

Compliance Coding Manual for International Institutional Commitments

By the
Global Governance Program
at Trinity College
University of Toronto

Version of May 21, 2026
www.g7.utoronto.ca
www.g20.utoronto.ca
www.brics.utoronto.ca

Contents

Preface	4
Chapter 1: Assessing Compliance	5
Chapter 2: Commitments	6
Identifying Commitments from the Summit Communiqué	6
Identifying Subset or Country-Specific Commitments	10
Categorizing Commitments	11
Assessing Compliance Catalysts	16
Measuring Compliance	20
Chapter 3: Priority Commitments for Compliance Assessments	21
Choosing Priority Commitments	21
Chapter 4: Summit Compliance with Commitments	23
The Concept of Compliance (Implementation, Inferred Causality)	23
Other Order Compliance	26
Commitments Applying Differentially to Each Member or Subsets	26
The Case of the European Union	26
From Compliance to Impact	28
Chapter 5: Compliance Measurement	30
Time Frame	30
Currency	30
Scoring	30
Commitment Features	31
General and Specific Interpretive Guidelines for Measuring Compliance	32
Interim vs. Final Compliance Reports	41
Chapter 6: Compliance Report Writing	42
Chapter 7: Interpreting Compliance Results	45
References	45
Appendix A: Compliance Report Template	47
Appendix A: Similar Commitments on Issue, by Year	48
Appendix B: Compliance in Issue Area, by Year, by Member	48
Appendix B: Where to Find G7 and G20 Compliance Information Online	49
G7-Specific Sites	49
G20-Specific Sites	49
BRICS-Specific Sites	49
General Sources	49
International Organizations	49
International News Sources and Newswires	50
Member-Specific Online Resources	50
If the Web Fails	57
Appendix C: G7/8 Compliance Bibliographical References	59
Appendix D: G20 Compliance Bibliographical References	62
Appendix E: G7/G20 Summit Performance Indicators by Function	64
1. The Domestic Political Summit	64
2. The Deliberative Summit	64
3. The Directional Summit	64
4. The Decisional Summit	64
5. The Delivery Summit	64
6. The Development of Global Governance Summit	64
7. Overall Assessments	64
Appendix F: Causal Models of Summit Performance	65
G7	65

G20	66
Appendix G: Indicators of Major Causal Variables	67
Relative Capability	67
Relative Vulnerability	67
Interdependence	67
Common Principles (Shared Social Purpose)	67
Political Control and Capital.....	67
Appendix H: Summary of Variables, Methods and Sources	68
Appendix I: Dictionary	70
Catalogue of Concepts	76
Specific Interpretive Guidelines	76
Politically Binding level	79
Dictionary Definitions (The Concise Oxford Dictionary 1990)	80
Appendix A: Compliance Coding Manual Excerpts	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Politically Binding	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Contextual Guidelines for “Support”	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Appendix C: Binding Level of Commitment Verbs	Error! Bookmark not defined.
High Binding.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Low Binding.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Preface

Each year since 1996, the G7 Research Group has produced annual compliance reports on the progress made by G7/8 members in meeting the priority commitments reached at their annual summit. Since 2002, the G7 Research Group has also published an interim compliance report, timed to assess progress at the transition point between countries in the hosting rotation. Built on the interim compliance report, a final compliance report is issued just prior to the annual summit. These reports monitor and assess each member's compliance on carefully chosen priority commitments. Since 2008, the G20 Research Group has been issuing similar interim and final compliance reports for the G20 summits. Since 2009 the BRICS Research Group has been doing so for the annual BRICS summits too.

In addition, compliance reports are produced for commitments on specific subjects for a selected period. These include a retroactive assessment of G7 compliance on climate change since 1975, and on Africa, finance, development, health and conflict prevention in selected years. In addition, the G20 Research Group analyzed compliance with G20 development and employment commitments made at the Seoul Summit in November 2010. Other compliance projects include assessing commitments with the commitments made by CARICOM's Port of Spain Summit on non-communicable diseases (NCDs) in 2007 and the United Nations High Level Meeting on NCDs in 2011.

These reports are offered to the general public, policy makers, scholars, researchers, civil society, the media, interested citizens and other stakeholders around the world in an effort to make the work of the G7, G20, BRICS and other globally relevant international institutions more transparent, accessible and accountable. They are also conducted to provide systemic data to enable meaningful social science analysis of informal summit-level institutions. Reports are available on the G7 Information Centre website at <http://www.g7.utoronto.ca>, G20 Information Centre website at <http://www.g20.utoronto.ca>, the BRICS Information Centre at <http://www.brics.utoronto.ca> and the Global Health Diplomacy Program website at <http://www.ghdp.utoronto.ca>.

These websites also contain the world's most comprehensive and authoritative online collection of information and analyses on the G7, G20, BRICS and related institutions. The research groups assemble, verify and post documents from the meetings, leading up to and at each summit. They present official documentation of all past summits and ministerial meetings, scholarly writings and policy analyses, research reports, data sets, fact sheets, scholarship, information and links to related websites.

The research groups are global networks of scholars, students and professionals in the academic, research, media, business, government and nongovernmental communities that follow the work of the G7, G20, BRICS and related institutions. Founded in 1987, 2008 and 2012 respectively, the research groups are coordinated from the University of Toronto through the International Relations Program and the John Graham Library based at Trinity College. The G7, G20 and BRICS Research Groups have partnerships with institutions and individuals in major capitals and cities.

This coding manual is the product of ongoing and past contributions of many people to whom I owe a deep debt of gratitude, including Ella Kokotsis, Madeline Koch, Brittaney Warren, Julia Kulik, Caroline Bracht, Jenilee Guebert, Laura Sunderland and many volunteers over the years who have completed compliance assessments.

John Kirton
Toronto, April 2026

Chapter 1: Assessing Compliance

Every year since the G7 Lyon Summit in 1996, the G7 Research Group has conducted compliance studies as an important part of the analysis it produces. The G20 Research Group and the BRICS Research Group both continue this work. Why do we do this task every year?

Each summit annually produces written, public outcome documents, variously called communiqués, declarations or statements, etc., that bind the leaders in many cases to firm commitments. Can the impact of these commitments be measured once the summit is over, the media have dispersed and the leaders have returned home? Are there limits to how much or how often G7, G20 or BRICS members comply with their leaders' summit commitments, particularly given that the members are autonomous, sovereign entities whose leaders are driven by differing domestic and international demands?

It makes little sense for summit leaders to invest their time and resources, while potentially risking their political and personal reputations, to generate these commitments if they have no intention of complying with them once the summit is done. As leaders of the world's most powerful countries, they accurately believe that their governments are capable of fully complying. The enormous amount of time they and their representatives spend in negotiating the text of these commitments confirms that the leaders are fully willing and able to comply. These compliance reports therefore allow for an assessment of how much credibility the leaders bring to the summit table, and whether the products of the summit (outcome documents) deserve to be treated with any serious attention. The same holds true for G7, G20 and BRICS ministers and their own meetings.

The empirical findings on compliance therefore offer explanations to three important questions:

1. To what extent and under what conditions do members live up to the commitments, i.e., the collective decisions that the leaders reach or authorize at the summit?
2. How does the pattern of summit compliance vary over time, by subject and by member?
3. What causes high and low compliance?

The determination of how much compliance has happened, when, where and by which member can lead to important conclusions about the overall effectiveness of the summit process. It also provides enough data to answer a fourth question:

4. How can leaders improve compliance with their commitments through low-cost, politically easy measures that they have used before, and that have been shown to have an impact in raising or lowering compliance in the past.

But before patterns of summit compliance, and their causes and corrections, can be determined, it is necessary to define what is meant by a commitment, because commitments form the basis of the compliance assessments.

Chapter 2: Commitments

Identifying Commitments from the Summit Communiqué

Commitments are defined as a publicly expressed, collectively agreed to, discrete, precise, politically binding and future oriented statements of intent; a promise or undertaking by summit members that they will undertake future action (often through a specific instrument) often to move toward, meet or adjust to meet an identified welfare outcome (Kokotsis 1999; see also Von Furstenberg and Daniels 1991, 1992a, 1992b). There are five key criteria contained in this definition: discreteness, precision, politically binding, future orientation and collective agreement by the leaders, i.e., “we-ness.”

1. Discreteness

A commitment consists of an instrument (specific action or tool), welfare outcome (goal, target) or both.

Instruments. An instrument is the action that the leaders have decided to take.

Outcomes. First, commitments must be discrete, in that each specified outcome (or aim, goal, welfare outcome) represents a separate commitment, even if a single set of actions supports these multiple outcomes. A sequence of specified measures through which these outcomes are to be achieved, however, does not usually represent separate commitments. A single commitment is defined by the given outcome. For example, many statements in the summit’s documents specify both a policy instrument and a corresponding welfare outcome. The following illustration consists of two separate policy instruments and one welfare outcome.

“We pledge to reduce our dependence on imported energy (welfare target) through conservation (policy instrument #1) and the development of alternative energy sources (policy instrument #2).”

Multiple Outcomes or Instrument. Some commitments do not have both a welfare outcome and corresponding policy instrument. Many welfare outcomes do not specify a policy instrument, and many policy instruments do not specify a welfare outcomes. Often they are simply implied or inferred. For instance:

“We pledge not to increase our greenhouse gas emissions this year.”

For this outcome the only commitment one can infer that the reason for making this commitment is to reduce or not increase global warming or improve the environment in some way without specifying any instrument.

What is a welfare outcome in one instance can be an instrument in another, and vice versa. For example, the G7 might commit to reducing greenhouse emissions (instrument) to tackle climate change (outcome). In 1990, the G7 said: “Climate change is of key importance. We are committed to undertake common efforts to limit emissions of greenhouse gases, such as carbon dioxide.” In another instance the G7 might commit to setting outcomes (instrument) to reduce greenhouse gases (outcome). In 1998, the G8 said: “We will each undertake domestically the steps necessary to reduce significantly greenhouse gas emissions.”

Multiple Instruments. In some cases, if more than one instrument is specified, even in regard to a single outcome, this may produce multiple commitments. If the criteria for each instrument are different, then the reference contains separate commitments. If the criteria are the same for each instrument, it represents a single commitment. For example, the statement below is split into three parts (“new efforts in world trade,” “new efforts in monetary matters” and “new efforts in exploiting raw materials”), and is therefore assessed as three commitments.

“We also concentrated on the need for new efforts in the areas of world trade, monetary matters and raw materials, including energy.”

Another example is the earlier one:

“We pledge to reduce our dependence on imported energy (welfare outcome) through conservation (policy instrument #1) and the development of alternative energy sources (policy instrument #2).”

This statement contains two discrete commitments because it contains two measurable instruments, even though there is one shared welfare outcome.

Allowing separate commitments to emerge from multiple, distinct instruments reduces the difficulty of dealing with compound statements in the interpretive guidelines and scoring metric for compliance assessments (see below).

If a compound outcome or instrument is presented with an “or” (not “and”), this is not a separate commitment, because only one or the other would qualify.

The word “including” followed by a list does not automatically mean that the items in the list are policy instruments. For instance, commitment 2016-135 is one commitment: “We will tackle all sources, techniques and channels of terrorist financing, including extortion, taxation, smuggling of natural resources, bank looting, looting of cultural property, external donation, and kidnapping for ransom.” This is a list of sources of terrorist financing to be targeted by an unspecified policy or action, rather than a list of distinct, actionable policy instruments.

A statement can only be divided into discrete commitments once. That is, if there is a list of instruments and a list of welfare outcomes, the list of welfare outcomes can be applied to each of the separated instruments.

In general the word “and” divides a sentence into two discrete commitments unless the substance of each one is highly similar to the other. In general this applies much more to welfare outcomes than to policy instruments because several different policy instruments can be used to accomplish a single welfare outcome.

2. Precision

Second, commitments must be sufficiently precise or specific in their instrument and/or outcome to be both identifiable and measurable. Outcomes such as “peace” or “prosperity” or “well-being” when used alone are usually too general to meet this standard (unless identified policy outcome to meeting them is sufficiently precise). “Growth” meets the standard because it is conventionally meant to indicate economic growth and is measured by gross domestic product.

3. Politically Binding

Third, a commitment must bind members politically. Actions need to include verbs that connote politically binding obligations to change members’ behaviour, even if the commitment is a promise to continue past behaviour (which then constrains the ability to change). General statements of aspiration are excluded. Statements with specified parameters are included.

The following points are helpful in determining how to identify measurable politically binding commitments, although the context can be important in determining whether a word or phrase constitutes a commitment:

<i>Commitment</i> = commit agree endorse pledge promise seek reaffirm commitment remain determined are determined to continue to	<i>Sometimes</i> = encourage promote support stand ready to shall ourselves object ought to/should	<i>No Commitment</i> = welcome urge call on (unless the thing being called on is controlled by the G7/G20/BRICS members) reflected upon discussed are aware look forward to emphasize
--	--	---

create will insist on must renew look to intend to affirm our intention need to/must ensure [something is] necessary (expresses obligation) need to address we emphasize the need (for us to...)		recognize the importance we gave particular emphasis to united in determination should stand ready to express confidence in reaffirm the need for advocate note condemn
--	--	---

Contextual Guidelines for “Support”

Inclusions

- we support the efforts of [institution]
- we will support implementation of the work of [institution]
- we will/agree to support the [institution] in meeting its goal
- we support initiatives of [institution]
- we support reforms of [institution]
- we support strengthening [institution]
- we support the work of the [institution]
- we seek the support of [institution]

Exclusions

- we support the principles of [institution/initiative]
- we support the role of [institution]

Contextual Guidelines for “Pledge” or “Commit”

A statement that uses the term “pledge” or “commit” must be measurable. It is not always necessary for a commitment to be numerically or quantitatively measurable (although quantitativeness is generally sufficient to ensure the measurability test under specificity or precision is satisfied). Non-quantitative statements such as those described below should be classified as a commitment:

Contextual Guidelines for “Should”

Many statements in the communiqué use the verb “should.”

“Our capacity to deal with short-term oil market problems should be improved, particularly through the holding of adequate levels of stocks.”

The word “should” does not always imply intent. However, with regard to summit documents it is generally safe to assume that it implies a commitment to do what is specified, although perhaps not if it is used in the passive tense. Hence, “should” statements are classified as commitments if they meet the other appropriate criteria.

Context

The context of the summit and the statement are relevant. The following statement is a commitment because at the time of the 2011 Deauville Summit, the leaders were elsewhere reaffirming their support for this initiative:

“We recall our strong commitment to the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and national unity of Libya” (G8 Deauville Summit 2011)

However, the word “recall” does not usually indicate a new commitment. It can be used to highlight past action, as opposed to future action, and therefore does not fit into the commitment criteria.

4. Future Orientation

Fourth, commitments must be future oriented, rather than represent endorsements of previous action. However, reaffirmations or pledges to continue an action are included, because they indicate a bound pattern for future action. Such commitments rest on an assumption that in the absence of summit reaffirmation or rearticulation each year, they would normally expire (or be taken less seriously and dwindle).¹ Excluded are actions or decisions that the summit members “welcome.”

Although action by summit members is assumed to be required in the future, this does not need to be specified. Future action can be implied by the tense used. Verbal instructions to international institutions, issued at the time of the summit, can be included if there is an assumption that summit members will take action to move toward this result.

There is also a specified actor target and welfare target. For example, a statement such as “the World Trade Organization should pay more attention to the environment” could be included if summit members have a predominant influence at the WTO, and because specified actor and welfare targets are indicated.

Statements that identify the agenda or priority of issues (e.g., “sustainable development is a critical concern,” “this conference is a landmark one”) are excluded, even if they contain logical language or set parameters (e.g., “debt relief helps promote democracy”). Such statements are direction setting, not decision making.

Again, context should be considered. Commitments expressed in the present tense can refer to action that continues in the future, such as a statement written in the present tense that includes a future date. Here is an example:

“We are working towards the completion of the 15th General Review of Quotas, including a new quota formula by the Spring Meetings of 2019 and no later than the Annual Meetings of 2019” (G7 finance ministers 2017-12).

This example omits the explicit “will” but implies continued and thus future action:

“We continue with our efforts to achieve a more effective cooperation between the IMF and regional financing arrangements, respecting their mandates” (G7 finance ministers 2017-13).

We-ness

Fifth, a commitment binds the institution’s members themselves to act, rather than someone else. It includes the international institutions that the members control. It is expressed through such terms as “we will,” “we agree to,” or “the G7/G20/BRICS.”

Communiqués often state that other international institutions or groups should take a particular course of action. If the text can be understood to mean that the members will press for action by an institution they are part of, it is a commitment. If the text is suggesting to another country or institution that they do not control or have sufficient influence over, it is not a commitment. For example, if the G7 states that “NATO should,” the statement qualifies as a commitment because G7 members have predominant influence in determining what NATO does. Similar institutions include the International Monetary Fund, World Bank, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, International Energy Agency and Financial Stability Board.

¹ Multi-year commitments also require more time to monitor than the annual summit-to-summit timelines. However, they are not considered “new commitments” at each summit unless they are renewed or referenced by the leaders.

However, because BRICS members do not have such influence given that none is a member, a BRICS statement that “NATO should” is a direction to an external uncontrolled institution (and is thus considered under a separate dimension of summit performance).

Who is “we”? (code as a commitment)	Who is not “we”? (do not code as a commitment)
<i>We should...</i>	<i>They should...</i>
The OECD should... (G7/G8/G20)	Other members of the OECD should...
NATO should... (G7/G8)	Africa should...
The World Bank/IMF should... (G7/G8/G20)	Developing Countries should...
The United Nations should... (variable)	All states should...

Example of text that is a commitment:

“We strongly encourage closer cooperation between the IMF and World Bank.”

Example of text that is not a commitment:

“Trade plays a key role in development. We encourage the developing countries, especially the newly industrializing economies, to undertake increased commitments and obligations and a greater role in the GATT, commensurate with their importance in international trade and in the international adjustment process, as well as with their respective stages of development.”

Note: If the text specifies a carrot and/or stick controlled by the members (e.g., structural adjustment as a condition of debt restructuring) with which they will influence other countries, then this is typically sufficient to qualify as a commitment. For example, “the industrialized economies will open up their markets as part of structural adjustment. Debt-relief will be provided on the basis of them doing so.”

Two or more consecutive sentences can be combined to assemble all four elements — discreteness, specificity, future orientation and obligation — required for a commitment if those sentences are tightly interlinked. For example, the G7 Leaders Statement on Ukraine on April 25, 2014, contained the following commitment: “We underscore that the door remains open to a diplomatic resolution of this crisis, on the basis of the Geneva Accord. We urge Russia to join us in committing to this path.”

Identifying Subset or Country-Specific Commitments

Summit commitments are collective because they equally cover all members (including the European Union in the G7 and G20). But some commitments can apply specifically to only some members.

1. *Specified Subsets.* These subsets can have the criteria and thus the identity specified, such as the “advanced countries” excluding Japan bound by the terms on deficits and debt at the 2010 G20 Toronto Summit. They can also be less specific, as in “some of us” or, for example, “those of us” that use nuclear power.
2. *Single-Member Commitments.* Some commitments specify an individual member, usually when, as part of a large collective framework, each member’s individual commitments to do a specific thing to contribute to the common goal are listed by name.
3. *Member Communiqué Inclusion Counts.* A member’s name and multiple members’ names can be mentioned in a commitment. This could help indicate the members this commitment, per the subset commitments discussion immediately above. It could also be considered a communiqué catalyst that affects compliance (see below). For further analyses, the specified members’ compliance scores for the commitment could be more heavily weighted in calculating the average compliance score for that commitment.
4. *Member Initiative Commitments.* A key question for further analysis is which commitments resulted directly from and reflected the initiative a member took, or provided key support to at an early stage, or tried to

veto but failed. The specification of a member's name in the commitment could provide a clue to this. This could be checked against the "Goals Set Met" analysis and report.

5. *Specified Subsets by Member Policies.* Some commitments specifically apply only to those members that have adopted specific policies, for example those that say "those of us that choose to use nuclear power."

Categorizing Commitments

Commitments can be assessed in several ways, for each summit and the institution, to assess decisional performance overall:

- Number of commitments
- Portion of commitments on a specific subject compared to the total commitments on all subjects (percentage)
- Breadth of commitments (by the major domains of economy, security, society and technology and then, in more detail, by the specific subject, e.g. climate change, health, development, trade)
- Ambition and significance
- Money mandated
- Iteration or innovation

Commitments can thus be categorized in ways other than by the number of the members and others to which they apply. The most useful ways are as follows:

1. *Breadth by Subject*, using the definitions employed for the communiqué conclusions, including a focus/diffusion score.
2. *Money Mobilized*, as summits are also seen as global fundraisers, when the leaders collectively and competitively pledge new or newly reauthorized money for specific purposes abroad or at home. The definition of money mobilized appears below under compliance catalysts.
3. *International Legalization*. Some commitments explicitly bind the member to adhere to, revise or create international law. Here the commitment must explicitly refer to a precise international law that exists or is envisaged. This is different from subsequent action regarding international law that counts as compliance with a commitment that does not bind members to this particular instrument of implementation. All such commitments contain an international law compliance catalyst, but such a catalyst can also come from a general, rather than specific, reference to international law.
4. *Domestic Legalization*. Some commitments explicitly bind the member to adhere to, revise or create domestic law, in all or some of the members or those outside. Here the commitment must explicitly refer to a precise domestic law that exists or is envisaged. There may be grounds for adding a compliance catalyst dealing specifically with domestic law.

See commitment catalysts below.

Ambition and Significance

Because there can be so many commitments, it is useful to assess each according to ambition and significance, although doing so systematically can be very time consuming. The following considerations provide a framework:

1. *Ambition*: How far reaching is the commitment as a change from the current status quo?
2. *Timeliness*: Does the commitment address key current issues, especially those that require a rapid response?
3. *Clarity*: Is the commitment easily identifiable and measurable, especially with high levels of precision, especially a target and timetable, expressed quantitatively, with a large target and short timetable. For

example, the 2015 G7 Elmau Summit commitment to decolonize by century's end had a very big target and also a very long timetable (Abbott et al. 2000).

4. *Obligation*: The degree of binding or obligatory nature of the commitment in a political sense rather than a legal sense (Abbott et al. 2000).

