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Preface

Each year since 1996, the G8 Research Group has produced a compliance report on the progress made by the G8 member countries in meeting the commitments issued at each leaders’ summit. Since 2002, the group has published an interim report, timed to assess progress at the transition between one country’s year as host and the next, and then a final report issued just before the leaders meet at their annual summit. These reports, which monitor each country’s efforts on a carefully chosen selection of the many commitments announced at the end of each summit, are offered to the general public and to policy makers, academics, civil society, the media and interested citizens around the world in an effort to make the work of the G8 more transparent and accessible, and to provide scientific data to enable meaningful analysis of this unique and informal institution. Compliance reports are available at the G8 Information Centre at <www.g8.utoronto.ca/compliance/>.

The G8 Research Group is an independent organization based at the University of Toronto. Founded in 1987, it is an international network of scholars, professionals and students interested in the activities of the G8. The group oversees the G8 Information Centre, which publishes, free of charge, analysis and research on the G8 as well as makes available official documents issued by the G8.

For the 2006 Final Compliance report, 20 priority commitments were selected from the record 317 commitments made at the St. Petersburg Summit, hosted by the Russian Federation from July 18 to May 15, 2006. This final report assesses the results of compliance with those commitments as the leaders prepare to meet, with Germany as host, in Heiligendamm from June 6 to 8, 2007.

To make its assessments, the G8 Research Group relies on publicly available information, documentation and media reports. In an ongoing effort to ensure the accuracy, integrity and comprehensiveness of these reports, we encourage comments and suggestions. Any feedback remains anonymous and would not be attributed. Responsibility for this report’s contents lies exclusively with the authors and analysts of the G8 Research Group.

The work of the G8 Research Group would not be possible without the dedication of many people around the world. In particular, this report is the product of a team of energetic and hard-working analysts directed by Janet Chow, chair of the student executive, as well as Brian Kolenda and Matto Mildenberger, with the support of Dr Ella Kokotsis, Director of Analytical Research, and Laura Sunderland, Senior Researcher.

John Kirton
Director
G8 Research Group
Toronto, Canada
Executive Summary

The University of Toronto’s G8 Research Group has completed its eleventh annual G8 Summit Compliance Report, this year assessing the compliance of G8 countries with 20 representative commitments agreed to at the 2006 St. Petersburg Summit. Looking to all actions by G8 countries between 18 July 2006 and 15 May 2007, this report allows for an objective assessment of the St. Petersburg summit before the start of the upcoming G8 Summit in Heiligendamm, Germany from 6-8 June 2007.

The final compliance scores are summarized in Table A, with individual analytic assessments by country and issue area in the sections below.

This report spans 20 priority commitments, including three from the Summit’s ‘Fight Against Infectious Disease’ theme (Global Fund, Tuberculosis, Polio), three from the Summit’s ‘Education for Innovative Society in the 21st century’ theme (Academic Mobility, Education Qualification Systems, Gender Disparities), and five from the Summit’s ‘Global Energy Security’ theme (Oil and Energy Reserve Data Collections, Energy Intensity, Surface Transport, Renewable Energy, Climate Change). Each analyzed commitment is surveyed across all G8 countries plus the European Union (EU).

The Overall Final Compliance Score

The final compliance scores reveal that during the compliance period from 18 July 2006 to 15 May 2007, the average compliance score across all issue areas and G8 countries was 47% (see Table A). This average is based on a scale whereby 100% is equivalent to perfect compliance and -100% means that the member governments are either non-compliant or are, in fact, doing the opposite of what was committed to. A score of “0%” suggests a work in progress, whereby a commitment has been initiated, but not yet completed within the one year time frame.

Final and Interim Compliance Levels at G8 Summits: 1996-2006

The final compliance score is up modestly from the interim compliance score of 35%, assessing compliance as of 31 December 2006 at the time of the transfer of the G8 presidency from Germany to Russia. This final compliance score of 47% is significantly lower than recent summits, and is a 28 percent decline from the 65% registered for the Gleneagles summit (2005). It is also the lowest final compliance score since the 33% registered for the Kananaskis Summit (2002). While it is thus also substantially lower than the 54% compliance at Sea Island (2005) and 51% compliance at Evian (2004), it also falls below the 48% average final compliance score for all summits since the G8RG began undertaking compliance studies at the Lyons Summit (1996).

