 2017, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs Boris Johnson stated that the UK has “secured a set of stringent new sanctions” to be placed on North Korea. He declared that North Korea perpetrated “unacceptable threats,” and stated “maximising diplomatic and economic pressure on North Korea is the most effective way to pressure Pyongyang to halt its illegal and aggressive actions.”

On 8 December 2017, the UK’s Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy published the impact assessment of the Nuclear Safeguards Bill. The bill is part of the UK’s Office for Nuclear Regulation’s “ongoing constructive engagement” with the department to develop a domestic nuclear safeguards regime as part of the UK’s exit from the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom). The impact assessment stated that the arrangements “form an essential part of the global nuclear non-proliferation regime, to which the UK is committed. [The UK’s] future arrangements will need to be robust and as comprehensive as the current Euratom regime … to support the UK’s ongoing commitment to the global non-proliferation regime” and to strengthen the UK’s international reputation as a non-proliferation leader.

On 11 January 2018, Foreign Minister Boris Johnson reaffirmed the UK’s commitment to non-proliferation by delivering a defence of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (Iran Nuclear Deal).

On 18 January 2018, Minister Field, speaking at the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), emphasized the importance of collaboration in working towards non-proliferation, specifically addressing the cases of Iran, North Korea, and Syria. He stated that “the UK remains committed...”
to a world without nuclear weapons,” and highlighted the UK’s approach of “gradual multilateral disarmament, negotiated step-by-step, within existing frameworks” in achieving this goal.

On 27 April 2018, Foreign Minister Johnson welcomed the progress made towards North Korea’s denuclearization at the inter-Korean summit. He stated that the UK will “continue to work with our international partners to strictly enforce existing sanctions” until North Korea takes “concrete steps” towards denuclearization.

The UK has made an effort to adhere to the NPT and to implement multilateral sanctions against North Korea. It has not made an effort to implement unilateral sanctions against North Korea.

Thus, the UK receives a score of 0.

*Analyst: Bonnie Li*

**United States: +1**

The United States has fully complied with its commitment on nonproliferation and disarmament.

On 20 August 2017, President Donald Trump stated threats of force against North Korea by writing on Twitter that the “U.S. military solutions are now fully in place, [and that North Korea] will not get away with what [it is] doing.” Trump then told reporters that the state would “truly regret it” if it

---

attacks Guam or the United States with nuclear weapons. Trump also stated his plans to meet with Chinese President Xi Jinping about the state’s role in containing North Korea’s nuclear ambitions.\(^{539}\)

On 6 September 2017, the United States demanded that the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) “impose an oil embargo on North Korea, ban its exports of textiles and the hiring of North Korean laborers abroad, and to subject leader Kim Jong Un to an asset freeze and travel ban”\(^{540}\) in a draft UNSC resolution. The ban also aims to ultimately reduce the state’s USD 3 billion annual export revenue by a third.\(^{541}\)

On 21 September 2017, US Secretary of State Rex W. Tillerson made remarks at the UNSC Session on Nuclear Non-Proliferation that included the strong advocacy against the use of nuclear weapons and the role of the US in leading as an example of non-proliferation. He stated that “signing treaties and passing resolutions is not enough [for non-proliferation],”\(^{542}\) and that rather the means of stopping nuclear proliferation are instead through exercises of “other levels of power, whether diplomatic, economic, digital, moral, or, if necessary, military.”\(^{543}\) Tillerson presented a point which emphasized the commitment of states to “sound nuclear security practices and robust and effective non-proliferation efforts.”\(^{544}\)

On 21 September 2017, President Trump commanded the broadening of US sanctions on North Korea which will include excluding the state out of the international banking system and targeting its major industries and shipping. During a meeting with President Moon Jae-in of South Korea and Prime Minister Shinzo Abe of Japan, Trump stated that “North Korea’s nuclear weapons and nuclear development [are] a grave threat to peace and security in our world, and it is unacceptable that others financially support this criminal, rogue regime.”\(^{545}\)

On 24 October 2017, the US held a Nonproliferation Working Group meeting with Ukraine. The meeting, which occurs regularly, serves to promote bilateral cooperation between the states by speaking on the threats of proliferation weapons of mass destruction. During the meeting, experts from both states addressed a slew of nonproliferation, counterproliferation, and strategic control challenges by which the states can most adequately address such challenges. Emphasis was put on

---


promoting “effective and robust implementation of strategic trade controls and all relevant UN Security Council Resolutions.”

On 26 October 2017, the US Department of the Treasury’s Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) announced sanctions against seven individuals and three entities with ties to the DPRK regime.

The sanctions aim to freeze “any property or interest in property of those designated by OFAC within US jurisdiction” and prohibit US citizens from being involved in transactions with “any of [the] sanctioned persons [and groups].” The Treasury Department stated that the sanctions were a response to the US State Department’s “Report on Serious Human Rights Abuses and Censorship in North Korea.”

On 9 November 2017, the United States and China held a nuclear smuggling consultation in Shanghai so as to reacknowledge their commitments to countering nuclear terrorism. The meeting included an agreement to “enhance their cooperation to promote international best practices and build capabilities to counter nuclear smuggling.”

On 15 December 2016, the US and Singapore held an annual Counterproliferation Dialogue in Singapore aimed to continue the bilateral cooperation of the states in addressing threats of “proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, their means of deliver, and sensitive dual-use technologies.” Discussion included counterproliferation and “strategic trade control challenges, and to identify avenues to best address those challenges.”