The sheer number of commitments can give a useful indication of how productive a summit was on reaching agreement (creating cooperation), but it is important to know how ambitious these commitments were, both individually and overall. Work thus far on commitments tends not to deal with the degree of ambition of the commitments, treating instead each individual commitment as being of equal importance (Kokotsis 1999; Kokotsis and Daniels 1999; Juricevic 2000). To make the analytic advance to assessing the ambition of each commitment, it is important to develop a scale of level of ambition by which each individual commitment can be scored. The following are some proposed criteria that might be incorporated into such a scale.

1. No backsliding versus new forward movement
2. Targets as well as instruments are included
3. Both a target and a timetable are included, i.e., most ambitious
4. Existing international institutions are used versus creating new ones
5. Commitments relate to a new agenda or principle rather than an old agenda or principle
6. An emphasis on outcomes, rather than instruments, as measure by their initial order and numbers in the commitment text.

See “Ambition-Adjusted G7 Commitments and Compliance” below.

Ambition-Adjusted G7 Commitments and Compliance

Added by John Kirton, March 2026

Have the commitments made by G7 leaders at their annual summits been increasingly less ambitious, and has G7 members' overall compliance with those commitments risen as a result?

To start to answer this important question, this research report identifies a way to assess the ambition of G7 commitments, compares the ratio of high- to low-ambition commitments made in 1975, in 1996 and in the priority commitments in 2025, and examines members' compliance with the high- versus low-ambition commitments in 2025, based on the interim findings of the G7 Research Group's assessment of the Kananaskis Summit.

It offers three conclusions. First, the ambition of a commitment can be measured by how high or low the binding nature of its verb is. Second, there has been a decline in the level of ambition of G7 summits, from 93% highly ambitious commitments at the first summit at Rambouillet in 1975, to 51% at Lyon in 1996, to 60% of the priority commitments at the most recent summit at Kananaskis in 2025. Third, the 21 commitments made at the 1996 Lyon Summit assessed for compliance averaged 72%, but the 12 with high ambition averaged 78%, and the nine with low ambition averaged only 60%. Similarly, the 2025 priority commitments with high ambition, and thus presumably harder for member governments to implement, had high average compliance of 78%, compared to those with low ambition, which averaged only 35% compliance.

Assessing the Ambition of Commitments

An efficient, fast and reliable way to measure ambition is to categorize a commitment dichotomously as being either high or low politically binding on its members (see “Assessing the Ambition of a Commitment” below).

Here the key criterion is whether the commitment says its members will do more than before (high) or no more than before (low). Thus, the verbs of *remain* committed, *reaffirm* commitments, *reiterate* commitments, *explore* all options, or *continue*, *sustain*, *support* or *develop* a roadmap or the equivalent are low binding. In contrast, verbs promising to *promote*, *adopt*, *implement*, *build*, *take actions*, *enhance*, *align* and *dismantle* are high binding.

A secondary criterion is the strength of the specified action. Commitments to *consider*, *monitor*, *assess*, *reflect on*, *stand ready*, *prepare* or *attend* a meeting are low binding ones.

Trends in G7 Ambition from 1975 to 2025

The ambition of G7 summit commitments declined during the summit's first 51 years (see <https://www.g7.utoronto.ca/evaluations/kirton-ambition-260316.html>). In 1975 at Rambouillet, 93% of the 15 commitments were ambitious ones.

In 1996 at the Lyon Summit, 65 (51%) of the 128 commitments were ambitious, while 63 (49%) had low ambition. The 21 commitments assessed for compliance averaged 72%, but the 12 with high ambition averaged 78%, and the nine with low ambition averaged only 60%.

In 2025 at Kananaskis, only 60% of the 20 priority commitments were ambitious.

The trend therefore is generally inclining ambition, but with a small rise in the most recent year.

Assessing Ambition-Adjusted Compliance at Kananaskis 2025

At the Kananaskis Summit on June 15–17, 2025, 60% of the 20 priority commitments assessed for compliance, from the 150 commitments overall, were ambitious.

Members' interim compliance, by December 28, 2025, with those 20 commitments was 75%.

The ambition-adjusted overall interim compliance score was 61%. This was calculated by:

- a. Coding each commitment as either high or low binding (see “Assessing the Ambition of a Commitment” below): 12 (60%) had high ambition, and 8 (40%) had low ambition;
- b. Dividing the compliance score in half (i.e., by 50%) for the eight commitments with low ambition;
- c. Giving the 78% compliance average of the 12 high-ambition commitments a 60% weighting and combining them with 35% average of the 8 low-ambition ones with a 40% weighting, for a combined ambition-adjusted compliance score of 61%.

This produces an easy and adequate, if imperfect, formula for measuring the level of ambition of a summit's commitment and compliance overall.

Interpretation

1. The level of ambition of G7 commitments matters, because compliance with low-ambition commitments lowers the impact and effectiveness of G7 agreement and ensuing action, and does so to a substantial degree.
2. Perhaps paradoxically, the commitments with high ambition, which are thus presumably hard to implement, had higher average compliance of 78% than those with low ambition, which are presumably easier to implement, and had only 35% compliance.
3. The innovative novelty of the subject of the commitments appears to make no difference to compliance with those commitments. The three assessed high-ambition commitments made in 2025 on the new subject of quantum averaged compliance of 84%. Two high-ambition commitments on the largely new subject of

wildfires, averaged only 60%. And the two high-ambition commitments on the old subject of migration and refugees averaged compliance of 85%.

Assessing the Ambition of a Commitment

The ambition and significance of each commitment, and thus the overall summit set, can be assessed, although doing so systematically can be a very time-consuming task, as shown by the pioneering work of Diana Juricevic (2000). Such an assessment requires asking four questions:

1. Ambition: How far-reaching is it as a change from the current status quo?
2. Timeliness: Does it address key current issues, especially those requiring a rapid response?
3. Clarity: Is it easily identifiable and measurable, especially with high levels of precision (Abbott et al. 2000)?
4. Obligation: Is it binding or obligatory, in a political rather than a legal sense (Abbott et al. 2000)?

To make the analytic advance to assessing the ambition of each commitment, one can develop a scale of level of ambition by which each individual commitment can be scored. The following are some proposed criteria that might be incorporated into such a scale.

1. There is no backsliding versus new forward movement.
2. Instruments versus targets are included.
3. It includes both a target and a timetable.
4. It uses existing international institutions versus creating new ones.
5. It relates to a new agenda or principle rather than an existing agenda or principle.

The instrument-outcome balance of a commitment offers an easy, rapid and meaningful way to assess the importance of a commitment, especially as these two concepts were a core part of the foundational work by George von Furstenberg and Joseph Daniels (1992) on G7 summit commitments and compliance.

Such an analysis, begun by Sarah Burton (2016) on the G7 Elmau Summit in June 2015, divides each commitment into four categories, in ascending order of importance:

- a. No instrument or outcome indicated.
- b. Instrument only specified. This tells members how to act but does not demand that their actions meet or even move toward any desired outcome.
- c. Outcome (welfare target) only specified. This compels members to move toward or reach an outcome, while giving them complete freedom on how to do so. An example is the 2015 Elmau commitment to complete decarbonization of members' economies by the twenty-first century's end (which was, *inter alia*, a commitment with a specified numerical target of zero and timetable of the year 2100).
- d. Both instrument and outcome specified. This binds members on both dimensions and assumes that the summit collectively knows, with a high degree of epistemic confidence, that the specified instruments will effectively and ideally optimally produce the specific outcome.

In all cases, the specific content of the instrument and outcome is highly relevant as well.

A much more efficient, fast and reliable way of measuring ambition is to categorize a commitment dichotomously as being either high or low binding.

Here the key criterion is whether the commitment says to members will do more than before (high) or no more than before (low). Thus, the verbs of *remain* committed, *reaffirm* a commitment, *reiterate* a commitment, *explore* all options, or *continue*, *sustain*, *support*, *develop* a roadmap or the equivalent are low binding. In contrast, those promising to *promote*, *adopt*, *implement*, *build*, *take actions*, *enhance*, *align* and *dismantle* are high binding.

Here a secondary criterion is the strength of the specified action. Commitments to consider, monitor, assess, reflect on, stand ready or prepared to, or attend a meeting are low binding.

References

- Abbott, Kenneth W., et al. (2000). "The Concept of Legalization." *International Organization* 54(3): 401–20.
- Burton, Sarah (2016). "Do Ambitious G7 Commitments Secure Less Compliance?" G7 Research Group, June 3. <https://www.g7g20.utoronto.ca/comment/160603-burton.html>.
- Juricevic, Diana (2000). "Compliance with G8 Commitments: Ascertaining the Degree of Compliance with Summit Debt and International Trade Commitments for Canada and the United States, 1996-1999," G7 Research Group. <https://www.g7g20.utoronto.ca/scholar/juricevic2000/index.html>.
- von Furstenberg, George M. and Joseph P. Daniels (1992). *Economic Summit Declarations, 1975–1989: Examining the Written Record of International Cooperation*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Instrument/Outcome Balance

A simple, easy way to assess the ambition of the commitment is through the instrument/outcome balance. A commitment is judged to be increasingly ambitious if it contains:

1. An *instrument only*, defined as a measure under the member government's direct control, i.e., the first-order compliance of Kokotsis 1999 and von Furstenberg and Daniels before (e.g., new budget, program, personnel assigned). In this case a government is bound to do something under its direct control but not bound to do (enough of it or other things) to reach a specified goal, i.e., an identified welfare outcome.
2. An *outcome only*, identifying the welfare outcome sought that lies beyond the member government's direct control (e.g., reducing inflation, raising growth by 2% above trend), i.e., the welfare outcome of von Furstenberg and Daniels. Such commitments tell the government the goal but not how to reach it, allowing each member to do so differently, according to national circumstances. Reaching the goal could depend on the behaviour of outside actors, which may be inspired by the collective G7/G20/BRICS commitment itself or the members' behaviour, even though they are not controlled by it.
3. An *instrument and outcome*, obliging the member to use a specified instrument to reach a specified outcome. The member is thus double bound.

Commitments can take the form of an extended causal chain, saying "we will do this, in order to do that, in order to do or get something else," etc. This does not automatically mean that both an instrument and outcome is included. For example, if members commit to raising growth 2% above trend in order to create more jobs and bring democracy and peace, the causal chain consists entirely of outcomes, i.e., things not under the member governments' direct control. The key test of the difference between instrument and outcome is the direct control of the committing government. For example, if G20 members commit to increasing contributions to the Financial Stability Board (FSB) so that it can engage in accountability reviews, because the FSB as an international organization is directly control by G20 members, it is still an instrument.

A more complex calculation of ambition is the added total or ratio of specified instrument (by number) to specified outcomes (by number). However, the trend in recent years toward disaggregating commitments into discrete, one-only instrument/outcome might make this an unreliable measure.

Iteration/Innovation

One dimension of a commitment is its iteration, referring to how often and how long it has been repeated in the past or will be in the future. The second and opposite category is “innovation” defined as a commitment that is new and appears for the first time. Each summit’s commitments can be coded for the balance between iterated and innovative ones. It can then be seen if the iterated or the innovative ones are complied with more.

Several scholars, notably Nicholas Bayne, suggest that the summit succeeds, including on compliance, through iteration, because leaders stick with commitments on difficult problems that will take longer than one year to solve and implement.

Iteration can be either:

- a) *Issue/Subject Specific*: Is a commitment’s subject (e.g., forests) repeated in similar or identical fashion in a commitment [or principle or conclusion] from a previous or subsequent year, or
- b) *General*: Is the broader issue/subject in which a commitment’s subject resides (e.g., within climate change) repeated in a similar or identical commitment [or principle or conclusion] in a previous or subsequent year?

Iteration, which can be used as a cause of compliance, can be measured at both the specific and general level as follows:

- Was there a commitment on the same subject/issue area the previous year?
- How many such commitments were there in the previous year?
- How many previous years, continuously or since the summit’s start, had such commitments?
- How many of the previous five years had such a commitment?
- What is the total number of such commitments for the period used?

Assessing Compliance Catalysts

For analytical purposes, it is also useful to assess each commitment for the number and type of compliance catalysts it contains. Compliance catalysts are words, phrases or factors that are embedded in and guide a commitment. They provide instructions on how to implement, proceed or comply with the commitment. As of February 28, 2011, more than 20 such “compliance catalysts” have been identified. Several different compliance catalysts can appear within a commitment (Kirton 2006; Kirton et al. 2007).

Definitions of Catalysts

Total Catalysts: The total number of compliance catalysts in the commitment.

Priority Placement: A commitment highlighted in the preamble or stated in the chair’s summary is given priority placement. Leaders can issue several collective documents, only one of which might be an overall summary or statement of purpose; this document becomes the equivalent of the preamble in a single document.

Past Reference to Summit: This refers to commitments that mention past summits of the same plurilateral summit institution. They are also considered iterations.

An example is “just like at the G8 Evian Summit, we stress... (from a more recent summit).”

Past Reference to Ministerial: This refers to commitments that mention past ministerial meetings. See “Past Reference to Summit.”

Targets: A commitment refers to a set goal, percentage or numerical allocation. A target does not include time-based targets, which are considered timetables. It does include statements to fully implement a defined initiative because “fully” can be translated as 100%.

Example of an inclusion: “a commitment to ‘full implementation’ of a specific initiative.”

Example of an exclusion: The commitment does not include time targets, such as 2020 or “next year” and does not include a target to achieve something generally, as in “we will develop more efficient and lower-emitting vehicles” or “all human rights” as that number is unknown.

Examples of targets: “we will cut in half”; “we will increase by 75%”; “we are committed to fully implementing the HIPC initiative” (the HIPC Initiative can be translated into a quantitative expression of what is required, as in the dollar amount of debt to be relieved).

Timetables – One Year or Less: The commitment refers to a time target, i.e., deadline. This is a short-term deadline. Inclusions: phrases such as “within a year,” “by the next summit.”

Timetables – Multi-year: A multi-year timetable is more than one year. Examples are “by 2030,” a specified year, and references to words and phrases such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which include well-known time targets (i.e., 2030).

A commitment with a multi-year target requires a formula in the general interpretive guidelines to determine action that can be completed within the compliance-monitoring period. The formula is calculated by determining the amount of action required by the end of the multi-year period divided by the number of years between the summit that made the commitment and the deadline. A member that completes that action within the monitoring period achieves full compliance.

For example, if a commitment made in 2020 commits members to “mobilize \$100 billion in climate finance by 2025,” during the compliance monitoring period the member must raise its share of the \$20 billion, that is one fifth of the total amount, assuming it will raise the same amount for the subsequent four years. This equal arithmetic division assumes that members are not expected to do everything with the first year, or do nothing until the last year, and still receive full compliance for the years in which they do nothing or not enough of their fair share.

Unless otherwise indicated in the commitment, a member’s fair share for monetary commitments is relative to the percentage of their gross domestic product to the G7/G20/BRICS GDP as a whole. For example in the G7, the US – with the highest GDP – is expected to produce 10 times more than Canada, the member with the lowest GDP.

Self-monitoring: The plurilateral summit institution commits to monitoring its actions in implementing the commitment. It could pledge to “monitor,” or provide a report or follow up. It could specify self-accountability mechanisms, but general references to surveillance or collection of data on a specific issue do not count.

Remit Mandates: The commitment includes a reference to a future assessment of progress made by the leaders on that commitment, most often at a future summit. An example is “We will review progress on our action plan at our next summit.”

Money Mobilized: A commitment refers to funds raised or a set dollar or monetary value. This definition has been consistently used since Kirton’s 2006 article in *Open Economies Review*. It is also money mobilized when there is a commitment for the G7/G20/BRICS to “increase financial support” for a specific issue.

It includes commitments to replenish funds and provide monetary aid, mobilizing insurance (i.e. commitment 2015-194).

It excludes references to debt relief and debt cancellation unless they specify a dollar amount to be provided to meet a shortfall as in G8 commitment 2002-90: a G7/8 direction to another international institution to devote more of its money to a specific cause, e.g., 2007-229 the Global Fund to HIV/AIDS; general references to providing/increasing resources.

It also excludes general references to investment.

Specified Agents: A commitment refers to a specific agent through which it will work, or work with, for implementation. The agent could be named specifically or could refer to a category, such as multilateral development banks. A member or country, if named, could also be an agent, e.g. “We are also committed to strengthen international cooperation to examine, by means of an international conference hosted by the UK, the global economy of illegal drugs.” An agent can also be a specified initiative, for example the HIPC Initiative or the Muskoka Initiative.

It excludes general references to the private sector, civil society or international institutions generically.

It excludes to “convention,” which is an international law catalyst.

It excludes general references to working with (as opposed to through) a general class of countries, such as developing countries.

Specified agents include the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis or Malaria, the International Fund for Agriculture and Development, and so on.

Institutional Body: A commitment refers to an institution that was created by the summit-level body to deal with the particular subject, such as the Gleneagles Dialogue on Climate Change or the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. It includes bodies created at the summit in question.

Core International Organization: The commitment refers by name to a separate international organization that has a focus on the specific issue or in relation to implementing an initiative under its control. Each subject typically has only one core international organization, i.e., the World Trade Organization (WTO) for trade, World Health Organization for health, World Bank for development. Not all subjects have a core international organization. References to regional or international organizations focused on other issues are not core international organizations.

It excludes references to international organizations when they are not institutional references. For example, a reference to WTO-resistant measures refers to international law, not to the WTO as an institution.

It excludes references to conferences or meetings mounted by an international organization, especially when the organizing institution is not noted by name, as in Monterrey Consensus on Financing for Development (G8 2002-10).

Another example of an exclusion is the 2009 Copenhagen Climate Change Conference as a reference to a core international organization for a climate commitment (G8 2011-52), because it refers to the conference and not to the core international organization, namely UN Climate (the secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change).

[[up to here]]

The concept of international organization used here is not the same as the concept of multilateral organization used in the causal variable used in multilateral organizational failure. Thus a core international organization need not be a fully multilateral one nor an actual organization, nor a formal member of the UN galaxy. Although the core of the IO is defined in the first instance by the earliest date of creation and its formal affiliation with the UN and its organizational strength. There can only be one core IO for each issue area or issue.

- Core IO by Issue Area:
Macroeconomic policy: IMF
Development: World Bank (not UNDP)
Labour and employment: ILO
Health: WHO
Civil aviation: ICAO
Food and agriculture: FAO (not IFAD, WFP)
Security: UNSC
Crime and corruption: INTERPOL, non-UN
Terrorism: FATF (plurilateral)
Refugees and migration: UNHCR (not IOM)
Trade: WTO

- Example: 2017-40 [...] WTO inconsistent is a descriptor

Other International Organization: when a commitment refers to a separate international organization (as an organization) that is *not* the core international organization for the issue in the commitment at hand.

- Exclusions: general references to institutions such as financial institutions
- Example(s): if the commitment is in the area of health, an “other international organization” would include the references to the World Bank, International Monetary Fund or Financial Stability Board.

Regional Organization: When a commitment refers to a regional organization.

- Exclusions: It does not include regional organizations in the general sense, e.g., G8 2002-51, Supporting regional organizations in developing tools to facilitate peer-review processes.
- Example(s): such as the African Union, NEPAD or the European Union.

International Law: International law includes both general references to international law and references to specific legal instruments (Kyoto, for example). Codified law, and customary law, are included.

- Inclusions: calls for the implementation or development of specific international legal instruments, e.g. Conventions per G8 1998-52; as of 2016: commitments to ratify or otherwise commit to implement international agreements including trade agreements (such as the Trade Facilitation Agreement and the Environmental Goods Agreement)
- Exclusions: UN Resolution, UN Action Plan, UN Strategy
- Example(s): charters, conventions, treaties, protocols, declarations, agreements, frameworks, guidelines, internationally recognized principles or standards.

Ministers: Commitment refers to a group of ministers.

- Example(s): “we ask our energy ministers to”

International Organization Accountability Request: Refers to commitments that ask international organizations to monitor the groups’ compliance with the commitment.

- Exclusions: international organizational surveillance
- Example(s): “we ask the WTO to monitor our compliance with this commitment.”

Civil Society: Commitments that make general reference to working with civil society.

- Inclusions: nongovernmental organizations, academia, religious leaders
- Exclusions: private sector
- Example(s)

Private Sector: Commitments that make general reference to working with the private sector, public-private partnerships, business (including the pharmaceutical industry) or other for profit actors.

- Inclusions: private sector, industry, company
- Exclusions: references to markets
- Example(s)

Country or Regional Specification: Commitments that make references to working with or in a particular country or region, such as Africa.

- Inclusions: supporting regional, or country-specific initiatives, e.g., African Peer Review Mechanism
- Exclusions: broad references to developed or developing countries, references to classes of countries example, countries in conflict or heavily indebted poor countries (HIPC)
- Example(s)

Surveillance: The commitment requests for the action or issue to be monitored in order to collect data

- Inclusions
- Exclusions: self-monitoring
- Example(s)

International Organization Surveillance: the commitment requests a specific international organization to monitor the issue, not the implementation of the commitment but to provide data collection in a specific area

- Inclusions: Monitor the issue
- Exclusions: International Organization Accountability Ask, principles, actions
- Example(s)

Binding Level of Commitment Verb (Added by John Kirton, September 5, 2020)

- *High Binding Commitment Verbs:* will, commit, are committed to [achieve], are committed to support, committed to promote, are determined to ensure, will promote, will support, affirm
- *Low Binding Commitment Verbs:* agree, reiterate, reaffirm, remain collectively committed, reemphasize, stand ready, support, help, stress our support, recognize

Measuring Compliance

Compliance catalysts are coded as either a 0 or a 1. They are either present or they are not. If they are in the commitment repeated times, there are still coded as 1 (i.e., present), not multiple times.

Catalysts should be coded with the broader context of the commitment in mind; therefore, the coder needs to read the commitment in its broader context, which may include the surrounding sentences, paragraphs or documents. A catalyst that applies to a particular commitment may lay outside of the specific commitment text.

Chapter 3: Priority Commitments for Compliance Assessments

Priority commitments are commitments that are determined a priority in the sense that they together best capture what the summit as a whole did on the decision-making dimension of its global governance. They are therefore measured for compliance during the subsequent year. Due to the vast number of commitments that appear in a communiqué, it is impossible to measure every commitment for compliance. Therefore, it is important to be able to choose commitments that best capture the essence of the summit communiqué and do so in a reasonably representative way. The G7 and 8 Research Group, G20 Research Group and BRICS Research Group determine how many commitments it will be able to measure for the upcoming year (based on the number individuals available as compliance assessors, access to reliable information and other available resources). Once this number has been determined, a number of interested parties, including the appropriate research group's executive, student executive and compliance chairs and their colleagues at partner institutions, select and rank commitments which they believe are a priority from the standpoint of their particular purposes for the year's summit overall. Other parties such as nongovernmental organizations might be invited to participate.