Compliance by Country

Canada, United States and the United Kingdom set the compliance standard across all 20 commitments each with a score of 60%. While for Canada and the United Kingdom, this reflects historical high levels of compliance, for the United States it confirms a recent trend of increased compliance with G8 commitments. Similarly, the EU continues its historical levels of high compliance by placing a close fourth, with a compliance score of 58%. The EU had been at the head of the
compliance pack in both the Gleneagles and Sea Island summit periods with exceptional compliance scores.

**Final 2006 St. Petersburg Final Country Compliance**

- **Germany**, which assumed the G8 presidency in January 2007, follows in the fifth position at 55% compliance, a modest decline from its historical compliance high in the Gleneagles compliance period where it placed third. In the next tier of compliance, **Russia** registers a record 45% compliance, for a placement of sixth place. Russia had lagged other G8 members during all previous compliance periods, attaining a rank of no higher than eighth. This year, it sees a meteoric rise from its benchmark compliance scores of 0% at Kananaskis (2002) and Sea Island (2004). Following close behind, **France** and **Japan** tie for seventh place with each achieving a compliance score of 40%. For **France**, the arc of high compliance that began with Okinawa (2000) and lasted through to Evian (2003) has definitely dissipated as, for the third consecutive summit, it lags behind the compliance pack. For Japan, this continues recent levels of low compliance. **Italy** registers exceptionally depressed compliance, well behind all of its G8 peers, recording 5% compliance and reaffirming its historical record of poor G8 compliance. No G8 country scores in the negative range for its compliance score.

Still, for seven of the eight G8 member countries, as well as the European Union, the final compliance score is down relative to their compliance score at this point during the Gleneagles compliance period. These declines range in scope from a 19% decline for Italy to an 8% decline for Japan. This includes...
the EU and the United States, that despite their historical overperformance, have compliance scores 17% and 18% lower respectively than they registered at Gleneagles. By contrast, Russia records a 27% increase in compliance relative to its final compliance score for Gleneagles, emphasizing the short-term and long-term character of its increase.

Since the G8RG also produces an interim compliance report that assesses compliance with St. Petersburg commitments from the summit through to 31 December 2006, it is possible to evaluate general trends in compliance over the course of the St. Petersburg compliance period. Overall, compliance scores increased in 10 of the 20 commitment areas. At one extreme, the European Union, Germany, Canada and the United Kingdom all exhibited particularly front-loaded compliance patterns, with their compliance scores changing relatively little since December 2006. For Germany, a leader in compliance at the interim period, this has shifted it back to the upper middle of the compliance pack. For Canada, this is an unusual pattern; historically, Canadian compliance has tended to be very concentrated in the second half of the compliance period. Russia and the United States, and to a lesser degree France, on the other hand, all have shown significant evidence of compliance score improvement since the interim compliance report.

The Compliance Gap between Countries

After reaching 0.75 for the Gleneagles Compliance period, the compliance gap between member countries decreased somewhat to 0.55 (60% for the UK, USA and Canada compared to 5% for Italy). This compliance gap is similar to the compliance gap of 0.58 at Evian (2003), modestly lower than the 0.66 of Sea Island (2004) and significantly less than the record 0.93 at Kananaskis (2002). Removing Italy, the gap between first place (60%) and 7th place Japan and France (30%) is only 0.30.

Compliance by Issue Area

Compliance by issue area varies considerably across the commitments considered. Of the 20 priority issues assessed, only the Oil and Energy Reserve Data (JODI) commitment and the Middle East/Lebanon commitment that called for the provision of economic and humanitarian support to the Lebanese people achieved perfect compliance scores of 100%. Here, perfect compliance reflects unanimous efforts to enhance the collecting and reporting of market data on oil and other energy sources, and alternatively, sufficient and substantial economic and humanitarian support for Lebanon.

Final 2006 St. Petersburg Issue Area Compliance

Six other commitments attain scores above 50% compliance. A commitment to facilitate the development of renewable energy in developing countries attained a score of 89%, as did the G8 commitment to debt relief. Close behind, a commitment reaffirming the G8’s Gleneagles commitments on climate change follows in fifth place with a score of 78%. Finally, three commitments record scores of 56%: first, a commitment to securing global critical energy infrastructure from terrorist attack, second, a commitment supporting the Global Partnership against non-proliferation, and third, a commitment supporting the Global Fund. Four commitments achieved the median compliance score, 44%; a commitment to pursue the eradication of polio; a commitment to increase academic mobility...
between G8 countries; a commitment to continue supporting the creation of an African Standby Force; and finally, a commitment to pursue alternative and cleaner forms of surface transportation. Another duo of commitments witnessed a below-median 33% compliance. These relate to consideration of energy-intensity targets and exchange of information about education qualification systems. At 22% compliance come commitments that support the elimination of gender disparities in education in the developing world and support for the Global Plan to support TB. A commitment to reduce trade-distorting agricultural subsidies follows closely at 11%. Finally, two commitments score 0% compliance: first, one relating to support for UN reforms for more efficient peacekeeping operations, and a second committing to combat transnational crime and corruption. No commitments scored in the negative range.