On 30 January 2018, President Trump announced in the State of the Union Address that the US “must modernize and rebuild [its] nuclear arsenal … making it so strong and so powerful that it will deter any acts of aggression.”

On 2 February 2018, the Pentagon released its new nuclear policy calling for the enlargement of the US nuclear arsenal. In the Nuclear Posture Review, the Trump administration’s recommendations

---


include increasing “low-yield” nuclear weapons as well as deploying them on “submarine-launched intercontinental ballistic missiles.”

On 8 May 2018, President Trump announced that the US will withdraw from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, also known as the Iran Nuclear Deal. The plan is a multinational accord that was reached in 2015 by Iran, the US, the UK, France, China, Russia, Germany, and the EU in order to “significantly limit Tehran’s nuclear ability for more than a decade in return for lifting international oil and financial sanctions.” The US now aims to reimpose the sanctions it had placed on Iran prior to the deal’s 2015 inception and is considering imposing new economic penalties. The US withdrawal from the Iran Nuclear Deal has met with heavy criticism from the rest of the signatories.

The United States has taken a leading role in implementing both unilateral and multilateral sanctions aimed at pressuring North Korea into ceasing its nuclear and ballistic missile programs. It has also partially adhered to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) by actively condemning North Korea’s provocative actions and promoting international dialogue in support of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament.

Thus, the United States receives a score of +1.

**Analyst: Hivda Ates**

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment on non-proliferation and disarmament.

On 10 August 2017, the EU Council added a further 13 names to its sanctions list. This included nine individuals and four organizations, bringing the total number of persons under restrictive measures due to suspected relations with North Korea to 62 persons and 50 entities. In accordance with a United Nations Security Council (UNSC) decision, these names were subjected to asset freezes and travel restrictions. In addition to these, the EU has independently imposed restrictive measures on 38 other persons and five other entities.

---


On 14 September 2017, the EU Council strengthened its stance by implementing the additional sanctions included in the UNSC Resolution 2375 (11 September 2017). The new resolution reinforced and strengthened the existing sanctions employed in Resolution 2371. These new measures targeted North Korea’s main exports, embargoing all exports of coal iron, iron ore, seafood, lead, and lead ore.

On 20 September 2017, before the UN General Assembly, the EU released a statement re-affirming that it will stand by its multilateral approach towards Iran and North Korea, additionally expressing support for disarmament and non-proliferation, with particular focus given to Iran and North Korea.

On 16 October 2017, the EU council increased its pressure on North Korea after continued violation of the UN resolutions. This included, but not limited to, “a total ban on EU investment in the DPRK in all sectors” as opposed to a previous ban in only certain sectors. Moreover, sale of petroleum products was also subjected to a total ban and personal remittances to and from North Korea were also lowered.

On 11 January 2018, Federica Mogherini, High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, reaffirmed the EU’s commitment to non-proliferation by delivering a defense of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (Iran Nuclear Deal).

On 13 March 2018, High Representative Mogherini reaffirmed the EU’s commitment to restrictive sanctions against North Korea at the European Parliament plenary session. In the speech, Mogherini declared that the EU’s intentions have always been towards “a full, irreversible and verifiable denuclearisation of the Korean peninsula.” She stressed that the EU has been working with third countries to enforce the full implementation of UNSC resolutions to maintain direct and indirect pressure on North Korea. Furthermore, she announced that the Foreign Affairs Council will meet with South Korean Foreign Minister Kang Kyu-lang-wha to discuss peace prospects for the region.

The European Union’s actions demonstrate that it has shown compliance towards non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament by imposing unilateral and multilateral sanctions against North Korea. It has additionally made efforts to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty by expressing support for disarmament and non-proliferation.

Thus, the European Union receives a score of +1.

Analyst: Srijan Sahu

---

5. Trade: Protectionism and Trade Practices

“We reiterate our commitment to keep our markets open and to fight protectionism, while standing firm against all unfair trade practices.”

*G7 Taormina Leaders’ Communiqué*

### Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>No Compliance</th>
<th>Partial Compliance</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Background

The modern world trading system was institutionally established with the Bretton Woods system after the Second World War. This was done through the creation of the International Trade Organization (ITO), a specialized agency to handle trade within the United Nations.\(^ {574}\) The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) was a multilateral trade agreement, that was concluded in 1948, which directed its signatories to reduce both tariffs and non-tariff trade barriers.\(^ {575}\) GATT was the main framework on which international trade was based before the creation of the World Trade Organization (WTO).\(^ {576}\)

On 1 January 1995, the WTO was formed in Geneva, Switzerland as a successor to the revised GATT.\(^ {577}\) The WTO is a unified multilateral trade framework which calls to eliminate tariffs and other trade barriers in trade agreements and in the general conduct of international trade, to settle disputes between parties of a trade agreement, and to monitor trade policies of their members.\(^ {578}\) The WTO’s goal of reducing trade barriers for goods, services, and intellectual property is currently the centre of the liberal international trading system which aims to fight protectionist trade measures and to keep markets open.\(^ {579}\)

G7/8 members have a long history of making commitments to promote free trade and the fight against protectionism. All commitments made by G7/8 members in past summits regarding anti-protectionist trade are listed in the Appendix. The G7/8’s commitments in the 1980s and the early

---


\(^ {576}\) What is the WTO? - Who we are, World Trade Organization (Geneva) Access Date: 20 April 2018. https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/who_we_are_e.htm.