The following provides guidelines for how to choose priority commitments on a primary, secondary and tertiary basis. Other considerations may also be applied, especially in relation to civil society and government groups who may tend to choose commitments that reflect their own interests. These guidelines cover both the composite set of priority commitments selected and the individual commitments that make them up.

Choosing Priority Commitments

Primary Selection Criteria

Priority commitments should be chosen according to the following criteria:

Importance. Their importance in the summit, the G7/G8/G20/BRICS and the world at large.

Priority Themes. At least two commitments should be chosen from each of the priority themes of the summit being assessed.

Comprehensiveness. Priority commitments should collectively be comprehensive. They should come from each of the economic, social/sustainability and political-security domains.

Core. At least one should come from each part of the traditional, core, built-in agenda (i.e., finance, macroeconomics, microeconomics, trade, development, environment/climate change, energy, crime and drugs, terrorism, arms control and proliferation, regional security, international institutional reform).

Balance. There should be balance amongst the priority commitments.

Separate Documents. At least one should come from each of the separate documents issued at the summit (that contain commitments).

Subject Representativeness. The number of priority commitments selected from each document should roughly reflect the percentage of overall commitments from that document at the summit as a whole. For example, if 20% of the commitments come from the growth and development document, then approximately 20% of the priority commitments should come from that same document.

Temporal Inclusiveness. Priority commitments should include those that reflect current crises as well as preventive measures and long-term change.

Country Class. Priority commitments should include commitments that affect the members, non-members and the world as a whole.

Domestic Intrusiveness Outside. For the G7/8 at least one priority commitment should reflect domestic intrusiveness within distant countries such as Kosovo, Sudan, Zimbabwe or Iran.

Level of Analysis. There should be a range of levels reflected amongst the priority commitments of analysis from individual country action to the structure of global governance as a whole.

Preparatory Process. They should take into account the preparatory process of the summit.

Past Similarity. They should take into account past commitments, so that comparisons and extended compliance can be monitored (see Appendix J).

Future Themes. They should also consider the priority themes for next year's summit, when they have already been announced by the host for that year.

Analytic Sensitivity. They should take into consideration current scientific research, such as including many of the A. compliance catalysts mentioned in the previous section. B. accountability measures, and C. ambitiousness scales defined by instrument/outcome/both cells.

Secondary Selection Criteria

Secondary selection criteria are to be taken into consideration only after primary selection criteria have been applied.

Member Subsets. G20 commitments can be chosen that apply to various subsets of countries within the group. For example, commitments that apply to advanced, emerging and surplus economies should all be considered, so that compliance comparisons can be made and studied.

Collective Compliance. Individual as well as collective compliance should be considered.

Annual Compliance. The ability to commit to at least some measurable degree and ideally fully to the commitment within a year or the actual compliance period can and should be considered to simplify the compliance analysis.

Information Availability. Availability of reliable information can be considered as it assists in the accuracy of the compliance report.

Interpretive Guidelines. Commitments should be selected for which interpretive guidelines already exist or can be constructed easily.

Tertiary Selection Criteria

Once primary and secondary selection criteria have been applied for primary commitment selection, tertiary selection criteria may also be applied. These include:

- significance as identified by scientific teams in the host country,
- significance as identified by experts in the host country, and
- significance as identified by relevant ministries and research group team members in the host country.

Chapter 4: Summit Compliance with Commitments

Given the definition of a commitment, what constitutes summit compliance?

The Concept of Compliance (Implementation, Inferred Causality)

First-Order Compliance

First-order compliance or implementation is national government action geared towards the domestic and/or international action the necessary verbal, participatory, budgetary, regulatory, administrative, institutional, legislative or even constitutional actions designed to execute summit commitments. National governments alter their own behaviour and that of their societies and outsiders, in order to reach summit-specified welfare targets.

“Government” action begins with that taken by the executive branch and its civil service, then the legislature that the executive branch controls, then the central bank, which controls monetary policy and often financial regulations and is responsive to executive branch preferences/priorities and must act to what the fiscal policy of the executive branch is. Other independent agencies and crown corporations are similarly included, if their formal independence is affected in a similar way.

If the compliant action is not taken at the federal level but at the state or provincial level it can still count towards compliance. This is based on the rational that federal governments should not make commitments unless they have the support from their states/provinces.

Compliance requires conscious new or altered effort by national governments in the post-summit period. Summit members must actively and consciously endeavour to implement the provisions contained in communiqués. Should a government arrive at fulfilling one of its summit commitments by chance, this could constitute compliance as strict causality between the summit commitment and compliant action is not required.

Compliance is measured according to governmental actions designed to modify existing instruments within the executive branch to, or that accommodate the commitments reached. Compliance therefore requires new or altered efforts by national governments where leaders very actively and consciously plan to implement their summit commitments. These actions should be deliberate. A commitment is fully complied with if a member succeeds in achieving the specific goal set out in the commitment. However, there can still be varying degrees of compliance in the absence of a complete fulfillment of the commitment.

Compliance is therefore assessed according to the following scale, from the least to the most compliance consistent implementing behaviour. This scale also measure the strength of the implementing ie compliance-consistent action.

Official Reaffirmation and Remembrance

Reaffirmation of a summit commitment is made by individuals working in an official capacity. This verbal or documented behaviour may occur either at the national or international context. The government demonstrates its intention to fulfill a commitment by stating its plans to include the commitment in the national agenda. Especially by publicly referring to a commitment, through internal policy debates, speeches or press releases, (and thus making a causal connection) a leader, minister or officials legitimizes the commitment. Such evidence of remembrance indicates that officials are still mindful of the commitment. A reaffirmation of a commitment represents moral suasion to inside and outside officials as well as the public.

Internal Bureaucratic Review and Representation

The earlier remembrance and reaffirmation of the commitment can be backed by a review — a systematic monitoring mechanism that includes processes such as public consultation. A national government internally reviews the commitment through a formal policy review or the formation of a task force or working group. Personnel are assigned to these tasks and are given new negotiating mandates. These persons are charged with

studying and implementing the commitment. Any new diplomatic initiatives required to reach the welfare target are launched.

Budgetary and Resource Allocations Made or Changed

A national government allocates, or diverts from another use, a notable sum of its own money for the purpose of achieving the commitment. Further alterations are made with regard to the distribution of money and other resources to international organizations from the national government.

New or Altered Programs, Regulations or Legislation

Broader changes are made in fiscal and monetary policy, to the extent that governments control the latter. International negotiating positions are changed. Programs, necessary for the implementation of the commitment are introduced or altered. Recommendations are made for increased research and development projects.

Depth of Compliance Action (added by John Kirton, April 21, 2020)

A more detailed scale of the depth or degree of compliant actions is presented below.

First-order compliance consists of actions that all members Federal/national governments, through their executive, legislative and the regulatory and judicial bodies that the control, can take to implement their summit commitments. These actions are arranged from least (shallow) to most (greatest depth) on each of the two following scales. While compliant action need not be explicitly and consciously or uniquely or solely caused by the one summit commitment, evidence that it is causally related to the summit commitment itself strengthens the weight any action at any level on the scale.

A. Largely Domestic Actions

1. Verbal Reference Reaffirmation

- e. Verbal reference to the subject/components of the commitment, or explicitly to the commitment or the institution that made it
- f. by an official, minister, or the leader
- g. in an informal remark or news conference response, a prepared speech, in the national policy address

2. Assigned Follow-up. Assignment of the responsibility for compliant consistent action to a specified national official to implement

3. Attendance at a meeting, inclusion in an institution. This includes that of the leader at a subsequent summit, which leaders can attend (+1 for full compliance), send their deputy (prime minister or vice president) in their place (0 compliance for partial), or send a lower level official or not attend at all (-1 for no compliance). The same applies to a minister's attendance at subsequent ministerial meetings. It should apply to working group officials meeting, if the data exists.

4. Money Allocated. Assignment of budgetary resources, changing fiscal or monetary policy.

5. Personnel Allocated. Assignment of personnel, creation of a new office, of varying sizes and strength and mandates, up to the creation of a new department.

6. Program. Expansion of an existing program, launch of a new program.

7. Domestic Legalization. Changes in regulations, legislation, or the constitution, including new federal-subfederal jurisdictional agreements.

8. Cabinet Reconfiguration. Change in cabinet appointments/composition (eg gender equality one).

9. *Enforcement* through policy or judicial action, results (fines, jail time eg bankers in 2008).

B. Largely International Actions

B1. International Information Sharing.

B2. International Legalization: sponsoring, signing or ratifying a relevant or the commitment-specified international treaty.

B3. International Organization: Joining, participating, voting, financing, sending personnel, securing board seats and executive positions, changing its mission, charter (or R2P).

B4. International Financial Support directly or through international institutions.

B5. Border Openings/Closings to people, goods, services, eg sanctions, immigration-refugees.

B6. Policy-Military Actions.

Summit or Ministerial Visits

To develop this list, one should:

- h. Review past compliance assessments to identify how many of the reported implementing actions are covered by each of the above, if the scoring metric and scores are consistent with this scale (when the commitment includes depth) and which other actions should be added and where to the scale.
- i. Check against Joe Daniels (1993 Garland) and Ella Kokotsis (1999 Routledge) books.
- j. Add POL 312Y Distribution of Resources framework

Over-implementation

Over-implementation occurs when a member surpasses the established welfare target. This may be desirable if over-implementation compensates for the failures of other members (for example, one country decreasing its carbon dioxide emissions by 10% instead of 5% as outlined in the communiqué will benefit others). However, over-implementation is not always advantageous as it can produce a runaway syndrome.

Too Much Evidence (added by John Kirton December 31, 2024)

If there is too much evidence for a member, eg 36 compliance-consistent actions for the US, there is no need to report all. But one must do the following:

1. Once you have reports in chronological order, enough of the closest compliance consistent actions (especially those with a clear causal link to the G7/20 summit commitment) from throughout the compliance period to have the member qualify for full compliance, at a minimum of about eight, you can stop, but add a footnote saying there are more such actions.
2. For negative compliance, list all the sources you have consulted to find no compliant-consistent actions, and report the antithetical ones the member may have taken.
3. For partial compliance, report all those that get the member up to the thresholds, and then add those from the second point above.

Lack of Evidence

There are instances when due to a lack of information the compliance analyst cannot conclude whether the member was in full, partial or negative compliance with the commitment. A lack of evidence happens when all options for research have been exhausted and no relevant information to support or reject compliance has been found. In this case, in place of the country specific analysis the research analyst should report all of the sources

where they searched for information. This conveys to the reader that all sources were exhausted and still no evidence was found. In this case, the lack of evidence results in a score of negative compliance (−1).

Although most communiqués contain several commitments across a wide range of issues, in order to make the compliance studies more manageable, the reports are limited to one (or, at the most, two) “core” commitments for each of the selected issue areas. Core commitments are determined according to three criteria:

1. ambition — how far-reaching is the commitment?
2. timeliness — does the commitment address current or “hot” issues?
3. clarity — is the commitment easily identifiable and measurable?

Other Order Compliance

In addition to first order compliance, which consists of actions that members’ governments take to comply with their commitments, there are several other orders of compliance.

Second-order compliance is spontaneous compliant behaviour that comes from non-governmental actors in response to a commitment that G7/G8/G20/BRICS leaders have made.

Third-order compliance is the way the compliant behaviour by both helps or harms the intendant of the results or the outcomes that leaders intend and value.

Fourth-order compliance is the way in which compliant behaviour with one commitment synergistically supports, rather than contradicts, compromises or cancels, compliance with commitments in closely related or other fields. For example, does compliance with all 22 development commitments made at the G20 Seoul Summit help or harm intended and desired outcomes on employment and synergistically help or harm compliance with the commitments directly related to employment in the communiqué (Kirton, Bracht and Rasmussen 2012).

Commitments Applying Differentially to Each Member or Subsets

So commitments explicitly apply only to a subset of the members, either by category (eg “advanced economies”) or by name (eg “United States”). Yet because they are issued collectively, the initial presumption is that all members should comply, and their compliance be assessed, even if they are not so named. Those not named are expected to act in a supportive way, by taking actions that help or do not harm the committed behaviour on the part of those named. For example, a commitment “to apply the necessary political will to reach a TTIP agreement by early as this year” (G8 2016-66) requires direct action on the part of those TTIP actors directly negotiating TTIP (ie the US, EU, and Germany, France, UK and Italy within the EU) but also supportive action by Canada (which is simultaneously seeking ratification of its own CETA with the EU though to be a model and catalyst for the TTIP one) and Japan, which is negotiating its own TTIP-like bilateral deal with the EU). Canada, Japan and the EU are also negotiating the TPP, which some see as a competitor to TTIP.

The Case of the European Union

[added by John Kirton, May 29, 2020, December 31, 2024] The European Union, as a member of both the G7 and the G20, is a special case, in that it is a semi-sovereign actor with varying degrees of supranational authority over its member states for each of the subject that summits make commitments on. Even on subjects where the EU has formal legal authority over its members, they usually have considerable autonomy in the degree to which they comply with the specific commitments a summit makes. Thus the compliance of each of the EU members (Germany, France, Italy and the United Kingdom before 2020) must be separately assessed. The reasons are elaborated below. They are focused on trade but the logic applies to other subjects, such as exchange rate policy and monetary policy as well.

Almost all G7 and G20 trade commitments can be assessed for compliance by members on a nationally differentiated basis (ie individually for Germany, France, Italy and before 2020 for the UK too) as well as for the EU as a whole. This is for the following reasons.

1. The Political, SOFT Law G7/G20. The G7 and G20 summits a not formal, legal “hard law,” international institutions but informal, political, soft law ones. Formal legal competence thus matters far less than political competence and capacity.

2. Participation in G7 Trade Negotiations. When G7/G20 trade commitments are negotiated and made (by sherpas, ministers and leaders), the representative of Germany, France and Italy do not leave the room, saying we have no legal competence and thus no interest, influence or relevance in regard to what the resulting trade commitment is. They do not a priori give the EU a “blank check” to do whatever it wants. This suggests that they do have an individual interest and capacity in compliance with the commitments that results, as they wish to craft the commitments in a way that affects the compliance by others and themselves that it is likely to produce. The one exception may be the old G7 Trade Ministers Quadrilateral of the US, Japan, Canada and the EU, but not Germany, France, Italy and the UK in their own right. But it disappeared long ago, and even when it operated, the EU member countries exercised individual influence from different positions behind the scenes (Ted Cohn). In the G20 trade ministers forum, the latter four countries have always been involved. Moreover, although the G7 and G20 have long has “subset” commitments that explicitly bind only some member states, seldom if ever has a G7/G20 trade commitment explicitly said in a communique that it is not agreed to by Germany, France and Italy, on the grounds that they have no legal competence so to do. Rather, they politically bind themselves to these trade commitment sin the same way that the US, Japan and Canada do.

3. Influence Inside the EU. Inside the EU institutions, members’ national governments, especially the most powerful ones of Germany, France and Italy have considerable influence in what the legally supranational bodies. They do so in regard to what G7 commitments are made and in EU compliance with them. They do not usually a priori automatically agree among themselves and with the formally supranational EU representatives. How they individually act within the EU is often highly relevant to compliance with a G7/G20 trade commitment and can thus be individually assessed.

4. Treaty Ratification. Even on a apparently high legal component of the G7/G20 trade agenda such as treaty ratification, individual members back home in their own countries have the decisive role, as the case of CETA ratification shows. Some members ratified and some did not. Those that did, do so at different times. Indeed, even subnational governments such as Belgium’s Wallonia, had an autonomous politically relevant role.

5. Aid for Trade. The EU’s individual member government retain national aid budgets and spend allocate them as they individually wish. G7/G20 aid for trade commitments are thus complied with differentially by the EU’s member states.

6. Export Credits. The same is true for export credits, including “credite mixe.”

7. Subsidies. The fiscal power of EU members’ national governments is routinely used in ways that could constitute or be considered to be trade subsidies — in agriculture, energy, or many other fields.

8. State-Owned Enterprises. Individual EU member governments own or influence in various degrees many state owned enterprises which engage in international trade (ie export and import) and in the related field of international investment, as do public investment funds. The EU itself has few if any state-owned enterprises of its own

9. Trade Promotion. Officials in EU member governments help their countries’ firms in many different ways, both at home and abroad.

10. Environmental, Labour, Gender, LBGTQ and Health Trade Provisions,

11. Regulatory Standards. Starting with sanitary and phyto-sanitary standards are in practice at least implemented by members states, which do so in different ways and to different degrees (depending on bureaucratic capacity)

12. Speech Acts. Speech acts are relevant for compliance. National leaders, in their speech acts in their national policy address, at Davos, or anywhere in public can chose to speak on trade or not, on particular trade issues and advance different positions or principles there. They do not always (or even usually?) simply parrot the single Brussels-produced party line.

Conclusion

Assessing compliance on individual EU members' compliance with G7/G20 trade commitments may well take more effort than doing so for non-EU members, in that one may have to look inside the EU institutions to see what these countries are doing there. But this is often true for other countries and on other issues too (eg did the US act inside the WTO on WTO reform). In short, EU members do individually and differentially comply with the G7/G20 commitments their leaders, in ways that are publicly observable and thus measurable by G7RG and G20RG compliance analysis. It cannot be assumed, a priority, that the formal legal competence of the EU for "trade" means that this cannot or does not take place.

Question (Added December 31, 2024)

How does one assess the EU's compliance if the EU member countries' compliance varies OR if some individual EU member states do not align themselves to EU's compliance? For example, if the EU adopted some directives, but some member states have not yet transposed these into their national law, what would be EU's compliance in this case? And if, in addition, the EU takes legal actions against countries that haven't fully adopted these directives?

Answers:

4. EU compliance actions start with those which are within the exclusive competence of, and are taken, by the EU institutions, ie its Commission, Parliament, European Court of Justice (ECJ), Euratom, the European Space Agency (ESA) etc.
5. EU directives not adopted into, and by, most of the four EU G7 members national law is partial EU compliance, but if the EU takes legal sanctions against most of these members, then that becomes full compliance for the EU.

References

Cohn, Theodore (2002), *Governing Global Trade: International institutions in conflict and convergence*, (Ashgate: Aldershot).

Larionova, Marina, ed. (2012), *The European Union in the G8: Promoting Consensus and Concerted Actions for Global Public Goods*, (Ashgate: Farnham).

See also works by Jan Wouters

From Compliance to Impact

The delivery of summit decisions, as recorded in these compliance scores, provide the essential foundation for proceeding to assess the subsequent dimensions of summit performance, including distinctive mission done and ultimately deaths delayed. This extended analysis can begin by identifying the potential impact of the summit by multiplying each members' compliance score (overall and by issues) with its relative capability or power in the world. Capability is measured by a members GDP or GNI, at current exchange rates, converted into US dollars. As G20 members possess over 80% of the world's GDP/GDI, this compliance times capability formula well indicates how much impact the delivery of their decisions will have in the world.

The following table, on G20 members' two-month compliance with their 11 priority decisions at the March 26, 2020, emergency summit, shows how this can be compiled.

Table 1: G20 Members Compliance and Relative Capability ²

Member (2020 compliance)	Compliance Average		GDP in 2019 (USD millions)	Purchasing Power Parity PPP (millions)	Compliance X GDP
Germany	+0.90	95%	3,845,630.03 m	4,514,794.31	4,289,054
Australia	+0.82	91%	1,392,680.59 m	1,275,026.60	1,267,338
Canada			1,736,425.63 m	1,852,669.16	1,580,146
Japan			5,081,769.54 m	5,247,580.84	4,624,409
European Union	+0.73	86%	15,592,795.17 m	19,814,119.62	13,409,803
France	+0.70	85%	2,715,518.27 m	3,110,915.15	2,308,190
Italy	+0.60	80%	2,001,244.39 m	2,585,936.45	2,068,748
Korea	+0.55	77%	1,642,383.22 m	2,046,766.34	1,264,634
China	+0.45	73%	14,342,902.84 m	21,414,903.68	10,470,318
United Kingdom			2,827,113.18	3,114,857.83	2,367,291
Saudi Arabia			792,966.84 m	1,643,080.03	578,865
Brazil	+0.27	64%	1,839,758.04 m	3,131,944.31	1,177,445
South Africa			351,431.65 m	747,577.38	224,915
Argentina	+0.18	59%	449,663.34 m	1,036,721.13	287,784
United States			21,427,700.00 m	20,544,343.46	12,642,343
Indonesia			1,118,190.78 m	3,117,334.24	659,732
Turkey			754,411.71 m	2,316,406.55	445,102
India	+0.09	55%	2,875,142.31 m	9,058,691.69	1,696,341
Russia			1,699,876.58 m	4,192,936.67	934,931
Mexico	0.00	50%	1,238,286.72 m	2,573,847.60	619,143
Average/Total	+0.44	72%			

Compiled by Mary Zelenova, Alissa Wang and John Kirton, August 7, 2020

² The World Bank, GDP (current US\$) https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=DE-AU-CA-JP-FR-IT-KR-CN-GB-SA-BR-ZA-AR-US-ID-TR-IN-RU-MX-EU&most_recent_value_desc=false

The World Bank, GDP, PPP https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.PP.CD?locations=DE-AU-CA-JP-FR-IT-KR-CN-GB-SA-BR-ZA-AR-US-ID-TR-IN-RU-MX-EU&most_recent_value_desc=false

Chapter 5: Compliance Measurement

How do we measure compliance? The compliance studies build on the methodology first developed by George von Furstenberg and Joseph Daniels in *The Meaning and Reliability of Economic Summit Undertakings, 1975–1989* and essentially follow a three-level measurement process:

1. Full or nearly full compliance with a commitment is assigned a score of +1.
2. A score of –1 indicates complete or nearly complete failure to implement a commitment.
3. An “inability to commit” or a “work in progress” is given a score of 0.

An “inability to commit” refers to factors outside of the executive branch that impede implementation. A “work in progress” refers to an initiative that has been launched by a government but has not yet been completed by the time of the next summit, and whose results therefore cannot be judged.

Time Frame

Commitments are assessed from the conclusion of one summit to the beginning of the next — this timeframe usually amounts to approximately one year. This is because commitments in the leaders’ documents are usually made on an annual basis, the span of approximately one full year is used to assess whether compliance has in fact occurred. Some commitments may be reiterated — which means they were made at previous Summits but have not yet been completed because one year did not allow enough time for their implementation. If the leaders reiterate their commitments, they are still counted as distinct commitments and hence measured.