Compliance in Summit Priority Issue Areas

The Russian government identified three thematic priorities for the St. Petersburg summit: energy security, infectious diseases, and education. Compliance in these issue areas varied. Five representative commitments were drawn from the energy security summit document. These had an average compliance score of 69%, substantially higher than the overall interim compliance average of 47% but approximately at historical averages for these issue areas. Compliance with the infectious disease and education commitments were more depressed, with the G8 registering average compliance scores of 33% and 41%, respectively. This compliance level was below the 2006 St. Petersburg final compliance average of 47%, and also below historical compliance levels in health and education commitments since 1996.

Final 2006 St. Petersburg Priority Issue Compliance
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Special Considerations

In evaluating the results of this report, the following considerations should be kept in mind.

- Compliance has been assessed against a selected set of priority commitments, rather than all commitments the last summit produced. The priority commitments selected were 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 here, summits have value in establishing new principles in normative directions, in creating and highlighting issue areas and agenda items, and in altering discursive constraints. Furthermore, some of the most important decisions reached and consensuses forged at summits may occur entirely in private and not be 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 a G8 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 U.S., the Queen’s Speech in the UK 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 G8 commitment.

- Compliance here is assessed against the precise commitments made by the G8, rather than what some might regard as necessary or appropriate action to resolve a particular issue.

- 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 welcome (see below).

- Because the evaluative scale used in this compliance report runs from −100 percent to +100 percent, it should assumed that any score in the positive range represents at least some compliance with the specific commitments made by the G8. 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 G8.

- 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 G8 with a commitment is contingent on cooperative behaviour on the part of other actors.

- The report was compiled in conjunction with the team from the State University Higher School of Economics. Analysts based in Russia and Canada collaborated on the reports for Germany.
and Russia, but the Toronto team had final responsibility for all Germany scores and the HSE team had final responsibility for all Russian scores.

**Further Research and Reports**

The information contained within this report provides G8 member countries and other stakeholders with an indication of their compliance results in the post-St. Petersburg period. As with previous compliance reports, this report has been produced as an invitation for others to provide additional or more complete information on country compliance with the 2006 St. Petersburg commitments. As always, comments are welcomed and would be considered as part of an analytical reassessment. Please send your feedback to g8@utoronto.ca.
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Table A: 2006 St. Petersburg Final Compliance Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>CAD</th>
<th>FRA</th>
<th>GER</th>
<th>ITA</th>
<th>JAP</th>
<th>RUS</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>EU</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Health (Global Fund)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Health (Tuberculosis)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Health (Polio)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Energy (Oil and Energy Reserve Data Collection)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Energy Intensity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Surface Transport</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Renewable Energy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Education (Academic Mobility)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Education (Qualification Systems)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Education (Gender Disparities)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Africa (Security)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Africa (Debt Relief)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Transnational Crime and Corruption</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Intellectual Property Rights</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Trade (Export Subsidies, Agriculture)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Counter-terrorism (Energy)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Stabilization and Reconstruction (UN)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Global Partnership (Non-Proliferation)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Middle East (Lebanon)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Country Average: 0.60 0.40 0.55 0.05 0.40 0.45 0.60 0.60 0.58

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Country Average</th>
<th>All Issue Average</th>
<th>2006 Final Compliance Average</th>
<th>2006 Interim Compliance Average</th>
<th>2005 Final Compliance</th>
<th>2005 Interim Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Final Compliance</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Final Compliance</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Interim Compliance</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                    |                   |                  |                               |                                 |                       |                        |
|                                    | Indicates increase since 2006 interim | Indicates decrease since 2006 interim |