\(^ {579}\) What is the WTO? - Who we are, World Trade Organization (Geneva) Access Date: 20 April 2018. https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/who_we_are_e.htm.
1990s focused broadly on “further opening … markets” and the reduction of trade barriers. From the 1996 Lyon Summit onwards, the members’ commitments also included investment as part of trade and economic growth as an objective of the post-1995 world trading system. There was a particular focus on reinforcing the multilateral trading framework of the World Trade Organization (WTO), which was created in 1995.\textsuperscript{581}

The commitments made in the early and mid 2000s focused on development, economic growth, and market access. Specifically at the 2001 Genoa Summit, G8 leaders fully endorsed “measures already taken to improve market access for the least developed countries (LDCs).”\textsuperscript{582} Commitments during this period continued to emphasize the importance of the multilateral trade system in creating world growth.\textsuperscript{583}

In the summits following the 2007-2008 financial crisis, the focus of their commitments on trade narrowed to reinforcing the established trading system and for barrier-free trade. In the three summits preceding the 2017 G7 Summit in Taormina, G7/8 leaders committed to keeping their markets open and “to fight all forms of protectionism.”\textsuperscript{584} In both the 2015 Schloss Elmau Summit and the 2016 Ise-Shima Summit, leaders committed explicitly to liberalize their economies to improve competitiveness.\textsuperscript{585} The commitment made at the 2017 Taormina Summit is the first that mentioned “unfair trade practices.”\textsuperscript{586}

The 2017 G7 Summit in Taormina also marked the first G7 summit US President Donald Trump attended. President Trump expressed his desire to impose unilateral tariffs on Mexico and China, and renegotiate the terms of North American Free Trade Agreement prior to the summit.\textsuperscript{587} President Trump remarked Germany’s trade surplus with the United States as evidence that Germany is “very bad”\textsuperscript{588} on trade.

In this commitment, G7 leaders also recognized that trade has not “worked to the benefit of everyone”\textsuperscript{589} and were committed to creating policies such that firms and citizens can “make the most of opportunities offered by the global economy.”\textsuperscript{590}

---


\textsuperscript{581} What is the WTO? - Who we are, World Trade Organization (Geneva). Access Date: 17 April 2018. https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/who_we_are_e.htm.


\textsuperscript{584} G7 Ise-Shima Leaders’ Declaration, G8 Research Group (Toronto) 27 May 2016. Access Date: 17 April 2018. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2016shima/communique.html.


\textsuperscript{587} G7 leaders divided on climate change, closer on trade issues, Reuters (Taormina) 25 May 2017. Access Date: 18 March 2018. https://www.reuters.com/article/us-g7-summit/g7-leaders-divided-on-climate-change-closer-on-trade-issues-idUSKBN18LZ2U.

\textsuperscript{588} G7 leaders divided on climate change, closer on trade issues, Reuters (Taormina) 25 May 2017. Access Date: 18 March 2018. https://www.reuters.com/article/us-g7-summit/g7-leaders-divided-on-climate-change-closer-on-trade-issues-idUSKBN18LZ2U.


Commitment Features
The G7 has committed to increasing its efforts to keep markets open and to fight protectionism, while standing firm against all unfair trade practices. There are thus three distinct components to this commitment defined as follows.

“Keeping markets open” refers to any government action that endorses an environment where companies and individuals can trade freely without limits, where prices fluctuate according to the quantity of goods and the number of people buying them.592

“Fighting protectionism” refers to any government action that reduces tariffs and taxes on imports into their country or a policy that encourages other countries to reduce their tariffs and taxes on imports to allow for unimpeded trade.593

“Standing firm against unfair trade practices,” while broad, can materialize as the punishment or pursuit of firms or individuals who have subscribed to deceptive, devious, fraudulent or unethical strategies to acquire business. Examples of these strategies include but are not limited to: misrepresentation, scams, and false advertising.594

Following through with these three sectors of the commitment in tandem promises to help economic growth and development world round, involving ever more varied and diverse actors strengthening the global economy.

For a G7 country to achieve complete compliance to the commitment to keep markets open, fight protectionism and stand firm against all unfair trade practices it must have made clear efforts to keep markets open, fight protectionism and in restricting unfair trade practices simultaneously. If a member’s efforts have ignored any of the above three elements it can only receive the score of partial compliance. To deserve a “lack of compliance” grading a member must have failed to put effort into any of the three elements of this commitment. A breakdown of this scoring metric can be found below in the scoring guidelines section.

Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>−1</td>
<td>The G7 member has not taken action in any of the three components: 1) keeping markets open; 2) fighting protectionism; 3) standing firm against all unfair trade practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The G7 member has taken action in one or two of the three components: 1) keeping markets open; 2) fighting protectionism; 3) standing firm against all unfair trade practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>The G7 member has taken action in all three components: 1) keeping markets open; 2) fighting protectionism; 3) standing firm against all unfair trade practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada: +1
Canada has fully complied with its commitment to keep its markets open and to fight protectionism, while standing firm against all unfair trade practices.

---

On 21 September 2017, Canada enforced the Canada–European Union Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA). Under CETA, 98% of EU tariffs lines (9,000) will be duty-free for Canadians and Canadian business owners.