G20 commitments are also assessed from the conclusion of one summit to the beginning of the next. In the second and third years of the G20 summit, the leaders met twice a year. Since 2011, they have met once a year, sometimes more than 12 months apart. The frequency summits has varied due to the global financial crisis and the increased necessity of cooperation.

G20 communiqués outline specific as well as general timeframes for implementation. Generally speaking, the assessment is based on a summit-to-summit timeframe. To reiterate, if there is no specific reference made to a past/future date, it should be interpreted as to mean since the last/at the next summit. In certain instances, as at Washington in November 2008, the G20 has identified specific timeframes of short term, medium term and long term. Each is defined as follows: short term is measured from summit to summit; “medium term” is from the summit cycle until five years; and long term is any commitment with a delivery date of over five years. As with the G8, some commitments may be reiterated. If the leaders reiterate their commitments, those commitments are still counted as distinct and hence measured.

Currency

When reporting currency, if it is not outlined in the guidelines it should be in constant US dollars for the most recent year.

Scoring

Compliance is measured on a three-point scale, where each member is awarded a –1, 0 or +1 for each commitment. Thus when average scores for each commitment and member are being calculated, they can range between –1 and +1.³

The following is an example of how compliance should be reported for an individual commitment:

³ Scores should be reported in decimal form. They are sometimes converted to percentages for public release.

	Lack of Compliance	Work in Progress	Full Compliance
Canada			+1
France			+1
Germany			+1
Italy	-1		
Japan			+1
Russia		0	
United Kingdom			+1
United States			+1
European Union			+1
Average	+0.67		

Scores as Percentages

Because the -1 to +1 scale is not familiar to many, it can be helpful to translate this scale into a percentage. This can be done by adding +1 to any score, dividing it by 2 and multiplying it by 100.

Example 1: The score of +0.67 equals 83.5%

$$0.67 + 1.00 = 1.67 \div 2.00 = 0.835 \times 100 = 83.5\%$$

Score	Percentage
-1.00	0%
-0.50	25%
0	50%
+0.50	75%
+1.00	100%

Example 2: The score of -0.33 equals 33.5%

$$-0.33 + 1.00 = 0.67 \div 2.00 = 0.335 \times 100 = 33.5\%$$

Commitment Features

Commitment features consist in turn of the:

1. **Background** of the commitment (including an Appendix listing all similar previous commitments);
2. **Dictionary of Definitions** and of commonly used words, notably verbs, adjectives and nouns. The cumulative Dictionary is contained in this Manual. Each commitment will have words that need these definitions;
3. **Catalogue of Concepts**, is a set of definitions, similar to that for the commonly used words, of commonly used concepts, relevant to and/or created for use in the international institution being assessed. Not all commitments will contain such specialized, technical concepts;
4. **General Interpretative Guidelines** of rules used for common coding issues that regularly arise and that are found in this coding manual to be applied “off-the-shelf” to the assessment at hand
5. **Specific Interpretative Guidelines** which are created by the analyst to resolve new and more specific issues arising from the specific commitment being assessed. These guidelines are then added to the list of General ones already in the manual, to be used as new general guidelines to ensure consistent interpretation when such issues arise again. It’s a candidate to be in the general interpretative guidelines
6. **Scoring Metric** (often called “Scoring Guidelines”) which identify how the general and specific guidelines are converted into numbers and applied to get the precise scores of +1,) and -1.

7. **Appendices**, list at least all similar previous commitments and the average compliance score of each if such a score exists.

General and Specific Interpretive Guidelines for Measuring Compliance

General interpretive guidelines are rules used for common coding issues that regularly arise and that are found in this coding manual to be applied “off-the-shelf” to the assessment at hand

Interpretive guidelines help individuals score commitments for compliance. While commitments change on a year-to-year basis, there are several general categories that commitments tend to fit within. These categories can help determine how to score commitments. Common concerns and questions also arise in regards to the commitments. These should also fit within and be assessed consistently by the use of the general interpretive guidelines. The general categories include the ones described below.

Instruments-Outcomes: A commitment may contain an instrument, an intended outcome/goal/target or both (recognizing that in recent years, commitments have been disaggregated by the Research Group coders to reduce the number of instruments and outcomes contained in a single commitment).

Order: For those commitments containing both an instrument and outcome, greater weight should be placed on which comes first in the text of the commitment (e.g., we will do X to get A versus we will get B by doing Y, Z).

Linkage: When a commitment contains several instruments and/or commitments it is important how they are linguistically linked. If it is by an “and” each component is in general equally weighted. If it is by “including” generally give greater weight to the specified inclusions although allow some room and weight for the general category if it is measurable. Try to equally weight the specified inclusions. It may not be necessary that each be fully achieved by a member to get a +1 score, but specify how much of how many qualify and justify your choice. **[[add “including”]]**

Specificity: The more specific an element, the greater weight it should be given, especially when an outcome contains a target and/or timetable especially in quantitative form.

Multiyear Financial Commitments

Multiyear financial commitments are commitments that declare they are going to give a set amount of money over a set number of years. There have been a number of these commitments that have been measured for compliance in the past. In 2006, a commitment on the Global Partnership and Non-proliferation serves as one example: “We remain committed to our pledges in Kananaskis to raise up to \$20 billion through 2012 for the Global Partnership, initially in Russia, to support projects to address priority areas identified in Kananaskis and to continue to turn these pledges into concrete actions.” Another example comes from the 2005 priority commitments: “Supporting the Polio Eradication Initiative for the post eradication period in 2006-8 through continuing or increasing our own contributions toward the \$829 million target and mobilizing the support of others.”

In these instances, formulas should be established based on initial commitments that measure how much money should be given by each actor. These should first and foremost be based on what it actually says in the commitment. If different countries commit different amounts of money, or if the commitment states that funds will be based on country GDP, this is what should be measured. However, this formula should not be applied if it is not explicitly stated in the text of the commitment. In particular, assessments of funding should take into account a government’s previous pledges with regards to the specific topic. This is important when various funding formulas are possible, such as lump-sum funding versus annual disbursements. The author of the Interpretive Guidelines should ascertain which funding structures have been declared permissible by the recipients/brokers of the funds in question.

A simple linear model should not be used to evaluate multi-year financial commitments. First, such a model is contrary to the geometric progression of many budget allocations (i.e. many governments plan on year-on-year

percentage increases rather than set increases in the absolute value of their disbursements). Secondly, linear models understate the nominal commitments made by governments. In inflationary environments, governments will have to provide increasingly large nominal disbursements in order to ensure that the same quantity of resources is targeted at a specific issue or problem. As such, it is preferable to have a geometric progression of the increases in resources committed to a specific issue area. This geometric progression should take into account inflationary trends if these are problematic (e.g., inflation of 5% or more per year). For example, if G8 countries promise to double official development assistance (ODA) over six years, the ideal progression of increases should not be assumed to be 18% of the initial year for each of the six years. Rather, the ideal progression should be assumed to be 12.5% year on year in the ODA budget, controlling for inflation. In other words, the current year's ODA budget should be deflated to last year's price level and a +1 award only if the increase from last year's budget is approximately 12.5% or higher. This allows for analysts to consider a country's actions on two levels: progress towards the stated goal since the commitment was first made; and changes in progress from one year to the next. A +1 may therefore also be awarded if the year-on-year increase is considerably smaller than 12.5% but previous increases in ODA budgets have been far greater than expected.

The following is an illustration of the various funding mechanisms that might be employed in the fulfillment of a multiyear financial commitment. The hypothetical situation is one in which a funding initiative with a baseline value of \$1 billion is to be doubled over six years.

Year	Even Yearly Payments	Geometric Progression	Random Progression	Lump-Sum
0	\$1 billion	\$1 billion	\$1 billion	\$1 billion
1	\$1.17 billion	\$1.12 billion	\$1.4 billion	\$2 billion
2	\$1.34 billion	\$1.26 billion	\$1.4 billion	\$2 billion
3	\$1.5 billion	\$1.41 billion	\$1.5 billion	\$2 billion
4	\$1.67 billion	\$1.59 billion	\$1.65 billion	\$2 billion
5	\$1.84 billion	\$1.78 billion	\$1.8 billion	\$2 billion
6	\$2 billion	\$2 billion	\$2 billion	\$2 billion

The crux of evaluation, therefore, is to determine if progress has been made toward the ultimate goal and if it is still feasible for the given country to achieve that goal.

For example, G8-2011-61 states "Despite the worldwide economic crisis, the G8's ODA increased from USD 82.55 to 89.25 billion in current dollars between 2009 and 2010. While all commitments have not been met in full, we will strive to maintain our efforts, together with other donors." Here, "maintain our efforts" means increase ODA commitments by the same percent as the year before, which is 8.1%. Although the commitment refers to the G8 as a whole, due to the need for proportional burden sharing, each individual member must do its fair share, and increase its own ODA by 8.1%. Thus, identify in USD how much ODA each G8 member provided in 2009-10 and then see if they provided 8.1% more in 2011-12 to secure a full compliance score. The OECD DAC data base is the best place to start, although it does not provide the data in time and may not include Russia and the EU. Moreover it is difficult to add each member's measure, assign it a USD dollar value, and sum the amount to see if it is over or under the level of an 8.1% increase. Thus additional interpretative guidelines must be added and justified.

These two criteria - if progress has been made toward the ultimate goal and if it is still feasible for the given country to achieve that goal - can be met under any one of the four funding schemes shown above.

Multiyear "Other" Commitments

Multiyear "other" commitments are commitments that declare they are going to accomplish a non-monetary goal over a set number of years. There have been a number of these commitments that have been measured for compliance in the past. In 2000 one such commitment read as follows: "We therefore commit ourselves in

working in strengthened partnership with governments, the World Health Organization (WHO) and other international organizations and other relevant actors in civil society to deliver three critical UN targets:

- a. reduce the number of HIV/AIDS-infected young people by 25% by 2010;
- b. reduce tuberculosis deaths and prevalence of the disease by 50% by 2010;
- c. reduce the burden of disease associated with malaria by 2010.

In these instances, formulas should be established based on initial commitments that measure how much should be done by each actor. These should first and foremost be based on what it actually says in the commitment. If different countries commit different levels of involvement, or if the commitment states that actions will be taken through an allocated organization, this is what should be measured. Next, a simple model which assumes equal distribution of action over the set length of the commitment should be established. If an actor fails to commit to the previously promised action(s) or it fails to commit in any new way and is behind the minimum formula, it will receive a score of -1. If a country takes new actions and is behind on the minimum formula it will receive a 0. If an actor commits in new ways and/or is ahead or on track with the formula it will receive a score or +1. It should be noted that in multi-year “other” commitment cases, funding may be an indicator of compliance, but does not necessarily need to be, if the commitment itself does not specify funds as part of the action.

Example of multiyear other commitment

All commitment that refer to the G20’s 2009 Pittsburgh commitment on phasing out fossil fuel subsidies directly, or indirectly through the use of the words such as “reaffirm” thus inherit the Pittsburgh time schedule of the medium-term, understood by the G20 leaders and other to be five or six years. However, because there was no numerical end date specified at Pittsburgh, or since, it is reasonable to allow countries to comply at a rate less than one-sixth, or 16.6% fossil fuel subsidy phase-out, each year from 2009-2014. However, after 2014 a stronger standard is applicable as all countries were committed to have completed the phase out within the medium-term. Thus those countries that have completed the phase out or will do so very soon get a +1, those that have not but who are close to doing so and who are making substantial measures to achieve this get a 0, and the others get -1. (added JK 161031)

Double Counting

Over the years, concerns have arisen over double counting. Double counting refers to actors who consider a single contribution as fulfillment of more than one commitment. Most recently this concern refers to ODA and debt relief. It should first be noted that at the Gleneagles Summit in 2005 when such initiatives took form, it was outright established that ODA and debt relief were to be considered separately. And it can be assumed that because the commitments are referred to separately in the communiqués, they are indeed meant to be committed to individually. For instance, in the 2007 Heiligendamm document, commitments for debt relief and ODA were both identified, and there were done so separately (Commitment 143 stating: “These include the historic multilateral debt relief of up to US\$60 billion, the implementation of which is now well underway. Commitment 144 stating: “They also include increasing, compared to 2004, with other donors, ODA to Africa by US\$25 billion a year by 2010”). Therefore, funding allocation must be specified to each area by each actor to be considered compliance in both areas. Any indication by an actor that one donation should be considered to fulfill more than one commitment is not the case, and should be considered for only one commitment. For more information see the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development at <http://www.oecd.org/dac>.

Burden Sharing

Actors are to be held responsible according to their relative capability at the time of the summit. Although relative capability may change from the time of the summit to when commitments are measured for compliance, commitments are made with the understanding that certain situations and crises may arise in the future that

cause changes in the respective countries/areas. Governing officials are aware of this possibility, and therefore no excuse(s) should be interpreted, justified or accepted for not complying with a commitment, and no adjustments should be made to compensate for changes in capability (in regards to an actors level of allocation, whether it be funding or otherwise).

The relative weight of individual countries' contributions should not be determined based on purchasing power parity (PPP) or GDP alone, unless explicitly stated in the commitment. This method is deceptive, as GDP represents the total wealth of the economy, held by the public and private sectors, and by nationals and foreigners alike. A preferable method is to use the PPP value of the various governments' revenues, which is a better metric of fiscal capacity to fund new projects or increase funding of existing initiatives. Although the ordinal ranking of the G8 member states is not altered substantially by using revenues instead of GDP, the proportional weight of each country changes considerably when revenues are used instead of GDP:

Example of G8 members:

Member	GDP (PPP, 2007)	Ranking by GDP	Proportion of total GDP	Government revenue (PPP, 2007)	Ranking by revenue	Proportion of total fiscal capacity
Canada	\$1.27 trillion	8	4.2%	\$0.57 trillion	7	5.8%
France	\$2.07 trillion	6	6.8%	\$1.31 trillion	4	13.3%
Germany	\$2.83 trillion	3	9.3%	\$1.47 trillion	2	15.0%
Italy	\$1.8 trillion	7	5.9%	\$0.98 trillion	6	10.0%
Japan	\$4.34 trillion	2	14.3%	\$1.46 trillion	3	14.9%
Russia	\$2.08 trillion	5	6.8%	\$0.30 trillion	8	3.1%
United States	\$13.86 trillion	1	45.6%	\$2.57 trillion	1	26.2%
United Kingdom	\$2.15 trillion	4	7.1%	\$1.16 trillion	5	11.8%
European Union	\$14.45 trillion			N/A	N/A	

Interpretive guidelines should be written by a single individual (the director of compliance studies) as soon as possible after the confirmation of the final list of commitments to be assessed in the current year's compliance report. This ensures consistency in the language and level of detail used for all commitments. The interpretive guidelines should also be considered a draft until they are reviewed by the various components of the group (chair, management and partners at the Higher School of Economics in Moscow). Analysts should receive the draft guidelines soon after being recruited, and then receive the final version once all corrections and feedback have been incorporated into the document.

Pre-Compliance (Added by John Kirton, May 3, 2018, September 5, 2020)

Because compliant behaviour by summit members takes place after the commitment is collectively produced and public announced in the collective communiques at a summit, compliant behaviour that a member takes prior to the commitment generally does not count for compliance during the new summit (commitment)-to-next summit compliance period. However, there are a few exceptions, as follows.

1. **Non-reversibility.** In general, if a member prior to the compliance period has already done everything to fully comply with the new commitment, and does not reverse or alter such behaviour during the compliance period, the member receives full compliance for this "inherited" and "non-reversed" (no backsliding) compliance. For example, if the commitment is "we pledge to sign/ratify treaty X" and a member has already done so and does not withdraw during the compliance period, it receives full compliance. This is treated as a "conscious" decision not to de-comply, rather than non-action "by Chance" (see above). The summit presumably makes such a collective commitment to bind only those members that have not yet signed/ratified.
2. **Reversibility Rule.** The general rule is "reversibility." If during the compliance period, the member could have retreated from its "inherited", prior full compliance, but chooses not to do so, that latter non-

behaviour ie decision not to retreat/reduce/withdraw is scored as the equivalent of new compliance behaviour, within the compliance period. This assumes that there is nothing more the member could have done within the compliance period to comply, as is the case for absolute dichotomous commitments eg sign/not sign, ratify/non ratify.

3. **Multiyear Budgetary Announcements.** If a member announces in a budget, or of statement of multiyear funding, delivered shortly before the compliance period starts, with funding relevant to compliance with the commitment, this will count for compliance on the assumption that the announced funds will actually be dispersed and spent for all, most, or at least a substantial part during the compliance period itself. However it is very important to find, if possible, data beyond the initial statement/press release, that the money is actually legally authorized and disbursed during the compliance period. if no such data can be found, the analyst must justify why the initial announcement make it highly likely that the announced money will actually flow during the compliance period. Similar pre-announced funding for a one-time project would not count for compliance if the funding were sufficiently small and speedily spent that a majority of the action would not take place within the compliance period itself.

[Added by John Kirton and Brittaney Warren, May 29, 2020] These same rules apply to commitments made at emergency summits, such as the G20 one on March 26, 2020, in response to the Covid-19 crisis. The very fact that an emergency summit was held, with all leaders participating, confirms that they all belied that new and additional measures were required, beyond those which they had already decided and started to put in place on their own at home in the exercise of their national autonomy. While an individual leader may have participating in the summit, to get other leaders to do what they had already done, then the burden-sharing logic applies, or one looks for subset commitment specifying that only specific members agree to do new particular things. For example, commitment G20 2020-26 which reads “We commit to do whatever it takes and to use all available policy tools to minimize the economic... damage from the pandemic” clearly suggests that all members must take post commitment measures to meet the outcome welfare target of “minimizing the economic damage from the pandemic.” Moreover, as the damage was maximizing at and after the time the commitment was made, more measures on the part of all were needed “to minimize.”

Post-Compliance (Added by John Kirton, May 7, 2018)

The compliance period ends immediately before the subsequent summit begins. However in practice, in order to publish the completed compliance report on the even of the summit, allowing time for stakeholder feedback and editing, the operational end date is usually a few week before that for the regular annual compliance reports (for the G7, G20 and BRICS).

Sometimes a document is produced by a member government or international organization etc. after the compliance period ends, reporting on things that have happened, inter alia, during the year before and thus within the compliance period. Although the document appears after the compliance period, the member behaviour it reports takes place during the compliance period. Such documents can be used as a source, and the reported information as compliant relevant behaviour – but only if the report contains sufficient detail (that the compliance assessor must specify) to confirm that the reported behaviour took place within the compliance period. Components of the Instruments (added by John Kirton, January 29, 2026)

An instrument can contains one or more specific components. For example, the instrument of “blended finance” in G20 2023-151 on green finance contained the three components of “blended finance,” “de-risking instruments” and “green bonds. All can be treated equally. While it says (“such that these are non-exclusive comonents of the instrument. But because there are three (and not just none, or one or two of them, and because all three are broad and central categories, they can be treated as a fully comprehensive set of the “financing mechanisms.” If there is only one, it must be included, but other non-specified components must be given equal weight.

Anatomy of a Typical Interpretive Guideline

The interpretive guideline should consist of four components:

1. the actual commitment text, drawn from the most recent commitment bank;
2. a breakdown of the commitment text and explanation of the components, with definitions if necessary;
3. a background section on the commitment topic; and
4. scoring guidelines specific to the commitment.

Although the interpretive guidelines have not included citations in the past, future versions should include footnotes for the commitment text, background section and commitment breakdown (if necessary). The interpretive guidelines are frequently posted along with the interim and final compliance reports. Citations help to ensure that the material can be verified and they also reduce the workload of editors for the interim compliance report, as the interpretive guidelines background sections are used by team leaders as the basis of the background sections in the interim compliance report.

Writing the Interpretive Guidelines

The commitment text component is self-explanatory. The director of compliance should use only the text included in the commitment bank. This may or may not include the context sections placed in square brackets in the commitment bank.

Commitment Breakdown

The commitment breakdown is an important precursor to the scoring guidelines. It provides a concise study of the goals of the commitment and the tools or policy that are to be employed in the completion of the goals.

For example, G20 Toronto Commitment 2007-26:

We agreed to strengthen financial market infrastructure by accelerating the implementation of strong measures to improve transparency and regulatory oversight of hedge fund, credit rating agencies and over-the-counter derivatives, in an internationally consistent and non-discriminatory way.

The breakdown for this commitment was as follows:

Although the commitment to strengthening the financial market infrastructure is large, the action to which the G20 member states have committed is quite simple: accelerating the implementation of measures to improve transparency and regulation to strengthen the financial market infrastructure. These measures include, but are not limited to:

1. Accelerating the implementation of strong measures to improve transparency and regulatory oversight of hedge fund
2. Improving transparency and oversight of “credit rating agencies”
3. Improving transparency and oversight of “over-the-counter derivatives”
4. Doing this all in an “international consistent and non-discriminatory way”

The breakdown is not simply a reorganization of the commitment. It should separate the commitment into two parts: the goals to be attained and the means by which those goals are to be reached. In the case of the above commitment, the second component is easy, as the commitment itself contains the means of encouraging the strengthening of the financial market infrastructure. As well, the actors and parties involved should be made explicit. In the above example, the only actors are the G20 members. Sometimes, however, the commitments call for several different parties to be addressed. G20 Commitment 2010-33 highlights this issue:

We have strengthened our commitment to the IMF/World Bank Financial Sector Assessment Program (FSAP) and pledge to support robust and transparent peer review through the FSB.

The commitment makes explicit mention of the Financial Stability Board, International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. This is made clear in the commitment breakdown:

The commitment contains one action, to “strengthen our commitment to the IMF/World Bank Financial Sector Assessment Program (FSAP).” One aspect of this action requires the “pledge to support robust and transparent peer review through the FSB” from the G20 members. Fulfillment is not limited to these actions and may take other forms, but fulfillment is dependent on the FSB, World Bank and IMF process.

Some of the commitments contain technical terms or jargon that may not be readily understood by laypeople or by those not familiar with the given commitment topic. Confusion may be avoided by clarifying this language in the commitment breakdown. For example, the G8’s 2009-100 commitment on renewable energy says:

work to identify sources of financing for CCS demonstration projects

The breakdown for this commitment clarifies what is meant by the phrase “CCS demonstration projects,” which is core to the commitment but not widely understood by those without technical knowledge:

The component to watch for in this commitment:

1. The financing must go towards CCS demonstration projects: Carbon Capture and Storage demonstration projects. Other renewable, or energy efficient initiatives are not acceptable.