Note:
+1 represents full compliance.
0 represents partial compliance.
-1 represents no compliance
The average score by issue is the average of all countries’ compliance scores for that issue. The average score by country is the average of all issue scores for a given country. The overall compliance average is an average of the overall issue average and overall country average. N/A represents scores where either a commitment is considered irrelevant to a particular party or insufficient data has been gathered to make an assessment of compliance with a commitment; such scores are excluded from the average.
Table B: G8 Compliance by Country, 1996-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summit Location</th>
<th>Lyon 96-97</th>
<th>Denver 97-98</th>
<th>Birmingham 98-99</th>
<th>Cologne 99-00</th>
<th>Okinawa 00-01</th>
<th>Genoa 01-Feb</th>
<th>Kananaskis Mar-02</th>
<th>Kananaskis Mar-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summit Date</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Interim</td>
<td>Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8+EU</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Commitments: 19 6 7 6 12 9 13 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summit Location</th>
<th>Evian Apr-03</th>
<th>Evian Apr-03</th>
<th>Sea Island May-04</th>
<th>Sea Island May-04</th>
<th>Gleneagles Jun-05</th>
<th>Gleneagles Jun-05</th>
<th>St. Petersburg Jul-06</th>
<th>St. Petersburg Jul-06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summit Date</td>
<td>Interim</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Interim</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Interim</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Interim</td>
<td>Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8+EU</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Commitments: 12 12 18 18 21 21 20 20
1. Global Fund on HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria [31]

Commitment

“We will work with other donors and stakeholders in the effort to secure funds needed for the 2006-2007 replenishment period and call upon all concerned to participate actively in the development of a four-year strategy, aimed at building a solid foundation for the activities of the Fund in the years ahead.”

Fight Against Infectious Disease

Background

The Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria was formed at the 2000 Okinawa Summit and formally launched at the 2002 International AIDS Conference in Barcelona. The Global Fund is a private-public partnership between governments, civil society, the private sector and communities around the world. It aims to finance projects that support the eradication, treatment or prevention of those diseases which cumulatively kill approximately 6 million people a year. At the 2006 St. Petersburg Summit, the G8 countries renewed their commitment toward combating HIV/AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis through the financing mechanism of the Global Fund. The G8 affirmed their goal of replenishing the Global Fund’s 2006-2007 funding period as well as encouraging the global community to actively work towards the development of the four-year Strategic Framework. Commitments to replenish the Global Fund have been made at past G8 Summits: 2003 Evian and 2005 Gleneagles.

Several contributions towards the Global Fund have been made since the July 2006 Mid-Term Replenishment Review Meeting in Durban, South Africa to close the 2007 funding gap of 2.1 billion—most notably, a pledge of US$500 million by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation distributed from 2006-2010 and a major contribution from the United States of USD747 million for 2007. In order to achieve successful compliance, G8 countries are expected to contribute their “fair share” in pledges towards the closing of the funding gap. Under the Fund-the-Fund campaign, 100 international organizations came together to support the Equitable Contributions Framework.

The Equitable Contributions Framework is a formula developed to show the world’s forty-seven wealthiest states what their “fair share” contribution to the Global Fund to Fight for HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria should be based on the Global Fund’s total budget relative to a country’s GDP and economic capability. We have, where possible, to relied heavily on the ‘fair share’ analysis of the Global AIDS Alliance’s ‘Donor Report Card’.

In addition, G8 member states have committed to actively support and participate in the development of a four-year Strategic Framework. This Strategic Framework will ultimately solidify the activities and initiatives of the Global Fund for the coming four years. The first elements of the Framework were adopted at the Global Fund’s Fourteenth Board Meeting from 31 October to 3 November 2006 in

1 Fight Against Infectious Disease, St. Petersburg Summit Documents, U of T G8 Information Centre, (Toronto), 16 July 2006. Date of Access: 7 October 2006. www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2006stpetersburg/infdis.html
Guatemala City, Guatemala. The Fifteenth Board Meeting of the Global Fund took place from 25 to 27 April 2007 in Geneva, Switzerland.

Team Leader: Sadia Rafiquddin

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada: +1

Canada has achieved full compliance with its St. Petersburg Summit commitments to the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. As of March 2007, Canada has fully contributed its 2006 and 2007 pledge of USD221,199,788 to the replenishment of the Global Fund (CAD125 million for 2006 and CAD125 million for 2007). Canada is apparently short its ‘fair share’ as calculated by the Global AIDS Alliance by at least CAD60 million. However, this threshold was calculated on the basis of feedback from Canadian NGOs in a deviation from methodology used to calculate other G8 countries’ ‘fair shares’. The funds contributed to date (CAD250 for 2006 and 2007) represented 4.9% of total donations as of March 2007, significantly more than Canada’s usual 3.75% share of total donations to UN and other organizations. In a press release dated 30 March 2007, the Canadian International Development Agency reiterated Canada’s commitment to collaborating with the Global Fund in order to achieve the Millennium Development Goal of combating HIV/AIDS, Malaria and other diseases. Canada was present at the Fourteenth Board Meeting of the Global Fund in Guatemala City from 31 October to 3 November 2006, and was active in developing the first elements of the four-year Strategic Framework.