On 24 September 2017, Minister of International Trade François-Phillipe Champagne spoke at the Annual General Meeting of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce and reaffirmed Prime Minister Justin Trudeau’s commitment to create well paying jobs by opening up new markets. Champagne discussed the importance of free trade and free trade agreements.

On 24 October 2017, Minister of Foreign Affairs Chrystia Freeland spoke in the House of Commons on the subject of supply management and fighting against protectionist administrations. The Minister’s statements were in reference to negotiations on the North American Free Trade Agreement with the United States.

On 5 November 2017, Minister of Foreign Affairs Chrystia Freeland and Minister of International Trade François-Phillipe Champagne traveled to Vietnam to attend the 2017 Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Leaders Week in Da Nang, Vietnam.

On 10 November 2017, at the APEC Leaders Week in Da Nang, the Government of Canada reaffirmed its commitment to free trade. Minister Champagne announced that Canada welcomes progress made on the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Trade Ministerial Meeting on a framework for the new Comprehensive and Progressive Trans-Pacific Partnership (CPTPP).

On 17 November 2017, Minister of International Trade François-Phillipe Champagne, Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development Navdeep Bains, and the Minister of Transport Marc Garneau concluded a historic trade mission to India. The trade mission was aimed at diversifying trade markets, by encouraging trade between the two countries. The trade mission included participants included 120 representatives from more than 85 Canadian companies, where more than 300 meetings were facilitated to encourage Canada-India commercial relations.

On 14 December 2017, Minister of International Trade François-Phillipe Champagne attended the Eleventh World Trade Organisation Ministerial Conference in Buenos Aires, Argentina. The Minister

---

led the Canadian delegation and both endorsed and signed a joint statements and declarations that support and promote Canada’s progressive trade agenda.602

On 10 January 2018, Canada filed a complaint with the World Trade Organization (WTO) regarding the United States “anti-dumping or countervailing duty investigations, reviews or other proceedings.”603 The complaint was a response to “unfair and unwarranted”604 tariffs on softwood lumber and related products. Also, the complaint encompassed 200 similar cases with other trading partners of the United States.605

On 8 March 2018, Minister Champagne signed the CPTPP in Santiago, Chile.606 It comprises of 11 members on both sides of the Pacific Ocean, notably with the exclusion of the United States, and 13% of global gross domestic product. Minister Champagne emphasized the benefits of having “unparalleled access”607 to new and dynamic markets around the world.608

On 20 March 2018, the Canadian government started the first round of negotiations for a potential comprehensive free trade agreement between Canada and Mercosur countries.609 The free trade agreement with the Mercosur countries (Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay) is part of Canada’s commitment to have trade policies that “contribute meaningfully to overall economic, social and environmental priorities,”610 according to the Canadian government.611

Canada has clearly demonstrated its commitment to keep markets open and fight protectionism while standing firm against all unfair trade practices.

---

France: 0

France has partially complied with its commitment to keep its markets open and to fight protectionism, while standing firm against all unfair trade practices.

On 27 July 2017, French Minister of the Economy and Finance Bruno Le Maire announced that France would “temporarily” nationalize STX France’s Saint-Nazaire shipyard.612 STX France was previously co-owned by the government of France and its majority shareholder, the Korean conglomerate STX. When STX collapsed in 2016, its shares were put up for sale and two Italian investors — including state-owned shipbuilding company Fincantieri — reached an agreement in May 2017 to buy a two-thirds share of the company. Italian Minister of Economy Carlo Padoan and Italian Industry Minister Carlo Calenda criticized France’s decision to take a protectionist stance in order to prolong the negotiated deal on STX.613

On 27 September 2017, the office of French President Emmanuel Macron announced a new deal in the STX shipyard case, in which Fincantieri would purchase a 50% stake in STX France.614 The French government has maintained its involvement in the deal, arguing that the shipyard is a strategic military asset. France has agreed to “lend” Fincantieri a 1% stake for 12 years, allowing the Italian company majority control over the shipyard, but reserving the right to revoke this 1% stake at any time.615

On 15 January 2018, Minister Le Maire delivered a New Year’s greeting where he outlined the state of the French economy and France’s economic goals for 2018, which included “protecting its strategic businesses including digital data storage and artificial intelligence.”616 Le Maire stressed that France needed to respond to globalization, stating that he saw no contradiction in attempting to make France an open economy while working to prevent the country from being “pillaged”617 by foreign interests.618

On 16 February 2018, French Prime Minister Édouard Philippe presented an extension of the 2014 Montebourg decree, which sets conditions limiting foreign investment in key French “strategic

---

savors.”619 Under the Montebourg decree, the definition of “strategic sectors”620 was expanded from the 2005 definition of national defense-related companies to the water, health, energy, transportation, and telecommunications sectors; the new PACTE law will add artificial intelligence, space technology, data storage, and semiconductors to the list.621 The PACTE law, which will be introduced in April, will also make it easier for the government to create “golden shares”622 in French companies, which will allow the state to have greater control over decisions to transfer intellectual property abroad.623

On 14 March 2018, Minister Le Maire announced that France would be taking Google and Apple to court over unfair trade practices involving contractual terms with developers and tech entrepreneurs.624 France is seeking EUR2 million from each firm as a sanction against “abusive commercial practices”625 that exploit French start-ups and app developers.626

On 20 April 2018, Minister Le Maire said at an International Monetary Fund meeting in Washington DC that France would not be drawn into a “vain and pointless”627 trade war with China, and would push for a permanent exemption against US steel tariffs.628

On 27 April 2018, Minister Le Maire said at a meeting of EU finance ministers in Sofia that France would support the United States’ desire for reforms in the World Trade Organization if the US agreed to permanently waive its steel tariffs.629

On 2 May 2018, President Macron met with Australian Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull in Sydney and affirmed France’s support for an Australia-EU free trade deal, committing to start negotiations


within a few weeks and framing the announcement as a rejection of rising protectionism in the US and China.\textsuperscript{630}

Although France has been taking a strong stance against unfair trade practices, France has demonstrated a lack of commitment in both keeping markets open and fighting protectionism.