These projects must have an identified source of funding. Identifying a possible project is only part of the commitment.

Thus, the commitment breakdowns should provide textual analysis of the commitments with the goal of clarifying the meaning rather than the context of the commitment. Context is to be addressed in the background section.

Background for a Given Commitment

The commitment breakdowns are often not sufficient to provide analysts with the information needed to understand the evolution of a commitment or the context in which the commitment was created. Background sections help to fill this knowledge gap. Unlike the breakdown sections, these parts of the interpretive guidelines should have historical components and should examine the evolution of the commitment topic — including areas that are not explicitly mentioned in the commitment text. Although the background section may include general information, it should always contain the names of the documents from previous summits in which the topic appeared.

This does not mean that issues that have not been addressed at previous summits should have small or superficial background sections. Rather, information should be taken from the organizations that do work in the relevant field. For example, UNIFEM and the UN were used as sources for information on which the background section of the 2007 Sexual and Reproduction Education (2007-233) commitment was based.

The background should briefly report all previous commitments on or closely related to the same subject (to be listed in Appendix A) and the compliance results of all assessed commitments in the issue area (to be listed in Appendix B).

Scoring Guidelines

The scoring guidelines are both the most controversial and the most important part of the Interpretive Guidelines. They provide team leaders and analysts with instruction on how to weigh the various components of their reports and come up with an evaluation that they feel accurately reflects the progress of a given country towards the completion of the promises and goals included in the commitment.

The general guidelines for scoring are as follows:

-1	No progress toward compliance or actions counter to compliance
0	Partial compliance with the stated goals of the commitment
+1	Complete or near complete compliance with the stated goals of the commitment

Although not explicitly stated, countries that are constitutionally prohibited from complying with a commitment (e.g., Canada with commitments on the minutiae of financial regulation) have been awarded a score of 0. The scoring guidelines should include this information when there is a potential for a government to be constitutionally limited in its actions.

Similarly, if a country has already fulfilled all components of a commitment, it should be awarded a score of +1. Such situations may arise in commitments concerning trade, convention/treaty ratifications, economic reforms or “consultations” (i.e., a commitment to hold consultations on a specific reform or policy) and are fairly rare. In general, commitments contain at least one component that has not been completed in full by any of the members. Nevertheless, if this caveat may be added into the scoring guidelines if it is likely to affect compliance with a specific commitment, such as for simple, single action commitments calling for the ratification (but not implementation) of a convention.

The scoring guidelines included in the Interpretive Guidelines should be tailored to each of the commitments. Do not seek to include extremely detailed information about the actions that have been taken in the past to meet the specified goals of the commitment — such information should be provided by the team leader. Rather, use the components of the commitment outlined in the commitment breakdown section in generalized examples for each of the scores listed above.

For example, G20 Toronto commitment 2010-26:

We agreed to strengthen financial market infrastructure by accelerating the implementation of strong measures to improve transparency and regulatory oversight of hedge fund, credit rating agencies and over-the-counter derivatives, in an internationally consistent and non-discriminatory way

The breakdown for this commitment was as follows:

Although the strengthening the financial market infrastructure commitment is large, the action to which the G20 member states have committed is quite simple: accelerating the implementation of measures to improve transparency and regulation to strengthen the financial market infrastructure. These measures include, but are not limited to:

1. Accelerating the implementation of strong measures to improve transparency and regulatory oversight of hedge fund
2. Improving transparency and oversight of “credit rating agencies”
3. Improving transparency and oversight of “over-the-counter derivatives”
4. Doing this all in an “international consistent and non-discriminatory way”

The corresponding scoring guidelines are:

-1	Country implements no new measures to strengthen the financial market infrastructure.
0	Country implements few new policies directed towards strengthening financial market infrastructure. State concentrates exclusively on implementing measures to improve transparency and regulatory oversight, but does not do it in an internationally consistent and nondiscriminatory way.
+1	Country implements new policies directed towards strengthening the financial market infrastructure. The state concentrates on implementing measures to improve transparency and regulatory oversight and does it in an internationally consistent and nondiscriminatory way.

The guidelines do not use the specific components of the breakdown, but each score is supplemented by a generalized example of the sort of actions that states may take and programs implemented that warrant a given score. Remember that the scores are awarded in a holistic manner — thus individual actions rarely warrant a score on their own. A number of actions and statements must be weighed together and their cumulative effect must be evaluated before a score is awarded.

Special Considerations

In evaluating the results of the compliance reports, the following considerations should be kept in mind:

- Compliance is assessed against a selected set of priority commitments, rather than all commitments the last summit produced. The priority commitments selected are not randomly chosen but identified according to a disciplined and systematic process intended to produce a representative subset of the total according to such dimensions as issue areas, ambition, specified time for completion, instruments used and, more generally, the degree of precision, obligation and delegation of each. The aim is to provide a comprehensive portrait of the compliance performance of the summit as a whole. As such, the individual commitments selected cannot in all cases claim to be the most important ones in their appropriate issue area, nor do they necessarily represent that issue area lodged.
- In addition to the specific commitments assessed in the compliance reports, summits have value in establishing new principles in normative directions, in creating and highlighting issue areas and agenda items, and in altering the publicly allowable discourse used. Furthermore, some of the most important decisions reached and consensus forged at summits may be done entirely in private and not encoded in the public communiqué record.
- Some commitments inherently take longer to be complied with than the time available between one Summit and the next.
- In some cases, it may be wise not to comply with a summit commitment, if global conditions have dramatically changed since the commitment was made or if new knowledge has become available about how a particular problem can best be solved.
- As each of the member countries has its own constitutional, legal and institutional processes for undertaking action at the national level, each is free to act in particular cases on a distinctive national time scale. Of particular importance here is the annual cycle for the creation of budgets, legislative approval and the appropriation of funds.
- Commitments encoded in the communiqué may also be encoded precisely or partially in communiqués from other international forums, the decisions of other international organizations, or even national statements such as the State of the Union Address in the United States, the Queen's Speech in the United Kingdom and the Speech from the Throne in Canada. Without detailed process-tracing, it cannot be assumed that compliant behaviour on the part of countries is fully caused by the single fact of a previous G7/G8/G20 commitment.
- Compliance is assessed against the precise, particular commitments made by the G7/G8/G20, rather than what some might regard as necessary or appropriate action to solve the problem being addressed.
- With compliance assessed on a three-point scale, judgements inevitably arise about whether particular actions warrant the specific numerical value assigned. As individual members can sometimes take different actions to comply with the same commitment, no standardized cross-national evaluative criterion can always be used.

Comments regarding the judgements in each case, detailed in the extensive accompanying notes, are always welcomed by our global audience.

- Because the evaluative scale used in this compliance report runs from –100% to +100%, it should be assumed that any score in the positive range represents at least some compliance with the specific commitments made by the G7/8. It is not known if commitments in other international forums or at the national level on occasions such as the State of the Union Address, Queen’s Speech or Speech from the Throne, etc., are complied with to a greater or lesser degree than the commitments made by the G7/G8/G20.
- It may be that commitments containing high degrees of precision, obligation and delegation, with short specified timetables for implementation, may induce governments to act simply to meet the specified commitment rather than in ways best designed to address core and underlying problems over a longer term.
- In some cases, full compliance by all members of the G7/8 or the G20 with a commitment is contingent on co-operative behaviour on the part of other actors.
- Although the analysts of the G7 and G8 Research Group the G20 Research Group make an exceptional effort to seek relevant information on the summit countries, credible commentary on the information offered about the compliance-related activity of some G7/G8/G20 members remains at times incomplete. The greater such incompleteness, the lower the scores would likely be as a result.

Interim vs. Final Compliance Reports

In 2002, the G8 Research Group completed — for the first time — an interim compliance report, which focused on the extent to which the previous summit’s commitments were complied with by the time the G8’s hosting chair had passed on to the next member — which happens on January 1 of each year.

The G20 Research Group began issuing interim compliance reports after the 2010 Seoul Summit, once the leaders began meeting once annually instead of twice.

The BRICS Research Group has produced only one compliance report per summit.

The G7/8 interim compliance reports assess how the commitments are evolving in the post-summit period with respect to their implementation up until January 1, when the G7/8 presidency changes to the next country in the hosting rotation. These reports are published online and are produced as a preliminary diagnostic — as an invitation for others to provide more complete information on members’ compliance performance to date. Final compliance reports — typically issued on the eve of the next summit, build on the interim reports to assess the extent to which compliance has evolved since their publication. The same template is used for both the interim and final compliance reports. The G20 interim compliance report follows the same format.

Chapter 6: Compliance Report Writing

The first step in writing a compliance report is to set up a compliance template. At the top of the page clearly state the:

- Report Title: e.g., “Compliance Assessment of [G8 2012-28 on Syria]”
- Your name and the date of the assessment e.g., John Kirton, December 31, 1999
- The specific commitment being assessed, by its discrete number and the full text of the commitment
- The source document and its date
- The implementing period covering by start and end dates.
- A summary table of the overall results by country and component score
- Background, including a definition of the issue area, and of all terms in the text of the current commitment, and a summary chart of all the similar companion commitments made at the same summit.

[Added by John Kirton, January 20, 2024] At the end of the “Background” section, report the compliance average of the assessed commitments in the same subjects and the commitments closest in content to the one under review here. For example, for that on G7 2023 Gender Labour Markets: “We will work toward... further improving gender equality in the labor market”, the addition would read:

The G7’s 24 gender equality commitment assessed from 2014 to 2022 averaged compliance of 69%. Within them, the five on entrepreneurship averaged 78%, the three on economic participation averaged 54%, the one on companies averaged 82% and the one on the labour market (G7 2018-163) averaged 100%.

This text provides identifies which previous assessments have the most useful material for the current assessment and provides a baseline against which the results of the current assessment can be judged.

- General interpretative guidelines, drawn from the coding manual and used in this assessment
- Specific interpretative guidelines, invented for this assessment, with justifications
- Scoring metric
- Member-specific reports, which provide a record of relevant implementing behaviour and rationale, by member, for each of the core commitments assessed (see Appendix A).
- Appendices: tables for similar commitments, issue area compliance and, where possible, financial contributions or treaty signatures/ratifications related to the commitment being assessed, so the reader can see at one glance which member did how much (and when)

After the template is completed, the research process begins. Analysts should always familiarize themselves with the agencies and ministries responsible for the topics and issues addressed by the commitment. Commitments often span the jurisdictions of various government ministries and agencies. For example, a pledge to increase energy efficiency among consumers, businesses and generators may involve the ministries of the environment, industry, natural resources, consumer affairs and of the economy. Commitments that address development issues may require analysts to follow press releases and news stories emanating from the ministries of foreign affairs and/or international cooperation, agencies tasked with the implementation of government projects (e.g., USAID, DfID, Agenzia Italiana della Cooperazione) and non-profit organizations awarded contracts and grants by government agencies. Before serious and in-depth research can begin, analysts should have a complete list of the pertinent organizations and independent news media to follow throughout the compliance cycle.

Analysts are instructed to collect information from a restricted set of sources. Press releases and news items issued by government sources directly are to be given priority in the research process, as this allows for analysts to include information that has not been analyzed and processed by a third party in their compliance reports. Next, analysts collect information from international organizations such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, and the African Union. Finally, analysts use articles from major news sources from around the world. Analysts must be extremely selective in identifying press sources and use articles from news services that are generally recognized as being reliable and as having a strong editorial board. Furthermore, the use of online sources only for the compilation of the compliance report greatly enhances the ability of readers to verify the findings.

Analysts collect information about their specific commitment over a period that ranges from two to five months. The actual compilation of the compliance report does not begin until a week or two weeks prior to the due date for submission of the report to the team leader. This allows for analysts to include the most current and up-to-date information possible in their reports. Analysts sort through the research they have conducted and select the most current and salient items with respect to the focus of the commitment. Pertinent facts are then arranged according to relevance to the commitment, relative importance in the fulfillment of the stated commitment, and time of issuance. Statements or press releases by the minister or ministry directly charged with compliance should come first, then those made by the head of government, followed by officials, ministries or agencies of lesser importance in terms of their relationship to the commitment. Similarly, statements about funding directly related to the commitment should be prioritized, followed by tangential or over-arching funding (e.g., disbursements targeted at the general commitment area rather than the specific topic), statements of support or reiteration, and joint press releases with other political figures or international organizations.

Once research has been sorted and categorized, writing the actual compliance report is a simple affair. The report must always begin with a clear statement about the actor's performance: "Member X has complied with its commitment on Y as agreed at the Z summit." This statement may be followed by a brief explanation of the reasons for compliance/noncompliance, particularly if the report is long or contains a description of a large number of disparate programs. The following paragraphs should contain the information collected and arranged according to the guidelines above. Analysts are instructed to use neutral language in their reports, such that programs, statements and initiatives are presented according to their relevance to the topic at hand, rather than as a subjective evaluation of the policies and priorities of a given government. The prose of the body of the report should be clear and concise, with short sentences preferred over complex ones. Analysts should describe programs and funding with a few sentences and, if possible, provide quotes from speeches or press releases by the appropriate government officials.

All information included in the body of the compliance report must be cited. Analysts are encouraged to cite as often as they feel necessary, particularly when figures and official statements are used. Although the style of citation has undergone minor changes from one year to the next, the basic format for the footnotes included in the Report is as follows:

Title of Article, Source of Article (City of Publication or summit location). Publication Date. Date Accessed. web address.

For example, the citation for the 2005 Gleneagles Summit document entitled "Africa" would be:

Africa, G8 Research Group (Gleneagles). 8 July 2005. Access Date: 15 March 2008. <http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/2005gleneagles/africa.html>.

The source of the article should be the organization that maintains the website on which the article was posted — regardless of whether the original document was issued by a different organization. This ensures that any discrepancies between the original document and the one used by the analyst will not be ascribed to error on the part of the analyst.

The last part of the compliance report is the concluding statement. The concluding statement should reiterate the score awarded to the actor in question and provide a brief explanation of why the score has been awarded. It should be no longer than one sentence. For example:

Thus, member X has been awarded a score of 0 for its contributions to fund Y and its lack of a comprehensive policy on Z.

This provides a firm reassertion of main points of the compliance report.

Chapter 7: Interpreting Compliance Results

The score of an individual compliance assessment can be interpreted in many ways.

The first way is by the overall average score across all measured members, or by the percentage of those with full compliance, partial compliance or no compliance.

The second way is in comparison with the compliance scores of other commitments:

- a. Over time from previous summits of the same group;
- b. Across issue areas from the same or earlier summit(s) of the same group;
- c. Across members from the same or earlier summit(s) of the same group

The third way is in comparison with the similarly assessed and measures compliance scores of other groups, notably the G7, G20 and BRICS, on the overall multiyear average and according to the components of time, issue area and member identified above.

The fourth way is in comparison with the compliance or implementation scores of other international institutions, using inherited data sets based on other methods.

The fourth way is in comparisons with the domestic anchor of a member government's compliance with their own national commitments made in their domestic world of hierarchy. The commitments can be those made in national policy address, such as the USA's State of the Union Address, the UK's Queen's Speech, Japan's General/Special Policy Address to the Diet, or Canada's Speech from the Throne. The commitments can be those made by the governing party in their party platforms during the lead up election campaign.

In the latter case in Canada, the Polimeter produced starting in 2011 by political scientists at Quebec's Laval University shows that the four newly elected governments in 2004 (Martin), 2006 (Harper), 2008 (Harper) and 2011 (Harper) fulfilled their campaign pledges at a average level of 33% after one year, 64% after two years and 72% by the end of their mandate (Birch and Petry 2016). The Trudeau government elected in 2015 fulfilled 54% of its campaign promises in its first year. It must be remembered that campaign promises are designed to be fulfilled within about four years rather than the one year the G ones usually are.

References

Birch, Lisa and Francois Petry (2016), "Justin Trudeau's promises, one year later," *Policy Options*
<http://policyoptions.irpp.org/magazines/october-2016/>

Appendix A: Compliance Report Template

This template refers only to the G7. For G20 or BRICS compliance, change as appropriate but follow the same format, listing the countries in alphabetical order with the European Union at the end.

Title

Authors

Date submitted

Compliance Period: From [date] to [date]

[Year of Summit] [Location of Summit] [G7] [Interim or Final] Compliance Report

[Issue Area]

Commitment

[Copy exact text of commitment]

Document that contains the commitment

Assessment

	No Compliance	Work in Progress	Full Compliance
Canada			
France			
Germany			
Italy			
Japan			
United Kingdom			
United States			
European Union			
Score			

The overall score is determined by averaging the total scores by country and issue area and converting that score to a %. Exclude N/A (due to lack of available data) from the calculation.

Background

[Provide a brief overview of the issue area and the context of and triggers leading to this commitment appearing in the final communiqué or declaration. Include an appendix of the text of all similar commitments in the recent past, with their compliance score if available and an appendix of issue area compliance.]

Commitment Features

Definitions used for key terms

General Interpretive Guidelines Used and Justifications

Specific Interpretive Guidelines Created and Justifications

Scoring Guidelines

-1	
0	
+1	

Lead Analyst: [name]

Canada: +1

Provide a 1/2-page–1-page analysis for each country, in the order below, including footnotes for each empirical reference. Include for each country concrete examples of how compliance has been achieved (if any). If compliance has not been achieved, provide a rationale (if available).

France: 0

Analyst: [name]

Germany: –1

Analyst: [name]

Italy: +1

Analyst: [name]

Japan: 0

Analyst: [name]

United Kingdom: –1

Analyst: [name]

United States: +1

Analyst: [name]

European Union: 0

Analyst: [name]

Compiled by [team leader, analysts' names listed alphabetically, academic institution, date]

Conclusion

Describe the overall pattern, such as compliance by subjects of G7/8, OECD, BRICS members and the rank of compliance (beyond the 3 strata) starting with who complied the first and most.

Annex A: Similar Commitments on Issue, by Year

Annex B: Compliance in Subject, by Year, by Member

Note: as this commitment is coded by its issue area, this table of compliance scores shows how it contributes to an is changed from the cumulative set and trend of the compliance of all other commitments previously assessed for compliance in the same institution.

Appendix B: Where to Find G7 and G20 Compliance Information Online

This reference guide contains useful online sources that can be used in preparing compliance reports as well as G8 and G20 country and issue area studies.

G7-Specific Sites

- G7 Information Centre: <http://www.g7.utoronto.ca>
- Official G7 host websites

G20-Specific Sites

- G20 Information Centre: <http://www.g20.utoronto.ca>
- G20: <http://www.g20.org>
- Official G20 host websites

BRICS-Specific Sites

- BRICS Information Centre: <http://www.brics.utoronto.ca>
- Official BRICS host websites
- Higher School of Economics website: www.hse.ru/en/org/hse/iori/bric

General Sources

- Strategies for Locating Foreign Government Information on the Internet:
<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/crsweb/docs/forgate.htm>
- Foreign Government Statistics
<http://www.lib.umich.edu/libhome/Documents.center/forstats.html>
- U.S. Census Bureau International Database:
<http://www.census.gov/ftp/pub/ipc/www/idbnew.html>
- Political Reference Almanac:
<http://www.polisci.com/almanac/almanac.htm>
- Political Resources on the Web:
<http://www.politicalresources.net/>
- Country at a Glance:
http://www.un.org/Pubs/CyberSchoolBus/infonation/e_glance.htm
- Library of Congress Country Studies:
<http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/cshome.html#toc>
- The CIA World Fact Book:
<http://www.odci.gov/cia/publications/factbook/>
- U.S. State Department Background Notes:
<http://www.odci.gov/cia/publications/factbook/>

International Organizations

- United Nations: <http://www.un.org/>
- IMF: <http://www.imf.org>
- World Bank: <http://www.worldbank.org>
- World Health Organization: <http://www.who.int/>
- UNESCO: <http://www.unesco.org/>
- UNEP: <http://www.unep.org/>
- WTO: <http://www.wto.org>
- OECD: <http://www.oecd.org>
- NATO: <http://www.nato.int>
- Group of 77 (G77): <http://www.g77.org/>

- Financial Stability Board (G20): <http://www.financialstabilityboard.org/>
- Basel Committee on Banking Supervision: <http://www.bis.org/bcbs/>
- Bank for International Settlements: <http://www.bis.org/>
- International Energy Agency: <http://www.iea.org/>

International News Sources and Newswires

- International Herald Tribune: <http://www.iht.com/frontpage.htm>
- New York Times: <http://www.nytimes.com/>
- Financial Times: <http://www.usa.ft.com/>
- Reuters: <http://www.reuters.com/>
- Associated Press: <http://www.ap.org/>
- Canada Newswire: <http://www.newswire.ca/>
- Agence France-Presse: <http://www.afp.com/english/home/>
- UPI World: http://www.vny.com/cf/News/upisearch.cfm?content=srv_intnews

Member-Specific Online Resources

Argentina

Government Resources

- General Secretariat to the Presidency: www.secretariageneral.gov.ar
- Office of the Cabinet Chief: www.jgm.gov.ar
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Trade and Worship: <http://www.cancilleria.gov.ar/>
- Ministry of Economy and Public Finance: infoprensa@mecon.gov.ar
- Ministry of Health: www.msal.gov.ar
- Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries: www.minagri.gob.ar
- Ministry of Defense: www.mindef.gov.ar
- Banco Central de la Republica Argentina: www.bcra.gov.ar

Online News Sources

- Buenos Aires Herald: www.buenosairesherald.com
- Clarin: www.clarin.com
- Ambino Financiero: www.ambito.com.ar

Australia

- Government of Australia: <http://australia.gov.au/>
- Parliament of Australia: <http://www.aph.gov.au/>
- AusAID: <http://www.ausaid.gov.au/>
- Australian Ministry of Trade: <http://www.austrade.gov.au/>

Online News Sources

- The Australian: <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/>
- The Australian Financial Review: <http://afr.com/>

Brazil

Government Resources

- Brazil Government: http://www.brasil.gov.br/?set_language=en
- Brazilian Cooperation Agency: <http://www.abc.gov.br/>

- Banco Central do Brasil: <http://www.bcb.gov.br/?english>
- Ministry of Finance: <http://www.fazenda.gov.br/>
- Ministry of the Environment: <http://www.mma.gov.br/sitio/en/>
- Ministry of External Relations: <http://www.itamaraty.gov.br/english>
- Federal Senate: <http://www.senado.gov.br/>