Analyst: Stephanie Ing

France: +1

France has complied with its St. Petersburg commitments to replenishing the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria and to develop a long-term four-year Strategic Framework. France fully met its replenishment pledge of EUR225 in 2006. In a statement released 8 February

---

2007, Foreign Minister Philippe Douste-Blazy reiterated France’s unwavering commitment to the Global Fund as the primary multilateral instrument for fighting HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria, and repeated its pledge of EUR300 million for the 2007 replenishment period. In a speech delivered on 29 March 2007 at the 4ème Conference francophone sur le VIH/SIDA in Paris, President Jacques Chirac emphasized France’s commitment to the Global Fund, and called on the international community to meet the Millennium Development Goal to halt and reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS. Furthermore, France participated in the First Meeting on the Second Voluntary Replenishment Mechanism, held in Oslo, Norway in March 2007, where donor states discussed the resource needs scenarios for the Second Replenishment. In addition, France has achieved compliance for its commitment to actively support the development of the four-year Strategic Framework. France’s strong financial and political commitments to the replenishment of the Global Fund and development of the four year strategic framework demonstrate its full compliance with St. Petersburg Summit commitments.

**Analyst: Stephanie Ing**

**Germany: 0**

Germany has achieved partial compliance with its commitment to replenish the Global Fund to Fight for HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria as well as participate in the development of a four-year Strategic Framework. German Chancellor Angela Merkel has stated her continuing support to tackle HIV/AIDS, most recently at the “Responsibility and Partnership—Together Against HIV/AIDS” conference from 12-13 March 2007. Moreover, Germany previously committed EUR300 million from 2002-2007 of which USD88,114,680 was pledged for 2006 and USD124,471,292 for 2007. These pledges account for only 46 percent of its “fair share” for 2006 and only 37 percent of its “fair share” for 2007. Further, Germany has failed to make any new contributions toward the Global Fund initiative during the current compliance period.

Germany’s performance towards the development of a four-year strategic framework was stronger. Germany participated in the Fourteenth Board Meeting of the Global Fund in Guatemala City from 31 October to 3 November 2006. This critical meeting was significant for the adoption of the first elements of the Global Fund’s four-year Strategic Framework. Germany also participated in the Fifteenth Board Meeting of the Global Fund held from 25-27 April 2007 in Geneva Switzerland.

Germany will need to take a leadership role in its capacity as the 2007 president of the G8 in order to address the commitment towards the Global Fund to Fight for HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. Chancellor Angela Merkel has emphasized that African growth and development will be a significant

---

focus of the 2007 Heiligendamm Summit, with priority given to HIV/AIDS and health care. To have successfully complied with the St. Petersburg Summit commitment to the Global Fund, Germany would have to commit new pledges for the 2006-2007 replenishment period.

**Analyst: Sadia Rafiuddin and Igor Churkin**

### Italy: 0

Italy has registered partial compliance with its St. Petersburg Summit commitments to the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria and to develop a long-term four-year Strategic Framework. Italy previously pledged EUR460 million to the Global Fund for the 2004-2007 period. Italy did not contribute to the replenishment fund in 2006, leaving an outstanding payment of EUR130 million, in addition to EUR20 million that has not been paid from 2005. For 2007, Italy has committed EUR130 million. On 29 January 2007 at the 8th African Union Summit in Addis Ababa, Prime Minister Romano Prodi announced that Italy would meet its 2006-2007 commitment to contribute EUR260 million to the replenishment of the Global Fund; this announcement has not been followed by any concrete measures. Italy further participated at the Fourteenth Board Meeting on the Global Fund in Guatemala City, where the first stages of the Global Fund’s four-year Strategic Framework were developed. In order to achieve full compliance for its St. Petersburg Summit commitments, Italy must achieve its financial pledges for the replenishment of the Global Fund.