Thus, France receives a score of 0.

\textit{Analyst: Bruce Cinnamon}

\textbf{Germany: +1}

Germany has fully complied with its commitments to keep its markets open and to fight protectionism, while standing firm against all unfair trade practices.

On 8 June 2017, the federal government of Germany adopted measures from a paper entitled “Economic Development in Africa: Challenges and Options.”\textsuperscript{631} German Minister of Economic Affairs and Energy Brigitte Zypries said the measures reflected Germany’s commitment to “creating an economic partnership of equals between Germany and Africa.”\textsuperscript{632} The measures consist of improved conditions for issuing Hermes guarantees for African countries, greater opportunities for African clients to access financing and the establishment of start-up funds.\textsuperscript{633} The measures also lay out plans for strengthening energy partnerships and dialogue.\textsuperscript{634}

On 20 June 2017, Germany donated EUR 1 million to help developing and least-developed countries to strengthen their trade negotiating skills.\textsuperscript{635} The contribution went to the financing of training workshops for officials. Speaking on the donation, Germany’s Alternate Ambassador to the World Trade Organization (WTO) Walter Werner stated that Germany cooperates with developing and least-developing countries so that they may be better integrated into the international trade system and reap the gains of global trade.\textsuperscript{636}

On 22 June 2017, Minister Zypries met with EU Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmström to discuss trade policy. Minister Zypries noted that “The European Union must firmly stand together … in
favour of open markets and free and fair trade.” Minister Zypries also declared Germany’s support for Commissioner Malström’s efforts to conclude free trade agreements with Japan, Mexico, and Mercosur.

On 6 July 2017, Germany donated EUR 150,000 to help developing countries comply with international food safety, animal and plant health standards. Director of the WTO’s Administration and General Services Division Nthisana Philips stated that Germany’s donation and the resulting improvements to health standards would allow developing countries’ exports to gain better access to global markets.

On 18 September 2017, Minister Zypries announced the implementation of many of the measures adopted on 8 June 2017. Among the measures implemented were the expansion export initiatives in energy and health, provision of staff to help companies train workers and advising and supporting companies as they invest in Africa.

On 10 November 2017, German State Secretary Matthias Machnig talked about the need for Europe to strengthen the WTO. Secretary Machnig argued that Europe needed “the WTO and its work to promote open markets and fair and equitable global trade.” Secretary Machnig went on to say that countries that choose to isolate themselves are “mistaken.” Afterwards, Secretary Machnig noted that Germany was supportive of the efforts the EU took to conclude several free trade agreements like


the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement, a free trade deal between Canada and the EU.\textsuperscript{646}

On 30 November 2017, The Global Forum on Steel Excess Capacity, headed by Minister Zypries, agreed on recommendations for action on reducing steel capacity.\textsuperscript{647} Minister Zypries commented on the recommendation stating that “overcapacities in the steel sector are a global phenomenon that require a global answer.”\textsuperscript{648} Minister Zypries further emphasized that the world needs “open markets and fair trade that is based on a level playing field across all industries.”\textsuperscript{649}

On 2 March 2018, the German Government released a statement responding to the United States tariff on imported steel and aluminium.\textsuperscript{650} Government Spokesperson Steffen Seibert noted Germany’s rejection of the planned tariffs saying that the problem of overcapacity can not be solved by isolationism and protectionism.\textsuperscript{651} Government Spokesperson Steffen Seibert added that Germany will “work for free trade and open markets.”\textsuperscript{652}

Germany has fully complied with its commitments to keep markets open and to fight protectionism while standing firm against all unfair trade practices by creating economic and trade partnerships with developing countries, supporting efforts to conclude free trade agreements with numerous states, and rejecting the US tariffs on imported steel and aluminum.

Thus, Germany receives a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Reuben Aboye}

**Italy: +1**

Italy has fully complied with its commitment to keep its markets open and to fight protectionism, while standing firm against all unfair trade practices.

On 30 May 2017, Italian President of the Chamber of Deputies Laura Boldrini and President of the Senate at the Chamber of Deputies Pietro met with the Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau in the Sala della Regina. The Italian parliamentarians supported Canada–European Union Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement and described it as a mean to create jobs and
economic growth. The parliamentarians and Trudeau expressed their concerns on the increasing rate of the isolationism and protectionism.653

On 22 August 2017, Italy expressed its concerns to the European Commission to block foreign acquisitions of European companies. Previously the European Commission has considered screening investments by state-owned Chinese firms and blocking Chinese investments, Italy has supported these two ideas. The Italian Industry Minister, Carlo Calenda, described this move as a an opportunity to monitor operations that are incompatible with European rules. Italy along with France and Germany suggested that all corporate investments outside the bloc should be front to the notice of the commission.654