Online News Sources

- Brasil em Folhas: <http://www.folha.info>
- Correio Braziliense: <http://www.correiobraziliense.com.br>
- Diário Oficial da União: <http://www.dou.com.br>
- Estado de Minas: <http://www.em.com.br>

Canada

Government Resources

- Government of Canada (primary page): <http://canada.gc.ca/>
- Federal Dept. index page: http://canada.gc.ca/depts/major/depind_e.html
- DFAIT: <http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/menu-e.asp>
- Department of Finance: <http://www.fin.gc.ca>
- Prime Minister: http://pm.gc.ca/prime_minister/-ssi
- Parliament: <http://www.parl.gc.ca/36/main-e.htm>
- Statistics Canada: <http://www.statcan.ca/>
- Federal Information by subject: <http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/dsp-psd/Reference/fed-e.html>
- Federal Budget Information: <http://www.fin.gc.ca/access/budinfoe.html>
- Government Electronic Publications: <http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/dsp-psd/epubs-e.html>

Online News Sources

- Globe and Mail: <http://www.globeandmail.ca>
- Toronto Star: <http://www.thestar.com>
- National Post: <http://www.nationalpost.com>
- Vancouver Sun: <http://www.vancouversun.com>
- Ottawa Citizen: <http://www.ottawacitizen.com>
- CBC News: <http://cbc.ca>
- CTV: <http://www.ctvnews.com/>

China

Government Resources

- People's Republic of China Government: <http://www.gov.cn/english/>
- Ministry of Finance: <http://www.mof.gov.cn/>
- Ministry of Environmental Protection: <http://english.mep.gov.cn/>
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs: <http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/>
- People's Bank of China: <http://www.pbc.gov.cn/publish/english/963/index.html>
- Ministry of Industry and Information Technology: <http://www.miit.gov.cn/>
- National Development and Reform Commission :<http://en.ndrc.gov.cn/>
- International Poverty Reduction Centre in China: <http://www.iprcc.org/publish/page/en/>

Online News Sources

- China Daily: <http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/>

France

Government Resources

- Main Government Page: <https://www.info.gouv.fr/>
- President: <https://www.elysee.fr/>
- Prime Minister: <http://www.premier-ministre.gouv.fr/>
- Bank of France: <http://www.banque-france.fr/gb/home.htm>
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs: <http://www.diplomatique.gouv.fr/mae/index.gb.html>
- Ministry of the Economy, Finance, and Industry: <http://www.telecom.gouv.fr/francais.htm>
- Ministry of the Environment: <http://www.environnement.gouv.fr/>
- National Assembly: <http://www.assemblee-nat.fr/0>
- Senate: <http://www.senat.fr/>
- National Institute of Statistics: <http://www.insee.fr/>
- Service des Statistiques Industrielles (SESSI): <http://www.evariste.anvar.fr>

Online News Sources

- International Herald Tribune: <http://www.iht.com/frontpage.htm>
- La Tribune: <http://www.latribune.fr/>
- Le Monde: <http://www.lemonde.fr/>
- Le Monde Diplomatique: <http://www.monde-diplomatique.fr/>
- Tocqueville Connection: <http://www.ttc.org/> (english language analysis of French News)

Germany

Government Resources

- Der Bundeskanzler: <http://www.bundeskanzler.de/>
- Federal German Government: <http://www.bundesregierung.de>
- Federal Statistical Office: http://www.statistik-bund.de/e_home.htm
- Foreign Office: <http://www.auswaertiges-amt.government.de/>
- Federal Ministry of Economics: <http://www.bmwi.de/>
- Federal Ministry of Finance: <http://www.bundesfinanzministerium.de/>
- German Central Bank: http://www.bundesbank.de/index_e.html

Online News Sources

- Handelsblatt: <http://www.handelsblatt.de/cgi-bin/hbi.exe?FN=hb&SFN=hp>
- German News (english edition): <http://www.mathematik.uni-ulm.de/de-news/>
- Frankfurter Allgemeine: <http://www.faz.de/>
- Frankfurter Rundschau: <http://www.f-r.de/>
- Die Welt: <http://www.welt.de>
- Germany Online: <http://www.germany-info.org>

India

Government Resources

- Government of India: <http://india.gov.in/>
- Ministry of External Affairs: <http://meaindia.nic.in/>
- Ministry of Finance: <http://finmin.nic.in/>
- Ministry of Environment and Forest: <http://moef.nic.in/index.php>
- Central Bank of India: <https://www.centralbankofindia.co.in/site/IndexCBI.aspx>

- Ministry of Statistics and Program Implementation:
http://mospi.nic.in/Mospi_New/site/home.aspx

Online News Sources

- The Times of India: <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/>
- The Economic Times: <http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/>

Indonesia

Government Resources

- Government website: <http://www.indonesia.go.id/en/>
- President of Republic of Indonesia: <http://www.presidentri.go.id/index.php/eng/>
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs: <http://www.deplu.go.id/Pages/Mission.aspx?l=en>
- Ministry of Finance: <http://www.depkeu.go.id/Eng/>
- Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources: <http://www.esdm.go.id/index-en.html?>
- Directorate General for National Export Development: <http://www.nafed.go.id/>

Online News Sources

- Inside Indonesia: <http://www.insideindonesia.org/>
- Jakarta Globe: <http://www.thejakartaglobe.com/home/>
- The Jakarta Post: <http://www.thejakartapost.com/>

Italy

Government Resources

- Government Page: <http://www.parlamento.it/>
- Presidenza del Consiglio dei Ministri: <http://www.palazzochigi.it/>
- Ministero Degli Affari Esteri: <http://www.esteri.it/>
- Italian Trade Commission of Canada: <http://www.italcomm.com/e/>
- Italian Political Parties: <http://www.agora.stm.it/politic/italy1.htm>
- Ministry of Finance/Ministero delle Finanze: <http://www.finanze.it/>

Online News Sources

- La Buvette: <http://www.axnet.it/buvette/>
- Milano Finanza: <http://www.milanofinanza.it/>
- Il Manifesto: <http://www.mir.it/>
- La Padania: <http://www.lapadania.com>

Japan

Government Resources

- Prime Minister's Official Residence: <http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/index-e.html>
- Ministry of Finance: <http://www.mof.go.jp/english/>
- Ministry of International Trade and Industry: <http://www.miti.go.jp/index-e.html>
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs: <http://www.mofa.go.jp>
- Japanese Market Information: <http://www.csjapan.doc.gov/links/market.html>
- The Information Technology Promotion Agency: <http://www.ipa.go.jp/>

Online News Sources

- Asahi Shinbun: <http://www.asahi.com/english/english.html>
- Daily Yomiuri: <http://www.yomiuri.com.jp/index-e.htm>
- Mainichi Newspapers: <http://www.mainichi.com.jp/english/>
- Japan Times: <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/>
- Foreign Press Centre: <http://www.nttls.co.jp/fpc/>
- NHK: <http://www.nhk.or.jp/index-e.html>
- Kyodo News: <http://home.kyodo.co.jp/>
- Nikkei Net: <http://www.nni.nikkei.co.jp/>

Korea

- Government Resources
- Office of the President: <http://english.president.go.kr/main.php>
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade: <http://www.mofat.go.kr/english/main/index.jsp>
- Ministry of Strategy and Finance: <http://english.mosf.go.kr/>
- Ministry of the Environment: <http://eng.me.go.kr/>
- Statistics Korea: <http://kostat.go.kr/eng/>
- Online News Sources
- The Seoul Times: <http://theseoultimes.com/ST/index.html>
- Maeil Business Newspaper: <http://www.mk.co.kr/>
- Korea Times: <http://www.mk.co.kr/>
- Korea Herald: <http://www.koreaherald.com/>
- Yonhap News: <http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/>

Mexico

Government Resources

- President's webpage: <http://presidencia.gob.mx/?DNA=118>
- Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources:
<http://www.semarnat.gob.mx/English/Pages/home.aspx>
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs: <http://www.sre.gob.mx/en/>
- Bank of Mexico: <http://www.banxico.org.mx/>
- Ministry of Finance and Public Credit: <http://www.shcp.gob.mx/Paginas/Default.aspx>
- Mexican Agency for International Cooperation and Development (AMEXCID)
<http://sre.gob.mx/lcid/?author=2>

Online News Sources

- El Universal: <http://www.eluniversal.com.mx/pre-home.html>
- Reforma: <http://www.reforma.com/>
- La Jornada: <http://www.jornada.unam.mx/ultimas/>

Russia

Government Resources

- Government Site: <http://www.gov.ru>
- President: <http://president.kremlin.ru/>
- Duma: <http://www.duma.ru/>
- Council of the Russian Federation: <http://www.akdi.ru/sf/>
- Central Bank: <http://www.cbr.ru/eng/>
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs: http://www.mid.ru/mid/eng/BOD_1.HTM
- Ministry of Finance: <http://www.minfin.ru/>

Online News Sources

- All News Russia: <http://www.allnews.ru/>
- Interfax: <http://www.interfax-news.com/>
- Russia Today: <http://www.russiatoday.com>
- Radio Free Europe: <http://www.rferl.org/bd/ru/>
- TASS: <http://www.tass.net/>
- ITAR/TASS: <http://www.itar-tass.com/>
- Russian National News Service: <http://www.russianstory.com>

Saudi Arabia

Government Resources

- Saudi Arabia Monetary Agency: <http://www.sama.gov.sa/sites/SAMAEN/Pages/Home.aspx>
- List of Government Agencies: http://www.saudiembassy.net/about/other_government_agencies.aspx
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs:
<http://www.mofa.gov.sa/detail.asp?InServiceID=205&intemplatekey=MainPage>
- Ministry of Finance: <http://www.mof.gov.sa/en/default.asp>
- Ministry of Information: <http://www.saudinf.com/>
- Ministry of Petroleum and Mineral Resources: <http://www.mopm.gov.sa/mopm/main.do>

Online News Sources

- Arab News: <http://www.arabnews.com/>
- Saudi Gazette: <http://www.saudigazette.com.sa/>
- United States Embassy: <http://www.saudiembassy.net/affairs/recent-news/>

South Africa

Government Resources

- Department of Environmental Affairs: <http://www.environment.gov.za/>
- Department of National Treasury: <http://www.treasury.gov.za/>
- International Relations and Cooperation: <http://www.dfa.gov.za/>
- Statistics South Africa: <http://www.statssa.gov.za/>

Online News Sources

- Cape Argus: <http://www.capeargus.co.za/>
- Business Day: <http://www.businessday.co.za/>
- The Star: <http://www.thestar.co.za/>
- Mail and Guardian: <http://www.mg.co.za/>

Türkiye

Government Resources

- Turkish Parliament: <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/english/english.htm>
- Republic of Türkiye Ministry of Foreign Affairs: <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/default.en.mfa>
- Ministry of Finance: <http://www.maliye.gov.tr/>
- Ministry of Environment and Forests:
<http://www.cevreorman.gov.tr/cob/anasayfa.aspx?sflang=en>
- Central Bank of the Republic of Türkiye: <http://www.tcmb.gov.tr/yeni/eng/>

Online News Sources

- Aksam: <http://www.aksam.com.tr/>
- Milliyet: <http://www.milliyet.com.tr/2010/12/08/index.html>
- Hurriyet: <http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/anasayfa/>

United Kingdom

Government Resources

- No. 10 Downing St.: <http://www.number-10.gov.uk/>
- Main Parliament site: <http://www.parliament.uk/>
- House of Commons: <http://www.parliament.uk/commons/HSECOM.HTM>
- House of Lords: <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld/ldhome.htm>
- Department of Trade and Industry: <http://www.dti.gov.uk/>
- Foreign & Commonwealth Office: <http://www.fco.gov.uk/>
- Ministry of Defense: <http://www.mod.uk/>
- Her Majesty's Treasury: <http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/>

Online News Sources

- Financial Times: <http://www.usa.ft.com/>
- The Guardian: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/>
- The Herald: <http://www.theherald.co.uk/>
- The Times of London: <http://www.thetimes.co.uk/>
- The Sunday Times: <http://www.sunday-times.co.uk/>

United States

Government Resources

- The President and the White House: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/>
- Senate: <http://www.senate.gov>
- House of Representatives: <http://www.house.gov/>
- Congress.org: <http://congress.org/main.html>
- C-Span: <http://www.c-span.org/guide/congress>
- Fednet: <http://www.fednet.net>
- U.S. State Department: <http://www.state.gov/>
- Office of Management and Budget: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/>
- NAFTA Secretariat: <http://www.nafta-sec-alena.org/english/>
- Federal Web Locator: <http://www.infoctr.edu/FWL/>
- You can also try the “hot documents” site at the University of Michigan’s U.S. Document Centre: <http://www.lib.umich.edu/libhome/Documents.center/federal.html>

Online News Sources

- New York Times: <http://www.nytimes.com/>
- Washington Post: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/>
- USA Today: <http://www.usatoday.com>
- Wall Street Journal: <http://public.wsj.com/home.html>
- Los Angeles Times: <http://www.latimes.com>
- CNN: <http://www.cnn.com>
- ABCnews: <http://abcnews.go.com>

- MSNBC: <http://msnbc.com/news/default.asp?nocookies>

European Union

Government Resources

- The European Commission: http://europa.eu.int/comm/index_en.htm
- Council of the European Union: <http://ue.eu.int/>
- Economic and Social Committee: <http://www.esc.eu.int/>
- European Parliament: <http://www.europarl.eu.int/default.htm>
- Court of Auditors: <http://www.eca.eu.int/>
- Court of Justice: <http://curia.eu.int/>
- Committee of Regions: <http://www.cor.eu.int/>
- European Investment Bank: <http://eib.eu.int/>
- European Central Bank: <http://www.ecb.int/>
- Europa (the EU's server): <http://europa.eu.int/index-en.htm>
- Directorates-General (DGs) of the European Commission: http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/dgs_en.htm

Online News Sources

- Press releases: <http://www.europa.eu.int/news/pr-en.htm>
- Publications Office: <http://eur-op.eu.int/general/en/>

Autonomous Analytical Assessments

- Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network
- Trade: Professor Simon Evenett, University of St. Gallen, Switzerland

Advocacy Assessments

- International Chamber of Commerce, ICC Scorecard, Annually since 2010 for the B20

If the Web Fails

- Consult with reference librarians
- Email web administrators, NGOs, international organizations and governments
- most governments and larger NGOs have staff hired specifically to answer questions
- provide detailed explanations of the information required and the research already completed
- Contact relevant organizations and embassies
- ask to speak to the media liaison or press relations person
- explain in detail the research question and the sources already researched
- while some embassies may not be helpful at the outset — and it is possible to be passed from official to official — normally, the embassies eventually forward the necessary information
- Contact relevant professors and scholars
- explain the specific research question and why they have been chosen as a contact
- ask if they are aware of anyone conducting research in this area or if they themselves know where to find the necessary information

If the information is not forthcoming after exhausting all of these channels, it is quite likely that the information is not available in the public domain. When information is not available, the countries receive a compliance score of N/A and the score is excluded from the final calculations that determine the overall compliance levels.

The scholarly literature on G7/8 and G20 diplomacy often identifies which countries initiate, support, or oppose initiatives within the preparatory process for the subsequent summit, indicating which member pushed within the G process for implementing action.

Appendix C: Compliance Bibliographical References [\[\[combine biblios\]\]](#)

- Baliamoune, Mina (2000), "Economics of Summity: An Empirical Assessment of the Economic Effects of Summits," *Empirica* 27: 295-314.
- Barnes, James (1994), *Promise, Promises: A Review: G-7 Economic Summit Declarations on Environment and Development* (Friends of the Earth: Washington, D.C.).
- Buxton, G.V. "Sustainable Development and the Summit: A Canadian Perspective on Progress." *International Journal*, XLVII, no. 4 (Fall 1992): 776-795.
- Chayes, Abram and Antonia Handler Chayes. *The New Sovereignty: Compliance with International Regulatory Agreements*.
- Chayes, Abram. "On Compliance." *International Organization*, 47, no. 2 (Spring 1993): 175-205.
- Chayes, Abram and Ronald B. Mitchell. "Improving Compliance with the Climate Change Treaty," in Henry Lee, ed. *Shaping National Responses to Climate Change: A Post-Rio Guide*. Washington, D.C., Island Press. 1995.
- Daniels, Joe (1993), *The Meaning and Reliability of Economic Summit Undertakings* (Hamden, Connecticut: Garland Publishing).
- G8 Online 2002 Lecture 6, 2004 Lecture 3
- G8 Research Group, *Compliance with G8 Commitments: From Köln 1999 to Okinawa 2000* <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2000okinawa/compliance/>
- G8 Research Group, Compliance Assessments, <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/compliance/>
- G8 Research Group, Compliance Assessment, 1996– web
- G7, *Napoli Summit 1994: The Record, Key Players, Preliminaries and Expectations*, Agenzia ANSA, Roma, 1994.
- Halifax Initiative. *First Annual G7 Report Card on Bretton Woods Reform: Report on the Commitments Made by the G7 Leaders at the Halifax Summit, June 1995*. Canadian Coalition for Global Economic Democracy. Ottawa, June 25, 1996.
- Independent NGO Evaluations of National Plans for Climate Change Mitigation: G7 Countries — Summit Meeting, Halifax, June 1995*. Report Coordinated by the United States Climate Action Network and Climate Network Europe. 1995.
- Ikenberry, John (1988), "Market Solutions for State Problems: The International and Domestic Politics of American Oil decontrol," *International Organization* 42 (Winter): 151-178.
- Juricevic, Diana, "Controlling For Domestic-Level Commitments: An Analysis of the Authoritative National Commitments Made in Canada and the United States from 1995-2000," November 7, 2000. <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/scholar/juricevic2000/juricevic.pdf>
- Juricevic, Diana, "Compliance with G8 Commitments: Ascertaining the degree of compliance With Summit debt and international trade commitments For Canada and the United States 1996-1999," June 24, 2000. <http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/scholar/juricevic2000/>
- Kirton, J. (2006). "Explaining Compliance with G8 Finance Commitments: Agency, Institutionalization, and Structure." *Open Economies Review* 17(4): 459-475.
- Kirton, John and Ella Kokotsis (2004), "Keeping Faith with Africa: Assessing Compliance with the G8's Commitments at Kananaskis and Evian," in Princeton Lyman and Robert Browne, eds., *Freedom, Prosperity and Security: The G8 Partnership with Africa* (Council on Foreign Relations: New York, September).
- Kirton, John and Ella Kokotsis (2015), *The Global Governance of Climate Change: G7, G20 and UN Leadership* (Farham: Ashgate).
- Kirton, John, Ella Kokotsis and Diana Juricevic (2002), "Okinawa's Promises Kept: The 2001 G8 Compliance Report," in John Kirton and Junichi Takase, eds., *New Directions in Global Political Governance* (Ashgate: Aldershot), pp. 269-280.

- Kirton, John, Ella Kokotsis and Diana Juricevic (2003), "G7/G8 Commitments and Their Significance," in John Kirton, Michele Fratianni and Paola Savona, eds. *Governing Global Finance: New Challenges, G7 and IMF Contributions* (Ashgate, Aldershot), pp. 227-231.
- Kirton, John, Ella Kokotsis and Diana Juricevic (2002), "Okinawa's Promises Kept: The 2001 G8 Compliance Report" in John Kirton and Junichi Takase, eds. *New Directions in Global Political Governance: The G8 and International Order in the 21st Century* (Ashgate, Aldershot), pp 269-282.
- Kirton, John, Ella Kokotsis, Gina Stevens with Diana Juricevic (2004), "The G8 and Conflict Prevention: Commitment, Compliance and Systemic Contribution," in *The G8, the United Nations and Conflict Prevention* (Ashgate, Aldershot), pp. 59-84.
- Kokotsis, Ella (2002), "Compliance with G8 Commitments," *G8 Online 2002*
- Kirton, John and Ella Kokotsis (2001), "Compliance with G8 Commitments: The Peace and Security and Conflict Prevention Agenda, Okinawa-Genoa," Paper prepared for the DFAIT's Policy Planning Division in Preparation for the Canadian Presidency of the G8 Foreign Ministers' Process in 2002, for June 26.
- Kokotsis, Ella (1995), "Keeping Sustainable Development Commitments: The Recent G7 Record," in John Kirton and Sarah Richardson, eds., *The Halifax Summit, Sustainable Development and International Institutional Reform* (Ottawa: National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy, 1995), pp. 117-133. on web
- Kokotsis, Ella (1999), *Keeping International Commitments: Compliance, Credibility and the G7, 1988-1995* (New York: Garland).
- Kokotsis, Ella (2004), "Explaining G8 Effectiveness: The Democratic Institutional Model of Compliance with G8 Commitments," Paper prepared for the Annual Convention of the International Studies Association, Montreal, March 18, 2004.
- Kokotsis, Ella and Joseph Daniels (1999), "G8 Summits and Compliance," in Michael Hodges and John Kirton, eds., *The G8's Role in the New Millennium* (Ashgate: Aldershot), pp. 75-94.
- Kokotsis, Ella and John Kirton (1997), "National Compliance with Environmental Regimes: The Case of the G7, 1988-1995," Paper prepared for the Annual Convention of the International Studies Association, Toronto, March 18-22, 1997.
- Kirton, John and Ella Kokotsis (2003), "Producing International Commitments and Compliance without Legalization: G7/8 Performance from 1975 to 2002," Paper prepared for the Annual Convention of the International Studies Association, Portland, Oregon, March 1, 2003.
- Koremenos, Barbara (1996), "On the Duration and Renegotiation of International Agreements," Paper for the International Studies Association, San Diego, April 1996.
- Labonte, Ronald and Ted Schrecker, *The G8, Africa and Global Health: A Platform for Global Health Equity for the 2005 Summit*. London: Nuffield Trust, forthcoming 28 February 2005; <http://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk>.
- Labonte, Ronald and Ted Schrecker, "Committed to Health for All? How the G7/G8 Rate," *Social Science and Medicine* 59 (2004): 1661-1676.
- Labonte, Ronald, Ted Schrecker, D. Sanders and W. Meeus. *Fatal Indifference: The G8, Africa and Global Health* Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press/IDRC Books, January 2004.
- Labonte, Ronald, Ted Schrecker and A. Sen Gupta, "A Global Health Equity Agenda for the G8 Summit," *British Medical Journal*, in press.
- Labonte, Ronald, Ted Schrecker and D. McCoy, "Health and HIV/AIDS: Fine words and fatal indifference" in G. Hubbard and D. Miller, eds., *Arguments Against G8* (London: Pluto Press, in press): 182-197.
- Labonte, Ronald, David Sanders and Ted Schrecker (2002). "Health and development: How are the G7/G8 doing?" *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 56(5) (2002): 322-322.