**Analyst: Stephanie Ing**

### Japan: +1

Japan has fully complied with its commitment to the Global Fund’s 2006-2007 replenishment by making new contributions and has showed political support towards the four-year Strategic Framework. A press release dated 2 March 2007 stated that Japan has announced a new contribution of USD 186 million. This totaled 78% of the pledged amount for the 2002-2007 period, and increased Japan’s total contribution to the fund to over USD 662 million, “making it the organization’s third-largest donor.”

Japan was actively involved in planning the future activities of the Fund. The Japanese delegation attended the first meeting of the second Global Fund replenishment 2008-2010 in Norway from 6 to 7 March 2007, and discussed the results of the first replenishment period and the possibilities for the second replenishment period. Led by Masaru Tsuji, Deputy Director General of the Global Issues Department at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Japanese delegation also attended both the First Special Board Meeting held in Geneva from 8 to 9 February 2007 and the Fourteenth Board Meeting of the Global Fund in Guatemala City from 31 October to 3 November 2006. At the two meetings,
representatives from donor countries adopted the first elements of the strategy.\textsuperscript{37} Japan has set a strong record of support for the Global Fund and should continue it in the future.

\textit{Analyst: Stephanie Law}

\textbf{Russia: +1}

Russia has fully complied with its Saint Petersburg commitment to the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. It has provided funding for the 2006-2007 period and has supported the development of a four-year Strategic Framework. In line with its pledge to the Global Fund consisting of USD40 million by 2008, Russia has already contributed USD37.5 million.\textsuperscript{38}

As President of the G8 in 2006, Russia selected the fight against infectious diseases as one of the three central themes of the St. Petersburg Summit.\textsuperscript{39}

Russia contributed USD10 million to the Global Fund in 2006. In 2007 Russia pledged USD5 million and has already pledged USD5 million for 2008, one of only two G8 countries to have done so and already paid in USD2.5 million of that sum, being the only country that has made payments in 2007.\textsuperscript{40} During the St. Petersburg Summit, Russia announced its intention to reimburse the Global Fund the USD270 million which had been used to fund projects in the Russian Federation through 2010.\textsuperscript{41}

Additionally, Russia worked with other parties concerned with the fight against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. As part of its G8 Presidency, Russia hosted an international conference entitled “Global Challenges – Global Actions: Putting Forward G8 Initiatives in the Fight Against Infectious Diseases” in Moscow on 8 December 2006.\textsuperscript{42} Russia took the opportunity to urge the international community to honor its commitment to fight infectious diseases as outlined at the G8 Summit in St. Petersburg\textsuperscript{43}.

As a member of the Global Fund Board’s Policy and Strategy Committee,\textsuperscript{44} Russian representatives together with other G8 and non-G8 representatives contributed to the development of a four-year strategy for the Fund. At the Fourteenth Board Meeting of the Global Fund in Guatemala City in October and November 2006, Russia participated in the development of a four-year Strategic Framework.\textsuperscript{45} It was also present at the Fifteenth Board Meeting of the Global Fund in Geneva Switzerland from 25-27 April 2007.\textsuperscript{46}

Russia’s monetary contribution to the Global Fund, continued work with the other donors and participation in the development of a four-year strategy stand for full compliance and a score of + 1.

\textit{Analysts: Maria Kaloshkina and Adina Dediu}

\textbf{United Kingdom: 0}

The United Kingdom has achieved partial compliance with its Summit commitment to replenish the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. The UK has taken no initiative to continue its leadership role in funding the Global Fund, unlike its performance in 2005. Specifically, the UK has fallen 25 percent below its fair share of funding for 2006-2007\textsuperscript{47} which equates to USD116,487,000 for 2006 and USD200,400,802 for 2007. Moreover, the UK has made no new commitments since the St.

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
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Nonetheless, the US has demonstrated full compliance with its commitment to support the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria in 2008. Additionally, the US has refused to participate in many key financial developments for the Global Fund, including signing a new declaration of support for the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria in 2007.

It is important to note that the US lacks consistency in its contribution to the Global Fund. Initially, the US had committed USD300 million to the Global Fund for the fiscal year 2007, until Congress pushed for an increase to USD724 million in February 2007. Similarly, the US President has dedicated USD300 million to the Global Fund for the fiscal year 2008. Congress has passed a resolution that will reduce the budget for international affairs, including the Global Fund, for fiscal year 2008 by USD1.2 billion.

As such, the US should increase its involvement if it is to continue registering full compliance with its commitment. Nonetheless, the US has demonstrated full compliance with its commitment to support the replenishment of the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria for the 2006-2007 replenishment period as well as support for the development of the four-year strategy.