On 13 October 2017, the Italian Cabinet passed a decree that forces investors that constitute minority stakes of at least 10% in Italian-listed companies to disclose what their intentions are on final ownership. This decree aims to avoid and prevent hostile takeovers by foreign companies on Italian companies. This signals that foreign companies have taken advantage of Italians open approach to foreign investments. Italian Industry Minister Carlo Calenda stated that investors should respect Italy’s openness to foreign investments. The decrees also goes on to restrict takeovers by non-EU companies to high-technology sectors.655

On 30 October 2017, Italian Prime Minister Paolo Gentiloni met with the Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi. The Italian Prime Minister also stated that both the countries, Italy and India, oppose the increasing rate of protectionism. He also stated that relationship between developed and developing economies should be strengthened by policies that support social inclusion and growth.656

On 21 November 2017, a four-day convention was organized by the ICE Agency to attract foreign investments in Italy, in Singapore. The idea of the event was to create a platform where Italian companies can interact with potential investors, local universities, agencies and ploy technologists dedicated to supporting technological innovation.657

On 19 January 2018, Prime Minister Gentiloni along with leaders from Brazil, India and Canada stood against the anti-free trade rhetoric coming from the US. While Donald Trump was against the multilateral trade, Italian Prime Minister Paolo Gentiloni stressed the need to “mix” free trade and fair trade.658

Italy has kept its markets open and has taken a firm stance against unfair trade practices and protectionism. Significant turmoil was generated by Italy’s general elections that resulted in a hung

parliament. Therefore, further material on Italy’s commitment towards free and fair trade was unavailable.

Thus, Italy receives a score of +1.

**Analyst: Krishna Moda**

### Japan: +1

Japan has fully complied with its commitment to keep its markets open and to fight protectionism, while standing firm against all unfair trade practices by advancing free-trade agreements such as the Japanese-European Economic Partnership Agreement (JEEPA) and Agreement on the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) while affirming its opposition to protectionism and unfair trade practice in multiple settings.

On 5 July 2017 the European Union trade commissioner, and the Japanese foreign minister declared a consensus on a long discussed Japan-EU Economic Partnership Agreement.\(^\text{660}\) The EU is expected to scrap a 10% tariff on passenger cars made in Japan, over a period of seven years. The Japanese have agreed to reduce tariffs on the import of European foods in return.\(^\text{661}\)

On 14 September 2017 Prime Minister Shinzo Abe and Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi participated in a dialogue in Gandhinagar as part of the India-Japan Annual Summit. A joint statement released after the event declared that the two committed to combating protectionism and unfair trade practices while achieving consensus on the importance of rules-based multilateral trading.\(^\text{662}\)

On 19 September 2017 Prime Minister Shinzo Abe hosted a meeting with fifteen world-renowned business leaders to have a dialogue about private sector investment in Japan. Abe discussed the value of free trade and committed to realizing the TPP.\(^\text{663}\)

On 11 November 2017, after pressure from the Japanese and Australian governments, 11 countries achieved consensus via-à-vis a number of essential components of the TPP. The agreement seeks to eliminate barriers to trade and tariffs on products in industry and agriculture.\(^\text{664}\)

On 13 January 2018, the Japanese government announced a trade agreement with the Baltic states to improve political and economic ties. In particular, Japan seeks to improve economic ties in the arena of transportation technology and products.\(^\text{665}\)

---


On 14 January 2018, Prime Minister Abe and Prime Minister Borisov of Bulgaria agreed to seek an early implementation of the JEEPA.666

On 10 March 2018, Japanese Trade Commissioner Hiroshige Seko met with EU Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmström and US Trade Representative Robert Lighthizer in Brussels to advance trilateral efforts at tariff reduction. Commissioner Seko and Commissioner Malmström both emphasized that they believe the EU and Japan should be exempt from American steel and aluminum tariffs put in place.667 The meeting also resulted in the three parties agreeing to fight against “distorted market practices, including stronger rules on subsidies and more sharing of information about market abuse.”668

On 11 March 2018, eleven countries signed the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership (CPTPP), which will reduce import tariffs in over 40% of countries worldwide. Japan was one of the leaders of the agreement along with Canada and Australia; the three countries assumed leadership after the United States’ withdrawal from the previous TPP in January 2017. The agreement guarantees the ability of investors to launch investor-state dispute settlements in the event that branches of the pact are violated.669

On 1 April 2018, Japan restored its tariff on imported US beef from 50% to 38.5%. The tariff was raised between 1 August 2017 and 30 April 2018 as an emergency safeguard mechanism to protect the domestic beef industry.670

Japan’s efforts to advance the JEEPA, to initiate a number of multilateral free-trade agreements, to lead the CPTPP, and to participate in multilateral efforts to reduce tariffs are evidence of its commitment to keep its markets open and combat protectionism with its explicit opposition unfair trade practices.

Thus, Japan receives a score of +1.

**Analyst: Armin Safavi-Naini**

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its commitment to keep its markets open and to fight protectionism while standing firm against all unfair trade practices.