- Li, Quan (2001), "Commitment Compliance in G-7 Summit Macroeconomic Policy Coordination," *Political Research Quarterly* 54 (June): 355-378.
- Schrecker, Ted and Ronald Labonte, "What's Politics Got to Do with It? Health, the G8 and the Global Economy" in I. Kawachi and S. Wamala, eds., *Globalisation and Health* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, in press).
- Von Furstenberg, George (1995), "Accountability and a Metric for Credibility and Compliance," *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics* 151 (June): 304-25.
- Von Furstenberg, George and Joseph Daniels (1991), "Policy Undertakings by the Seven "Summit" Countries: Ascertaining the Degree of Compliance," *Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series of Public Policy* 35: 267-308, North Holland.
- Von Furstenberg, George and Joseph Daniels (1992a), "Can You Trust G-7 Promises?" *International Economic Insights* 3 (September/October): 24-27.
- Von Furstenberg, George and Joseph Daniels (1992b), *Economic Summit Declarations, 1975-1989: Examining the Written Record of International Co-operation*, Princeton Studies in International Finance 72, Princeton NJ, Department of Economics.

Appendix D: G20 Compliance Bibliographical References

- Bradford, Colin and Johannes Linn (2004). "Global Economic Governance at a Crossroads: Replacing the G7 with the G20," Brookings Institute Policy Brief 131. <http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2004/04/globaleconomics-bradford>.
- Engelen, Klaus (2008), "Letter from the G20 Summit: Rift Barley Avoided," *The International Economy* 22 (fall 2008): 10-11.
- English, John, Ramesh Thakur and Andrew F. Cooper, eds. (2005). *Reforming from the Top: A Leader's 20 Summit*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.
- English, John, Ramesh Thakur and Andrew F. Cooper, eds. *Reforming Multilateral Institutions from the Top: A Leaders 20 Summit*, Tokyo: United Nations University Press.
- Fischer, Fritz (2004). 'Thinking the Unthinkable.' *The International Economy* 18(4):60-65, 87.
- Hajnal, Peter I. (2007). *The G8 System and the G20: Evolution, Role and Documentation*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Kirton, John (2005b). "From G7 to G20: Capacity, Leadership and Normative Diffusion in Global Financial Governance." Paper prepared for a panel on "Expanding Capacity and Leadership in Global Financial Governance: From G7 to G20." International Studies Association Annual Convention, Hawaii, United States, March 1-5, 2005.
- Kirton, John J. (2004b). "Toward Multilateral Reform: The G20's Role and Place." Paper prepared for a conference on "The Ideas-Institutional Nexus: The Case of the G20," sponsored by the Centre of International Governance Innovation, United Nations University FLASCO and the University of Waterloo, Buenos Aires, May 19–21. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/scholar/kirton2004/kirton_g20_2004.pdf.
- Kirton, John (2002b). "Global Community Outreach: The G20 and Africa." Paper prepared for G8 Online 2002 Course. Available from: www.g8.utoronto.ca/g8online/2002/english/2002/09.html
- Kirton, John (2002c), "Guiding Global Economic Governance: The G20, G7 and IMF at century's Dawn," in John Kirton and George Von Furstenberg, eds., *New Directions in Global Economic Governance* (Ashgate: Aldershot).
- Kirton, John (2001f). "The G20: Representativeness, Effectiveness and Leadership in Global Governance." In John J. Kirton, Joseph P. Daniels and Andreas Freytag, eds. *Guiding Global Order: G8 Governance in the Twenty-First Century*, 143-172. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Kirton, John (1999d). "What is the G20." Adapted from "The G7, China and the International Financial System." Paper presented at an International Think Tank Forum on "China in the Twenty-First Century." China Development Institute, November 10-12, 1999. Available from: www.g7.utoronto.ca/g20/g20whatisit.html
- Kirton, J. J., Bracht, C. and Rasmussen, L. (2012) *Implementing the G20 Seoul Development and Employment Commitments: An Assessment*, Toronto: G20 Research Group (Paper produced with the financial support of the International Labour Office through the ILO–Korea Partnership Program. http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/biblio/SDC_Assessment.pdf.
- Kirton, John and Madeline Koch, eds. (2008-), series of publications on the G8 and G20 published by Newsdesk, London. Available at <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/newsdesk>.
- Martin, Paul (2008), "Time for the G20 to Take the Mantle from the G8," in John Kirton and Madeline Koch, eds. (2008), *Growth, Innovation, Inclusion: The G20 at Ten* (Newsdesk: London), pp. 22-8.
- Oldani, Chiara (2008). "Global Credit Market Disruption: Challenges and Risks." G20 Meeting of 2008 Commentary Papers. ssrn.com/abstract=1322078.
- Porter, Tony (2000). "The G7, the Financial Stability Forum, the G20, and the Politics of International Financial Regulation." Paper prepared for the International Studies Association Annual Meeting, Los Angeles, California, March 15, 2000.
- Summers, Lawrence (2008), "The Birth of the G20," in John Kirton and Madeline Koch, eds. (2008), *Growth, Innovation, Inclusion: The G20 at Ten* (Newsdesk: London), pp. 29-31.

Summers, Lawrence (2008), “The Birth of the G20,” in John Kirton and Madeline Koch, eds. (2008), *Growth, Innovation, Inclusion: The G20 at Ten* (Newsdesk: London), pp. 29-31.

Woods, Ngaire (2004). “The Orderly Resolution of Financial Crisis.” Paper prepared for “The G20 Architecture in 2020- Securing a Legitimate Role for the G-20, “The G20 at the Leaders’ Level.”” Ottawa, Ontario, February 29, 2004.

Appendix E: G7/G20 Summit Performance Indicators by Function

1. The Domestic Political Summit

- A. Media Coverage at Home: Attention and Approval
- B. Elite Editorial Consensus
- C. Public Opinion Poll Change
- D. Election Record During and After
- E. Civil Society Participation, Protests, Police
- F. Societal Behaviour Changed
- G. Attendance of Leader
- H. National Policy Address
- I. Host Economic Costs + Benefits

2. The Deliberative Summit

- A. Length of Leaders Participation
- B. Length of Summit in Days
- C. Length of Summit in Hours
- D. Length of Summit Working Sessions
- E. Location of Summit
- F. Level of Spontaneity

3. The Directional Summit

- A. Number of Words in Leaders' Collective Summit-Released Documentation
- B. Number of Separate Summit Released Collective Documents by Leaders
- C. Number of Priority Values Identified and Affirmed in Communiqué Chapeau
- D. Number of Linkages Identified and Affirmed in Communiqué Chapeau

4. The Decisional Summit

- A. Number of Commitments
- B. Breadth of Commitments (by domain, and issue area)
- C. Ambition-Significance of Commitments
- D. Money Mandated

5. The Delivery Summit

- A. Compliance
- B. Money Mobilized and Disbursed
- C. Member Behaviour Reinforced, Constrained and Altered
- D. Member's Conception of Interests and Identities Changed
- E. Outside Country Behaviour Altered

6. The Development of Global Governance Summit

- A. Remit Mandates
- B. G8 Ministerial Institutions Created, Adjusted Affirmed
- C. G8 Official Institutions Created, Adjusted, Affirmed
- D. Instructions to Outside Intergovernmental Institutions

7. Overall Assessments

- A. Bayne Grades (1987, 2000, 2001-) and Grid (2001-)
- B. Sherpa Consensus (Kirton 1989)
- C. G8 Research Group Summit Performance Assessment, 1996-)

Appendix F: Causal Models of Summit Performance

G7

1. American Leadership (Putnam and Bayne, 1984, 1987)

Decisional Performance, occasionally high, due to:

- A. U.S. able and willing to lead with support of a strong second
- B. Reigning ideas and historical lessons as interpreted by leaders
- C. Electoral certainty
- D. Transnational actors alliances

2. Concert Equality (Wallace 1984, Kirton 1989)

Comprehensive Performance, high, low, then very high, due to:

- A. Equal vulnerability activated by shocks
- B. Multilateral Organizational Failure
- C. Collectively predominant and internally equal capabilities
- D. Common principles of open democracy, individual liberty, social advancement
- E. Domestic political capital and control
- F. Constricted participation

3. False New Consensus (Bergsten and Henning 1996)

Decisional Performance, declining during 1990s, due to:

- A. False new consensus that economic globalization makes governments impotent
- B. American economic and political decline due to cold war's end and poor policy
- C. Traditional differences between the U.S. and Germany

4. Democratic Institutionalism (Ikenberry 1993, Kokotsis 1998)

Delivery Performance, increasing into 1990s, due to:

- A. Effective multilateral organizations controlled by G7/G8
- B. G7 institutionalization at ministerial and official level
- C. Strong G8 bureaucratic units in domestic governments
- D. Leader's commitments to international co-operation, G7/G8 institutions, individual issue
- E. Popular support for leaders and issue

5. G8 Nexus (Gill 1998)

Directional and Decisional Performance, increasingly effective but contested, due to:

- A. Marketization, globalization and liberalization, producing a global concentration of wealth and power
- B. Similar political outlook and congruent political/economic principles of elite
- C. Dominance of financial-asset (bond-currency) market interests in leading states

6. Collective Management (Bayne 2000, 2001, 2002)

Comprehensive (Five Function) Performance, increasingly effective, due to:

- A. Complexity of new and unexpected global problems
- B. Inadequacy of other global institutions
- C. Globalization constraint on independent major power action
- D. G8 iteration, agenda focus, leaders-only format; institutionalization

7. Ginger Group (Baker 2000, Hodges 1999)

Deliberative Performance, increasingly effective, due to:

- A. Financial market globalization
- B. Small private club of governmental agents
- C. Common worldview

8. Group Hegemony (Bailin 2002, 2003)

Decisional Performance, constantly high, due to:

- A. Concentration of power > small group size > designate K-Group
- B. Group Identity > small group size > designate K-Group
- C. Economic Liberalism > mutual interests > reach mutual agreements
- D. Preparatory Process > mutual interests > reach mutual agreements
- E. System of Interaction > shadow of the future > develop trustworthy relations
- F. Documentation > shadow of the future > develop trustworthy relations

9. Meta Institution (Pentilla, 2003)

Decisional Performance, increasingly high, due to:

- A. Concerted power of G8 members
- B. Failure of established international organizations

10. New Directions

G20

Systemic Hub Model (Kirton 2013)

Appendix G: Indicators of Major Causal Variables

Relative Capability

Collective Predominance:

- G7/8 GDP per World Total (current US\$)
- G7/8 GDP per World Total (1995 base US\$)
- G20 GDP per World Total (current US\$)

Internal Equality:

- GDP Inequality Within the G7/8 and G20 (current \$, sigma GDP)
- GDP Inequality within the G7/8 (1995 base sigma)
- US GDP Share of G7/8 Total GDP
- US GDP Share of G20 Total GDP
- Average US\$ Depreciation
- Cumulative US\$ Depreciation

Relative Vulnerability

Collective Vulnerability:

- Energy Dependence (NEI/DEC)
- Terrorist Attacks by Number, Global Total
- Deaths from Human-Induced Ecological Disasters
- Annual Average Change in NYSE, NIKKEI, and LSE Indexes

Internal Equality of Vulnerability:

- US Bank Failures by Number

Interdependence

- G7-bound Trade as % of total (average for G7)G20-bound Trade as % of total (average for G20)

Common Principles (Shared Social Purpose)

- Freedom House Democratization Index
- Ideological Consensus

Political Control and Capital

- Years Since Last Election

Appendix H: Summary of Variables, Methods and Sources

Bayne Grade — Numerical equivalent of the letter-grade assessment of summit performance compiled by the G8 Research Group and Sir Nicholas Bayne (source: <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca>)

Summit Length (days) — Length of the G7/8 summit in days (source: fact sheet at <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca>)

Number of Summit Communiqués — Number of official documents issued at the summit (source: internal G8 Research Group compilation available by request from g8@utoronto.ca or g20info@library.utoronto.ca)

Number of Words in Summit Documents — Length of the official documents produced at the summit measured in words (source: internal G8 Research Group compilation; available by request from g8@utoronto.ca).

Number of Commitments — Number of total commitments identified in the summit documents (for methodology see Kokotsis, Ella. *Keeping International Commitments: Compliance, Credibility, and the G7, 1988-1995*. Transnational Business and Corporate Culture series. New York: Garland Pub., 1999; source: internal G8 Research Group compilation available by request from g8@utoronto.ca).

Compliance — Average standardized compliance with the commitments undertaken by summit members (for methodology see Kokotsis, Ella. *Keeping International Commitments: Compliance, Credibility, and the G7, 1988-1995*. Transnational Business and Corporate Culture series. New York: Garland Pub., 1999; source: internal G8 Research Group compilation at <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca>).

Remit Mandates — Remit mandates are formal instructions contained in the documents the leaders collectively issue at the annual G7/8 summit, specifying that they will deal with an item at their Summit the following year or in subsequent years (source: fact sheet at <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca>).

Ministerial Bodies Created — Number of ministerial bodies created at the summit. Inter-summit ministerials and equivalents are meetings of G7/8 ministers or heads or equivalents from these actors (collective statements issued in the name of the G7/8, conference calls) between the end of one year's annual summit and the start of the summit the regularly scheduled annual following year (source: fact sheet at <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca>).

Leadership Bodies Created, Approved or Adjusted (source: internal G8 Research Group compilation available by request from g8@utoronto.ca).

Average Depreciation of the US\$ and Cumulative Depreciation of the US\$ — Denotes the average depreciation of the US\$ against the basket of G8 currencies between the end of a summit and the start of the next one. The formula used is: $\text{AVERAGE}([E^{t+1}_{\$/i} - E^t_{\$/i}] / E^t_{\$/i})$, where i iterates through all 7 other currencies, and t and $t+1$ are the days on which the Summit ends and the next one starts, respectively (source: UBC Pacific Exchange Rate Service located at <http://fx.sauder.ubc.ca/>).

U.S. Bank Failures — Number of U.S. commercial and savings banks and insurance trusts failures, as defined by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. For methodology and data see the “Historical Banking Statistics” series at <http://www.fdic.gov>.

G7/8 GDP as percentage of total world GDP (in current US\$ and in 1995-base year US\$) — Denotes the ratio of the cumulative G7/8 GDP to the total world GDP as reported by the World Development Indicators Database of the World Bank. The two variables measure GDPs in current and real (1995 base-year) U.S. dollars. (complete methodology and source: <http://www.worldbank.org>). *Methodological note:* Because base-year deflation uses a fixed consumption pattern (an assumption likely to introduce distortions for years significantly removed from the 1995 base-year), the “real US\$” deflated numbers should be interpreted with caution.

Inequality of G7/8 GDP composition (in current US\$ and in 1995-base year US\$) — This is the standard deviation of the set of the individual G7/8 members GDP shares in the G7/8 cumulative GDP in each year. The two variables measure GDP in current and real (1995 base-year) U.S. dollars. (complete methodology and source: <http://www.worldbank.org>). *Methodological note:* Because base-year deflation uses a fixed consumption pattern (an assumption likely to introduce distortions for years significantly removed from the 1995 base-year), the “real US\$” deflated numbers should be interpreted with caution.

Terrorist Attacks — Total terrorist attacks worldwide (series covers 1981–2002 only) as reported by the U.S. Department of State in its Patterns of Global Terrorism report in 2003 (source: <http://www.state.gov>, Statistical Appendix).

Ideological Consensus of G7/8 Leaders — This number signifies the ideological likeness of the leaders of the G7/8 members defined as the ratio of leaders of same or similar ideological/political persuasion to the total number of Summit leaders (source: contact G8@utoronto.ca).

Average Years since Last Election — Average of the years since the last election of each of the leaders attending the Summit (source: internal G8 Research Group compilation available by request from g8@utoronto.ca).

Freedom House Democratization Index — An index of global democratization developed by the Freedom House Foundation (methodology and source: <http://www.freedomhouse.org>).

Energy Dependence — Measures the dependence of the G7/8 on outside (non-G7/8 produced) energy imports. The data used for the compilation of this time-series covers tradable energy (oil, natural gas and coal) measured in Mtoe (millions of tons of oil equivalent). The following formula is used to arrive at the aggregate annual ratio: Total G7/8 energy consumption [Mtoe] — Total G7/8 energy production [Mtoe] = Net G7/8 Energy Imports [NEI in Mtoe] —> Energy dependence = [(NEI) / (Total G7/8 energy consumption)] (sources: British Petroleum Database, <http://www.bp.com>; UNCTAD TRAINS Database, <http://www.unctad.org>; Euromonitor Database, <http://www.euromonitor.com>).

G7/8-Bound Trade as Percentage of Total Trade of G7/8 Members — The share of G7/8-bound trade in the total trade of G7/8 members (annual average for the G7/8; trade measured in customs-reported value) (sources: UN Common Database, <http://unstats.un.org>; Euromonitor Database, <http://www.euromonitor.org>).

Deaths and Injuries from Human-Induced Ecological Disasters Worldwide — Total number of deaths and injuries from human-precipitated ecological disasters; annual aggregate (source: UNEP GEO Data Portal, <http://geodata.grid.unep.ch/>).

Average Change in Major Stock Indexes (NYSE, NIKKEI and London Stock Exchange) — Data compiled for value of transactions, annual averages (source: Wren Research Database, <http://www.wrenresearch.com.au/>).

U.S. GDP as percentage of G7/8 Total GDP — Calculated in current US\$ (source: World Development Indicators Database, <http://www.worldbank.org>).

Appendix I: Dictionary (see also separate file “Dictionary of Definitions”)

A. Definition of Words

Access: access should be interpreted to mean the right to obtain or make use of the entity in reference. In terms of health, according to the World Health Organization, “access” is a broad concept that measures three dimensions of key health sector interventions.

Actions: to do something; to act in order to get a particular result (Merriam Webster)

Address: to give attention to or deal with a matter or problem

Advance: move or push forward, make progress, give active support to, promote, cause an event to occur at an earlier date (OECD 1990:17)

Affirm:

Agree:

Approach (N): a way of dealing with a situation or problem, initial proposals (or request made to someone).

Arising from

As needed: according to need

Assessments: evaluate or estimate the nature, ability or quality (OED)

Associate: is intended to identify a common purpose, action or condition that the parties agree to unite over.

Availability: defined in terms of the reachability (physical access), affordability (economic access) and acceptability (socio-cultural access) of services that meet a minimum standard of quality. Making services available, affordable and acceptable is an essential precondition for universal access.

Balanced (G20 2011-247):

Based on:

Broadband: high-speed Internet access that is always on and faster than the traditional dial-up access. It includes several high-speed transmission technologies. (U.S. Federal Communications Commission) [added 160919 BW]

Call on: to promote or motion others (depending on the commitment) to associate with the mentioned requirement.

Certain: when a reference is made to a “certain” entity or group of entities, there is a specific actor/group that is being referenced. In these cases, additional information should be obtained from sources to clarify the member(s) referenced. It should not be interpreted to mean all members.

Close as possible: should be interpreted to mean to come near or close to the goal without there being a major hindrance, obstacle or circumstance of some kind. It should not be interpreted to mean any effort made.

Commit: to do or perform, to pledge or bind (a person or an organization) to a certain course or policy.

Complete: finish

Conduct: organize and carry out (OED)

Consistently:

Continue to provide: refers to commitments that are established and implemented. It should be interpreted to mean new actions will be added to the already existing ones. It should not be interpreted to mean no new allocations.

Cooperation: the action or process of working together to the same end

Counter:

Coverage: defined as the proportion of a population needing an intervention who receive it. Coverage is influenced by supply (provision of services) and by demand from people in need of services.

Cross-border: involving movement or activity across a border between two countries

Defeat: should be interpreted to mean to overcome or eliminate.

Develop: when a commitment states it will develop, it should be interpreted to mean that a new initiative will be established in the area. It should not apply to old initiatives.

Deposit schemes (also called deposit refund schemes [DRS]): deposit schemes “have been used for many years for glass bottles, [and] are also sometimes applies to plastic beverage bottles. A deposit fee is charged at the point of purchase, and refunded to the purchaser when the bottle is returned via a specifically designed system...such schemes...help to capture a specific type of material for recycling, thereby facilitating effective and efficient collection, reducing littering/material leakage and enabling reuse of recycling, which in turn encourages higher quality, purer secondary material that is not contaminated with other material or chemical additives.” (OECD: <https://www.oecd.org/stories/ocean/deposit-refund-schemes-58baff8c>).

Determined

Determined to Assist: implies success is based on action in the said area and not necessarily on the outcomes of these initiatives or actions

Discourage

Digital Divide: the economic, education, and social inequalities between those who have computers and online access and those who do not [added 160919 BW]

Effectively: should be interpreted to mean operating in a way that produces the intended result. It does not mean any effort, especially thoughtless ones.

Efficiency:

Effort:

Eliminate: synonym=end

Encourage: to say “encourage” does not imply strong measurability in the commitment. It should be taken as a soft commitment where no concrete action is to be taken.

Enhance: to heighten or intensify

Ensure: to make something certain to happen [added 160919 BW]

Equitable: should be interpreted to mean fair and just as indicated by law.

Especially: to single out one thing over all others, more than usually, for a particular purpose or person, in particulars

Essential:

Establish:

Extended producer responsibility (EPR): “a policy approach under which producers are given a significant responsibility – financial and/or physical – for the treatment or disposal of post-consumer products. Assigning such responsibility could in principle provide incentives to prevent wastes at the source, promote product design for the environment and support the achievement of public recycling and materials management goals...[including]...waste streams such as electrical appliances and electronics.” (OECD: <https://www.oecd.org/env/tools-evaluation/extendedproducerresponsibility.htm>.)

Facilitate: to make easier; to help bring about (Merriam Webster)

Few: should be interpreted to mean not many, but more than one. An indefinitely small number.

Foster: to encourage the development of something

Fraud: wrongful or criminal deception intended to result in financial or personal gain

Governance:

Immediate:

Impact: defined as reduced new infection rates or as improvements in survival. It results from the coverage of services, modulated by the efficiency and effectiveness of interventions and changes in other relevant factors. Impact goals were set in the context of the Millennium Development Goals.