**United States: +1**

The United States demonstrated full compliance with its commitment to the Global Fund to Fight for HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. In a press release dated 21 February 2007, the Global Fund announced a new American contribution of USD724 million for 2007, thus securing funds for the 2006-2007 replenishment period. This means that the United States’ contribution to the Global Fund equates to 3 billion or 29% of all paid-in contributions and firm pledges to date. It also represents a 33% increase on its 2006 contribution. US legislation restricts the US contribution to the Global Fund to a limit of 33% of total contributions. As a result, American contributions should encourage other donors to comply with the commitment to ensure the US’ financial support. The US delegation, led by Mark Dybul, U.S. Global AIDS Coordinator, attended the first meeting of the second Global Fund replenishment 2008-2010 in Norway, from 6-7 March 2007, where decisions on the second replenishment period were made. The US showed continued support regarding the development of a Four Year Strategic Framework. The US delegation also attended the First Special Board Meeting held in Geneva from 8-9 February 2007 and the Fourteenth Board Meeting of the Global Fund in Guatemala City from 31 October to 3 November 2006 to decide on the initial elements of the four-year strategy.

It is important to note that the US lacks consistency in its contribution to the Global Fund. Initially, the US had committed USD300 million to the Global Fund for the fiscal year 2007, until Congress pushed for an increase to USD724 million in February 2007. Similarly, the U.S. President has dedicated USD300 million to the Global Fund for the fiscal year 2008. Congress has passed a resolution that will reduce the budget for international affairs, including the Global Fund, for fiscal year 2008 by USD1.2 billion. In effect, this restricts the potential for increased US contributions to the Global Fund in 2008. Additionally, the US has refused to participate in many key financial developments for directing funding to the Global Fund, including UNITAID.

As such, the U.S. should increase its involvement if it is to continue registering full compliance with its commitment. Nonetheless, the US has demonstrated full compliance with its commitment to support the replenishment of the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria for the 2006-2007 replenishment period as well as support development of the four-year strategic framework.

---


European Union: 0

The European Union has demonstrated partial compliance with its commitment to replenish the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria and participate in the development of a four year strategic framework. The European Commission has pledged USD723,247,115 from 2001-2006 to the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, of which USD 117,153,200 is allocated for 2006 and USD 84,699,454 forecast for 2007. In addition, on the occasion of World Aids Day on 1 December 2006, Members of the European Parliament called on the European Commission to increase its contribution to the Global Fund by EUR1 billion while also emphasizing the lack of research efforts on major epidemics. The European Commission has been actively involved in the development of the Global Fund’s Four Year Strategy. It participated at the Fourteenth Board Meeting of the Global Fund which took place in Guatemala City from 31 October to 3 November 2006 and was also present for the Fifteenth Board Meeting of the Global Fund in Geneva, Switzerland from 25-27 April 2007. In order for the European Union to achieve full compliance, it will need to provide new funding towards the Global Fund’s 2006-2007 replenishment period.

Analyst: Stephanie Law

---


2. Health: Tuberculosis [36]

Commitment

“We will also support the Global Plan to Stop TB, 2006-2015, which aims to cut TB deaths in half by the year 2015 compared to 1990 levels, saving some 14 million lives over ten years, and call upon all donors and stakeholders to contribute to its effective implementation.”

*Fight Against Infectious Disease*

Background

The G8 has pledged to eradicate Tuberculosis due to its increasing worldwide growth and its direct effects on those suffering from HIV/AIDS. This process began in earnest with the 2001 G8 commitment to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria and expanded a year later with the establishment of the G8 Africa Action Plan at Kananaskis. The 2003 Evian Summit brought to fruition the G8’s Health Action Plan designed to specifically to tackle the world’s most deadly diseases. The Gleneagles Summit furthered these moves with its focus on HIV/AIDS and Polio eradication. On 27 January 2006, in conjunction with leading members of the international community, the G8 countries signed on to the Global Plan to Stop TB, 2006-2015. The Stop TB plan “sets out the actions and funding needed over the next ten years to accelerate progress in the development of new tools to Stop TB (diagnostics, drugs and vaccines) and in country-level implementation to achieve the internationally agreed targets to Stop TB. These targets comprise the TB target of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the Partnership’s own targets for 2015, which are linked to the MDGs. The Plan has been developed in the context of wider MDG initiatives to reduce poverty. With its ten-year time period, this second Global Plan will support long-term regional and country planning needs.”