On 22 September 2017, UK Prime Minister Theresa May urged the European Union to retain current trade terms for two years after the UK officially leaves the EU.671 She stated that there was “no need to impose tariffs where there are none now.”672 Rather than adopting an existing trade

---

model, Prime Minister May called for a new economic partnership that would be both “comprehensive and ambitious”\textsuperscript{673} and ensures the prosperity of both sides through free trade and fair competition.\textsuperscript{674}

On 10 October 2017, UK Business Secretary Greg Clark condemned the increased tariff the US government imposed on the manufacturer Bombardier in the UK. Secretary Clark described the US government’s decision as “totally unjustified,”\textsuperscript{675} and stated that the UK government is committed to pushing for the removal of the tariff.\textsuperscript{676}

On 7 November 2017, the UK government published a trade bill that details its post-Brexit trade policy. It includes provisions for the UK to implement existing EU trade agreements, establishment of an independent trade remedies body to defend UK firms against unfair trade practices, and continued access to foreign government contracts for UK businesses.\textsuperscript{677} International Trade Secretary Liam Fox stated that the UK wanted to negotiate "more liberal"\textsuperscript{678} trade agreements to provide “even better market access”\textsuperscript{679} to what the UK previously had as part of the EU.\textsuperscript{680}

On 24 November 2017, Prime Minister May attended the Eastern Partnership Summit to advance progress on the negotiation regarding open trade with the EU. May repeated her wish for the UK and the EU to “step forward together,”\textsuperscript{681} and has prepared a financial offer of GBP40 billion to the EU to open up free trade talks.\textsuperscript{682}

On 12 December 2017, Secretary Fox spoke at the World Trade Organization (WTO) Ministerial Conference, calling for countries to “update and strengthen”\textsuperscript{683} the international trading system.\textsuperscript{684}

He highlighted UK’s “unwavering”\textsuperscript{685} commitment to free trade, and stated that the UK will continue to fill its commitment and possibly take a larger role at the WTO as it leaves the EU. He emphasized trade as an important tool for development, and called for countries to do more in domestic policies and non-tariff measures to promote free and fair trade practices.\textsuperscript{686}

On 9 January 2018, the Trade Bill has passed its second reading in the House of Commons.\textsuperscript{687} Secretary Fox emphasized that maintaining the flow of free trade in both directions as UK leaves the EU is the priority of the Department for International Trade, and that the bill will “provide maximum certainty and continuity for business and consumers.”\textsuperscript{688}

On 16 April 2018, Prime Minister May spoke at the Commonwealth Business Forum on opportunities to boost free trade and economic growth by the UK government. May highlighted the UK’s support for “free and inclusive” trade, new opportunities in UK-Commonwealth partnerships as the UK leaves the EU, and the benefits of free trade among Commonwealth countries.\textsuperscript{689} May further emphasized the huge potentials of shared standards to stimulate trade, supported new programs to boost women’s participation in business, and announced the UK’s funding for an all-new Commonwealth Standards Network to establish a common standard for goods and services to help increase trade.\textsuperscript{690}

The UK has taken actions to keep markets open, fight protectionism, and stand firm against unfair trade practices.

Thus, the UK receives a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Bonnie Li}

**United States: 0**

The United States has partially complied with its commitment to keep its markets open and to fight protectionism while standing firm against all unfair trade practices.

\begin{itemize}
\item https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-speaks-at-the-commonwealth-business-forum-16-april-2018
\end{itemize}
On 26 June 2017, the Secretary of Commerce Wilbur Ross imposed additional tariffs on Canadian exports of softwood lumber, bringing duties on these goods to between 17.41% to 30.88%. The US Department of Commerce asserts this “affirmative preliminary antidumping duty determination” was in response to its findings that imported Canadian softwood lumber products were sold between 4.59% and 7.72% less than their “fair value based on factual evidence provided by the interested parties.”

On 12 July 2017, the US trade representative, Ambassador Robert Lighthizer wrote a letter to South Korean Minister of Trade Joo Hyung-Hwan expressing the Trump administration’s desire to reduce the “significant trade imbalance” of the United States with Korea by convening a special session of the Joint Committee under the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement (KORUS). U.S. actions to achieve a “more balanced trade relationship” aims to close its 20-year-long trade deficit with Korea.

On 14 August 2017, President Donald Trump issued a memorandum asking Ambassador Robert Lighthizer to investigate “China’s laws, policies, practices, or actions that may be unreasonable or discriminatory and that may be harming American intellectual property rights, innovation, or technology development.”

On 17 November 2017, Ambassador Lighthizer released updated negotiating objectives for the fourth round of negotiations of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) which called to eliminate the third-party dispute settlement mechanism outlined in Chapter 19 of the agreement and the preservation of domestic preferential purchasing programs. The dispute settlement

---


mechanism in NAFTA is subject to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, overseen by the World Trade Organization.\textsuperscript{700}

On 29 January 2018, Ambassador Lighthizer declared that the NAFTA chapter on anti-corruption was completed after the sixth round of NAFTA renegotiations.\textsuperscript{701} Ambassador Lighthizer declared this round as a “watershed moment.”\textsuperscript{702} At the same time, an agreement was made on efforts to clamp down on unfair trade practices, in particular bribery and graft.\textsuperscript{703}

On 8 March 2018, President Trump signed proclamations that imposed 25% and 10% tariffs on steel and aluminum imports respectively. Secretary of Commerce Wilbur Ross issued a statement claiming that “the President’s decision regarding the steel and aluminum Section 232 reports are the result of a long and well-thought-out process led by the Commerce Department.”\textsuperscript{704} Canada and Mexico were exempt from the tariffs due to the ongoing NAFTA negotiations.\textsuperscript{705}