Implement: when a reference is made to “implement” it should be interpreted to mean taking steps forward. While the commitment may be a part of a longer-term initiative and actions on it may continue into the prolonged future, steps need to be taken in the near future to be considered implementation. This should not, therefore, be interpreted to mean only prolonged or delayed action.

Implementation: the process of making something active or effective (Merriam Webster).

Improve: improve is defined as “make or become better” or “produce something better than” (as improve upon) (OECD 1990:594). In a G20 context, when a commitment states that it will “improve” it should be interpreted to mean that old initiatives will be updated. It should not be interpreted to mean a brand new initiative.

Including:

Inclusive: all parties are included in the discussion and decision making process taking into account relative capabilities.

Increasing: when a commitment indicates that it will “increase” efforts it should be interpreted to mean additional efforts to an old commitment. It should not be interpreted as adding new efforts in new ways.

Inefficient: not producing the effect intended or desired

Initiate: when a commitments states that it will “initiate” it should be interpreted to mean new efforts. It should not apply to old efforts or initiatives that have been referred to in the past.

Intensify: increase existing actors

Joint (efforts):

Land-based sources of pollution: “the deposition of solid or liquid waste materials on land or underground in a manner that can contaminate the soil and groundwater, threaten public health, and cause unsightly conditions and nuisances. The waste materials that cause land pollution are broadly classified as municipal solid waste (MSW, also called municipal refuse), construction and demolition (C&D) waste or debris, and hazardous waste...[in addition to]...sewage disposal...” (see commitment G20 2017-299 for additional details) (Brittanica)

Legitimacy:

Long-term: medium term is from the summit cycle until five years; and long term is any commitment with a delivery date of over five years.

Mainstreaming:

Make effort: when a commitment states it will “make an efforts” it should be interpreted to mean efforts in the immediate future. It could be based on old efforts, but new steps or initiatives need to accompany the commitment. It should not be interpreted to apply to compliance that has already taken place in the area.

Market manipulation: a deliberate attempt to interfere with the free and fair operation of the market and create artificial, false or misleading appearances with respect to the price of, or market for, a security, commodity or currency

Meaningful: should be interpreted to mean in an important or significant way. See *significantly* for further instruction.

Measure: when a commitment states that it will “measure” it should be interpreted to mean that steps should be made toward something that is assessable. It should be clear and not vague. It should be shown that measurement is possible, either by past examples, or clear descriptions of how it will be implemented in the future.

Medium-term: medium term is from the summit cycle until five years; [G20 2008-51]

Meet shortfall: when a commitment states it will “meet shortfalls” it should be interpreted as referring to past initiatives that have failed to be met. It should not be interpreted to apply to new initiatives or old initiatives that have met full compliance.

Moving forward: when a reference is made to “moving forward” it should be interpreted to mean taking additional steps and should include new initiatives in the area. It should not include past compliance efforts, or continued fulfillment of old promises.

Need to: obligation (Merriam Webster); to have to have something, or to want something very much (Cambridge Dictionary).

Openness: the term should be interpreted within the context of the commitment and taken to mean either, unrestricted access to something or to be transparent.

Operationalization (G20 2011-247):

Outcome (G20 2011-247)

Outstanding:

Particularly: deserving of special mention, to a higher degree than is usual or average. Synonym is “especially.”; to give special emphasis to a point, specially.

Phase out: To bring or come to an end, one stage at a time. The particular time may or may not be specified in the commitment itself e.g., phase out over medium term.

Pollution/environmental pollution: “the addition of any substance (solid, liquid, or gas) or any form of energy (such as heat, sound or radioactivity) to the environment at a rate faster than it can be dispersed, diluted, decomposed, recycled, or stored in some harmless form. The major kinds of pollution, usually classified by environment, are air pollution, water pollution, and land pollution...Pollution of all kinds can have negative effects on the environment and wildlife and often impacts human health and well-being.” (Britannica)

Polluter pays principle: “is the commonly accepted practice that those who produce pollution should bear the costs of managing it to prevent damage to human health or the environment...[It] is part of a set of broader principles to guide sustainable development worldwide (formally known as the 1992 Rio Declaration). (LSE: <https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/explainers/what-is-the-polluter-pays-principle/>).

Preventing:

Promote: support or renew old efforts or create new efforts in the area. It should not have to be a brand new initiative. To contribute to growth or prosperity of, to help bring into being.

Promptly:

Pursue: follow in order to catch or capture, to try to get a do over a period of time.

Put in place: to exist and be capable of being used (Macmillan Dictionary)

Rationalize: to rationalize is to justify or to give an explanation as to the meaning of the issue/items being discussed.

Reaffirm: “affirm again” whereby affirm is to assert strongly, state as fact, confirm or ratify a judgment (OECD 1990).

Realistic: should be interpreted to mean practical or obtainable. It should not be interpreted to mean far-reaching or ideal.

Realize: to bring into concrete existence; accomplish (Merriam Webster)

Recognize: to acknowledge formally (Merriam Webster). It should be interpreted to mean explicit acknowledgement of something

Rectify: adjust or make right, correct or amend (OECD 1990).

Reform:

Reiterate (G20 2013-140):

Relevance:

Resolve:

Respect:

Review: a formal assessment of something with the intention of instating change if necessary

Remain committed, reaffirm commitment or 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.

Resilience:

Rights:

Robust: should be interpreted as an inclusive action. Something embodying strength.

Scaling up: should be interpreted to mean progression or movement forward. It does not include past or previous performance. It does not include action already taken. It can include past measures if further or additional attention is applied to them.

Short-term: short term is measured from summit to summit;

Significantly: when a commitment states that it will achieve or work “significantly” or in a “significant way” the work must be meaningful or to an important degree, suggesting it must matter in the eyes of the public. It must not occur by accident or chance and therefore it should be statistically significant.

Stand ready:

State-building:

Steps:

Strengthening: to make or become stronger

Strong: effective; of a good quality or level and likely to be successful (Cambridge).

Subsidy: financial aid given by the government to individuals or groups.

Substantially: an ample or considerable amount in the eyes of the public. Considered of importance. It should be essential to the whole. It should not be minimal or small in comparison to the other parts.

Support: the action, or act of providing aid, assistance, or backing up an initiative, or entity.

To stimulate: to encourage something to grow, develop, or become active. (Cambridge Dictionary)

Take concrete steps: when a commitment states that it will take “concrete steps” it should be interpreted to mean visible new steps, which could apply to new or old initiatives. It should not be interpreted to mean questionable compliance or half-hearted actions.

Threat:

Together with:

Transparent: open, frank, candid.

Undertake:

Universal: when a commitment states a target of “universal” access it should be interpreted to mean all of the intended group. It should not be interpreted to mean a partial or percentage of the whole. It should not be interpreted to mean a small amount or a minority.

Urgently: when a reference states it must be employed “urgently” it should be interpreted as a short-term initiative that should be put into action in the present and/or very near future. It should not include prolonged and/or delayed efforts and compliance.

Work (G20 2013-140):

Work towards: actors are applying international diplomacy, such as drafting proposals, putting forth new ideas, encouraging new initiatives, etc. It does not include putting forward no effort, resisting or destroying efforts put forth by other actors, or merely tagging along with the consensus reached.

Catalogue of Concepts

Words or phrases used in commitments should be interpreted as they are meant. Words and/or phrases that have a deeper underlying meaning and cannot be understood upon first reading should be researched and interpreted as the leader's intended. If a word or phrase is still ambiguous the glossary in the appendix below can be used as a guide for how to interpret and measure such word and/or phrases.

Specific Interpretive Guidelines

In addition to the general interpretive guidelines, brand new commitment specific guidelines are necessary. It is necessary to breakdown the commitment and define the relevant words or phrases to increase the clarity for measurement purposes. The following terms have been defined from previously made commitments.

Access: access should be interpreted to mean the right to obtain or make use of the entity in reference. In terms of health, according to the World Health Organization "Access" is a broad concept, which, measures three dimensions of key health sector interventions:

1. *Availability*, defined in terms of the reachability (physical access), affordability (economic access) and acceptability (socio-cultural access) of services that meet a minimum standard of quality. Making services available, affordable and acceptable is an essential precondition for universal access.
2. *Coverage*, defined as the proportion of a population needing an intervention who receive it. Coverage is influenced by supply (provision of services) and by demand from people in need of services.
3. *Impact*, defined as reduced new infection rates or as improvements in survival. It results from the coverage of services, modulated by the efficiency and effectiveness of interventions and changes in other relevant factors. Impact goals were set in the context of the Millennium Development Goals.

Aid for Trade: development assistance funding that finances trade related initiatives. This includes funding for; the building of infrastructure, trade policy and regulations and trade-related adjustment, economic infrastructure and building productive capacity.

Climate change: means a change of climate which is attributed directly or indirectly to human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere and which is in addition to natural climate variability observed over comparable time periods — definition as per Article 1: Definitions, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (New York) 2014. Date of Access: 6 July 2014. http://unfccc.int/essential_background/convention/background/items/2536.php

Copenhagen Accord: an international climate change accord reached on 18 December 2009 at 15th Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

Common but differentiated: there is an understanding outlined in the UNFCCC that each country depending on their social and economic conditions has different capacities, strengths and weaknesses when it comes to implementing the Convention. It also acknowledged that the global nature of climate change calls for the widest possible cooperation by all countries

Deforestation: the deliberate cutting of trees to make room for cleared land, or for timber profits.

Development assistance or international aid, overseas aid, official development assistance (ODA) or foreign aid: aid given by governments and other agencies to support the economic, environmental, social and political development of developing countries. It is distinguished from humanitarian aid by focusing on alleviating poverty in the long term, rather than a short term response.

Digital Economy:

Financial inclusion is a complex and multidimensional. However, an inclusive financial system provides access to financial services for all in a reliable, convenient, affordable, continuous, and flexible manner by focusing on financially underserved as well as financially excluded.

Financial support can take the following forms: grants, interest-free loans or equity investments, and can be referred to as foreign aid, humanitarian assistance, development aid or official development aid.

Forests: tropical (and sub-tropical) rainforests are by far the most vulnerable to deforestation and illegal logging, but temperate forests are also mentioned in G8 reports and other types of forests include Mediterranean, boreal, coniferous, montane and plantation.

Fossil fuel subsidy: a form of financial assistance paid to fossil fuel producers or consumers.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Gases which exist in earth's atmosphere and trap the sun's radiation, producing heat and allowing for life to exist on earth. These gases include: water vapour; carbon dioxide; methane nitrous oxide and ozone. Human activity of burning fossil fuels, deforestation and intense agriculture and animal husbandry, all add huge quantities of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, trapping earth's heat and exacerbating climate change. Definition as per the David Suzuki Foundation, Climate Change Basics: Greenhouse Gases, 2014. Date of Access: 21 July 2014. <http://www.davidsuzuki.org/issues/climate-change/science/climate-change-basics/greenhouse-gases/>

Green recovery: a synergistic relationship between economic recovery and environmental protection. Financial contributions to the transition to a green economy through investment in any sustainable development initiative.

Innovation: "refers to the embodiment of an idea in a technology, product, or process that is new and creates value. An innovation is the implementation of a new or significantly improved product (good or service), or process which derives from creative ideas, technological progress, a new marketing method, a new organizational method in business practices, workplace organization or external relations. Innovation covers a wide range of domains with science and technology as the core." (G20 2016 Hangzhou: <http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/2016/160905-blueprint.html>).

Liquidity risk: a financial term to mean the risk that a given security or asset cannot be traded quickly enough in the market to prevent loss.

Liquidity cushion: a reserve fund containing money market and highly liquid investments.

Market manipulation: a deliberate attempt to interfere with the free and fair operation of the market and create artificial, false or misleading appearances with respect to the price of, or market for, a security, commodity or currency

National (Financial) regulatory system (G20 2008-51):

Objective provisions and principles: Outlined in the UNFCCC are unbiased democratically negotiated commitments and statements developed by the parties associated with the convention. These clauses are agreed upon by the group and therefore objective as they have not been developed by one party alone.

Policymaking:

Radicalization:

"Reducing Emissions from Deforestation": Given that forests, especially large tropical forests in Africa, South America and Southeast Asia, act as crucial carbon sinks, reducing deforestation increases the amount of carbon that these sinks are able to absorb each year. Reducing deforestation, protecting existing forests and re-foresting are all critical components of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and mitigating the effects of climate change.

Regulators: are supervisors who are to assess the adequacy and functioning of the institutional body and are expected to take action when necessary.

Review business conduct rules: an assessment of the manner in which a business operates, to ensure that the business does not act against the interests of its clients. While circumstances will vary from country to country, key issues to address include margin lending, blackout trading, “rumourage,” short selling, bribery, predatory lending practices, excessive executive pay practices (bonuses, dividends, share options, severance pay) and, more generally, a lack of transparency in the business sector, and a lack of oversight and supervision of market practices and regulatory standards.

Sink or carbon sink: anything that absorbs more carbon than it releases. The ocean, soil, and forests are all considered carbon sinks, as they absorb significant quantities of carbon. Forests are considered crucial carbon sinks as the tropical forests of Asia, Africa and South America alone absorb ‘about 18% of all carbon dioxide added by fossil fuels. Source: One-Fifth of Fossil Fuel Emissions Absorbed by Threatened Forests, Science Daily (Yorkshire) 19 February 2009. Date of Access: 6 July 2014. <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2009/02/090218135031.htm>

Sustainable forest management: a dynamic and evolving concept [which] aims to maintain and enhance the economic, social and environmental value of all types of forests, for the benefit of the present and future generations. Sustainable Forest Management (SFM)/REDD+, Global Environmental Facility, Investing in Our Future (Washington) 2013. Date of Access: 6 July 2014. <http://www.thegef.org/gef/contact>

Sustainable global growth: the pursuit of sustainable development where the pattern of resource use aims to meet human needs while preserving the environment; where this pursuit expands from domestic policy to the broader scope of international cooperation.

Strengthening cross-border cooperation: the process of working together to address issues including: cross-border tax evasion, money laundering, financing and providing of safe havens for terrorists, and illicit finance emanating from states.

Stress tests: test that assess bank resilience and include a “comprehensive firm-wide perspective across risks and different books.” Also includes tests across credit, market and liquidity risks and include severe and extreme market events. Banks should, at a minimum, outline details of the methodologies, models and scenarios selected for the conduct of the particular stress tests, as well as summary of the findings and results.

Technical cooperation or assistance: It is often associated with actions aimed at strengthening individual and organizational capacity by providing expertise (short- and long-term technical assistance personnel, institutional twinning arrangements, mobilization of diaspora, etc.), training and related learning opportunities (peer exchange, tertiary education, etc.), research and equipment. Technical cooperation can take the form of activities that boost the level of knowledge, skills, technical know-how or productive aptitudes of people in developing countries, or can be services such as consultancy, technical support or the provision of know-how that contribute to the execution of a capital project. Free-standing technical cooperation falls in the category of technical cooperation as much as technical cooperation that is embedded in an investment program or included in a program-based approach does.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC): a convention to unify countries in an effort to mitigate, adapt and finance climate change. The Conference of the Parties (COP) is the body that oversees the implementation of the convention and monitors progress.

Waste management: “the collecting, treating, and disposing of solid material that is discarded because it has served its purpose or is no longer useful.” (Britannica: <https://www.britannica.com/technology/solid-waste-management>).

Politically Binding level

John Kirton and Jessica Rapson (2020) proposed that the politically “binding level” of a commitment could be a compliance catalyst, with high(er) or strong(er) binding catalysing higher compliance. This could be because such strong binding is an expression of threat elusive but often invoked variable - a leader’s “political will.” It is distinct from the ambition or significance of the commitment itself, or where they contain one or both of instruments and outcomes inside.

Of the eight candidate causes of compliance and two controls that Kirton and Rapson (2020) assessed, the binding level of the commitment proved to be the strongest predictor of compliance and the strongest of the two catalysts that could be considered causes, rather than merely predictors, of compliance.

The reached this conclusion by coding the verb in the more than 200 G20 commitments assessed for compliance into two categories. Strong or high binding came from the use of such verbs as “promise”, “are determined to” or “pledge”. Weak or low binding came from the use of the verbs “support”, “should”, and “urge”. As they referred specifically on page 231 to the *Compliance Coding Manual* of the Global Governance Program, a more complete list and categorization can be compiled by using its relevant sections, as reproduced below. Also relevant may be the distinction between strong and weak commitments introduced by John Kirton and Brittaney Warren (2018) in analysing the commitments made at the G7 Environment ministers Meeting in Halifax in September 2018.

The easiest first step, and a direct replication of Kirton and Rapson (2020), is to take all the verbs in the first and second columns of the Compliance Coding Manual (all of which do or could represent the minimum threshold for one of the three criteria - “politically binding” - for a passage to be considered a (commitment” in the first place). The verbs in the first column (and similar ones not yet listed) would be coded as “strongly” or “highly” binding. Those in the second column would be considered low or weak, when they were counted, given the context, as commitments at all.

The second stage refinement took the following steps:

1. **New Verbs** used in compliance-assessed commitments but not included in any column in the coding manual (e.g. “strive” at G20 Osaka 2019) would be added, assigned to one column and coded as strong or weak.
2. **Repeated Commitments** (e.g. reaffirm, reiterate, reemphasize, remain) are coded as weak, as they lack innovation and assume that the prior commitment(s) have a. been unmet and that b. no additional action is required or specifically agreed to get them fulfilled now.
3. **Recoded Existing Verbs** by transferring them from either column to the other column or category. Thus “endorse” in the first column would be considered and categorized/coded as a weak/low binding commitment. Also, the verbs “shall ourselves object, need to/must ensure/necessary (expresses obligation)” would be considered/categorized/coded as a strongly or highly binding commitment.
4. **Dictionary Definitions** of each old and new verb would be added to show the binding “strength” of each, taking into account the context in which it was used in the commitments. Thus “commit” might be considered stronger than “agree”.
5. **Double Verbs** in a commitment could be coded according to the binding strength of: a. the first one used, b. the strongest one used in any order, c. the average all verbs used, d. the context signaled by the following known.
6. **Adverb Added.** eg We strongly commit to, We will strongly support, We are fully determined to

7. **Passive Tense.** signals low binding, as does even a mere causal direction that constitutes a weak commitments, per the study by John Kirton and Brittaney Warren on the G7 Environment Ministers' Meeting at Halifax in September 2018.

Dictionary Definitions (The Concise Oxford Dictionary 1990)

Agree: “hold a similar opinion, consent, become or be in harmony, suit, be good for, have the same number, gender, case or person, reach agreement about, consent or approve of terms, bring things into harmony, decide by mutual consent” [seems moderate]

Establish. “set up or consolidate (a business, system, etc) on a permanent basis.”

Commit. “entrust or consign for, treatment, perpetuate, pledge, involve or deep bind (esp oneself) to a certain course or policy, morally dedicated or politically aligned, obliged to take certain action, ...join”, [thus strong due to “deep bind” and “obliged” per Abbot et al precision, obligation, delegation POD criteria]

Support: “carry all or part of the weight of, keep from falling or sinking or failing, provide with a home or the necessities of life, enable to last out, give strength to, encourage, bear out, tend to substantiate or corroborate, give help or countenance to, back up, second, further, be actively interested in, take a part that is secondary to the principal actor, assist”

Strive: “try hard, make efforts, struggle or contend”. Hence strong due to hard, struggle

Task. Verb. (as in “we task our ministers”) “assign a task to”, (not “make great demands on” etc). Task as a noun is “a piece of work to be done or undertaken”

Appendix B: Application - Binding Level of G20 Climate Commitments

Commitment	Low/High	Compliance	
2009L-84: We <i>agree</i> to make the <i>best possible</i> use	[L]	-0.10	45%
2009P-85: We <i>will</i> intensify our efforts...an agreement must	[H]	+0.73	87%
2010T-56: We <i>reiterate</i> our commitment	[L]	+0.40	70%
2010T-57: Those of us ... <i>reaffirm</i> our support ... & call on	[L]	-0.06	47%
2010T- 58: We are committed ... & determined to ensure	[H]	+0.89	95%
2010S-131: We <i>reiterate</i> our commitment	[L]	+0.25	63%
2010S-132: Those of us... <i>reaffirm</i> our support for it	[L]	+0.47	74%
2010S-133: We all are <i>committed</i> to achieving	[H]	+0.30	65%
2010S-134: We are <i>committed</i> to <i>support</i> [High due to first verb rule, but “are”]	[H]	-0.75	13%
2011C-241 We <i>will</i> promote...in order to optimize.. and ensure	[H]	+0.65	83%
2011-247 We <i>stand ready</i> to work towards	[L]	-0.45	28%
2012-91: We <i>reiterate</i> our commitment	[L]	+0.70	85%
2012-230: We are <i>committed</i> to promote... and to continue	[H]	+1.00	100%
2013-188 We <i>support</i> the operationalization of GCF	[L]	-0.20	40%
2014-75: ...our actions <i>will support</i> sustainable development	[H]	+0.70	
2014-76: ...our actions <i>will support</i> economic growth	[H]	+0.70	
2014-77: ...our actions <i>will support</i> certainty for business	[H]	+0.80	
2014-79: We <i>reaffirm</i> our support for mobilising finance	[L]	+0.10	55%
2014-80: [We <i>reaffirm</i> our support for mobilising finance for M	[L]	+0.25	63%
2015-86: We <i>affirm</i> our determination to adopt	[H]	+0.70	85%
2016-129: We <i>reiterate</i> our commitment to sustainable development	[L]	+0.45	73%
2016-130: We <i>commit</i> to complete our respective domestic	[H]	+0.85	93%
2017-73: We <i>remain</i> collectively committed to mitigate	[L]	+0.60	80%
2017-278: <i>help</i> overcome institutional and market barriers	[L]	+0.90	95%
2017-475: The G20 <i>will</i> promote adaptation efforts	[H]	+0.65	83%
2017-476: We <i>stress</i> our support for national adaptation	[L]	+0.10	55%
2017-479: We <i>reemphasise</i> the commitment by developed	[L]	-0.15	43%
2018-55: <i>Recognize</i> ... In this sense, we <i>support</i> actions [[first verb rule = recognize, link of “in this sense”]	[L]	+0.40	70%
2018-56: reaffirm & <i>commit</i> to its <i>full</i> implementation [[reaffirm is preambular, commit is the verb]	[H]	+0.74	87%