On 28 March 2018, Press Secretary Sarah Huckabee Sanders announced that the United States and Korea had reached an agreement, in principle, on a revised version of KORUS, stating that “this is a big deal for the American automotive industry. It’s a big deal for our parts manufacturers. It’s a big deal for our pharmaceutical companies. And ultimately, it’s a big deal and a major win for American workers and American businesses.”\textsuperscript{706} While details on the revised agreement have yet to be released by the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the deal is expected to address the US’s trade deficit with Korea, and exempt Korea from President Trump’s steel tariffs.\textsuperscript{707}

On 27 April 2018, the eighth round of NAFTA negotiations concluded, with many unresolved questions looming as to whether or not an agreement will be achieved in the near future. Issues such as dairy, dispute-resolution mechanisms, and a proposed five-year sunset clause, and intellectual property are all areas that remain unsolved.\textsuperscript{708}

The United States has not demonstrated its commitment to keep its markets open and to fight protectionism. However, the United States still demonstrates its commitment to stand firm against all unfair trade practices.

Thus, the United States receives a score of 0.

*Analysts: Nicholas Di Marco with Steven Camit*

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with its commitment to keep its markets open and to fight protectionism while standing firm against all unfair trade practices.

On 1 June 2017, Germany and China agreed to advance the negotiations on a China-EU investment agreement as means to “enrich the two countries’ cooperation and ties.” German Chancellor Angela Merkel and visiting Chinese Premier Li Keqiang announced the developments during a joint press conference in Berlin. The investment deal includes the broadening and equality of both Chinese and EU markets to improve mutual trade and investment scales of both parties. Merkel stated that the signing of such a treaty acts as a good point at which negotiations on an EU-China free trade agreement can begin.

On 8 June 2017, Germany and Argentina expressed plans for a free trade agreement between the EU and Mercosur when German Chancellor Angela Merkel visited the country. The efforts were also in part a pledge to “fight protectionism.”

On 22-23 June 2017, the European Council held a summit during which leaders restated their agreement to free trade and investment. The European Council took a stance against unfair trade practice by agreeing on trade defence instruments in order to protect against such unfair practices. Furthermore, the Council strongly advised the progression of all ongoing negotiations for “ambitious and balanced free trade agreements,” including those with Mercosur and Mexico.

On 6 July 2017, the EU agreed on an outline for a free trade deal with Japan that would “stand against a protectionist tide threatening the global economy.” The deal is designed to lessen and remove trade barriers such as tariffs between states. As such, the EU will remove the 10% duty on Japanese car imports reciprocated by like Japanese efforts.

---

On 21 September 2017, the Comprehensive Economic Trade Agreement (CETA) came into force. CETA is a free trade agreement between the EU and Canada that aims to open markets and fight protectionism.715

On 6 October 2017, the EU-India Summit was held in New Delhi during which leaders continued talks of diplomatic relations and expressed their “shared commitment”716 in fortifying economic relations between the EU and India. As such, both sides expressed efforts to relaunch negotiations concerning a “comprehensive and mutually beneficial Free Trade Agreement.”717

On 31 January 2018, the European Commission endorsed “horizontal provisions for cross-border data flows and personal data protection”718 in EU trade agreements.719 The provisions follow from the EU’s protection of personal data as a fundamental right, and extend to trade negotiations so that they are not subject to such negotiations. The draft paper would allow the EU to fight protectionism in third countries while also protecting their current legislation on the protection of personal data.720

On 1 March 2018, European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker announced that he would “bring forward in the next few days a proposal for World Trade Organization-compatible countermeasures against the U.S.”721 Following the U.S.’s proposed tariff hike on steel and aluminum, Europe’s Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmstrom stated that the EU would raise a dispute at the WTO “at the earliest opportunity”722 and that the Commission will furthermore propose “WTO-compatible safeguard action to preserve the stability of the EU market”723 if it deems necessary.724

On 14 March 2018, German Chancellor Merkel stated that protectionism is not a viable mechanism to international trade while also announcing the EU’s aim to be excluded from the US’s planned steel

and aluminum tariffs.\textsuperscript{725} In the event of such tariffs being imposed, EU officials have expressed their assurance of going to the WTO to facilitate fair trade.\textsuperscript{726}

On 18 April 2018, the European Commission concluded negotiations for the Economic Partnership Agreement with Japan and the trade and investment agreements with Singapore.\textsuperscript{727} The agreement with Japan is the largest bilateral trade negotiation ever entered by the EU, and will remove many of the customs duties on EU companies exporting to Japan. The agreement will remove many existing regulatory barriers including double testing and overlapping bureaucracy. Furthermore, the agreement with Singapore purports to build a foundation for future region-to-region trade and investment between the EU and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. The trade agreements also include comprehensive reports on trade and sustainable development.\textsuperscript{728}

On 21 April 2018, the EU and Mexico reached a free trade deal which was seen as an accomplishment against the increased protectionism posed from the US. The European Commission stated that the deal will eliminate tariffs for many goods, including Mexican farm products and European dairy produce.\textsuperscript{729}

The EU has taken significant steps toward fighting protectionism by keeping its markets open and taking a firm stance against unfair trade practices.

Thus, the EU receives a score of +1.

\textit{Analyst: Hivda Ates}


\textsuperscript{729}EU and Mexico agree new free trade pact, Reuters (Brussels) 21 April 2018. Access Date: 30 April 2018. https://www.reuters.com/article/us-eu-mexico-trade/eu-and-mexico-agree-new-free-trade-pact-idUSKBN1HS0PF.