*Team Leader: Brian Kolenda and Jonathan Scotland*

Assessment

**2006 Final Compliance Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada: +1**

Canada has fully complied with its St. Petersburg Summit commitment to support the Global Plan to Stop TB. Canada’s major move towards compliance following St. Petersburg consists of a December 2006 announcement by International Co-operation Minister Josée Verner promising CAD120 million for global projects pertaining to infectious diseases. Although TB is not referenced specifically, the close

---

*64 Fight Against Infectious Disease, St. Petersburg Summit Documents, U of T G8 Information Centre, (Toronto), 16 July 2006. Date of Access: 7 October 2006. www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2006stpetersburg/infdis.html.*


connection between HIV/AIDS and TB infection rates make this announcement noteworthy. The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) pointed out on the occasion of World TB Day on 24 March 2007 that Canada has contributed on average CAD30 million annually to TB control efforts, including to the Global Drug Facility. Although Verner also announced a one-time grant of CAD20 million in March 2006, the balance of which was delivered by August 2006. Further, CIDA pledged a total of CAD22.1 million and delivered a total of CAD29.4 million (with an additional CAD3 million set to be disbursed the week of 28 May 2007) in "TB control efforts in support of the Global Plan".

This is evidence of significant compliant behaviour and merits a +1. Additionally, Canada has contributed funds to related initiatives such as the Global Fund to which it contributed USD221,199,788 in fall 2006 for 2006 and 2007.68

**Analyst: Brian Kolenda and Maria Ionescu**

**France: 0**

France has continued with its support to fight tuberculosis in the developing world and is on its way to achieving compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment to fight TB. On 1 November 2006, French President Jacques Chirac pledged France’s support for the International Union Against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease with a contribution of EUR300 million for 2007.69 President Chirac pledged EUR50 million in 2006 to UNITAID as part of its proceeds from the air-ticket solidarity levy; the proceeds from this levy are expected to rise to EUR200 million in a full year.70

On 13 March 2007, France attended a high-level ministerial meeting hosted in Bremen, Germany, between other European nations and international organizations entitled "Responsibility and Partnership Together Against HIV/AIDS". As a signatory of the resulting Bremen Declaration, France reiterated a commitment to Goal 6 of the Millennium Development Goals “to have halted and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis and other major diseases by 2015”.71 In spite of this, France has yet to announce new funding commitments to the Global Plan to Stop TB in the period between 20 July 2006 and 15 May 2006. Additionally, France has contributed funds to parallel initiatives to the Global Plan to Stop TB, such as the Global Fund, to which it has thus far pledged USD 3,415,301 in 2007. France has also pledged EUR372.8 million to the International Finance Facility for Immunisation (IFFIm) with an additional contribution totaling approximately USD2 billion pending parliamentary approval in 2007.72

**Analyst: Sophia Huda**

**Germany: 0**

Germany has not fully complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to support the Global Plan to Stop TB. Germany has yet to announce new funding commitments to the Global Plan to Stop TB in the period between 20 July 2006 and 1 May 2007. The German government has, however, contributed funds to parallel initiatives to the Global Plan to Stop TB, such as the Global Fund, to which it has pledged USD122,635,227 for 2007.73

---

On 13 March 2007, Germany hosted a high-level ministerial meeting as part of its EU presidency entitled "Responsibility and Partnership Together Against HIV/AIDS". The resulting Bremen Declaration, which Germany signed, reiterated a commitment to Goal 6 of the Millennium Development Goals "to have halted and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis and other major diseases by 2015".

On 22 March 2007 an "International Symposium on the occasion of World TB Day 2007" took place in Berlin, organized in part by the Germany Ministry of Health and German Central Committee against Tuberculosis (DZK). At the meeting the problem of Tuberculosis and further work in fighting the disease were discussed along with new initiatives.

Analyst: Elvira Omarbagaeva and Igor Churkin

**Italy: 0**

Italy has not yet fully complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to support the Global Plan to Stop TB. Although Italy pushed to ensure its G8 partners consider TB one of the priorities of the St. Petersburg Summit, it has yet to announce new commitments to the Global Plan in the period between 20 July 2006 and 1 May 2006.

On 13 March 2007, Italy attended a high-level ministerial meeting hosted in Bremen, Germany, between other European nations and international organizations entitled "Responsibility and Partnership Together Against HIV/AIDS". The resulting Bremen Declaration, which Italy signed, reiterated a commitment to Goal 6 of the Millennium Development Goals "to have halted and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis and other major diseases by 2015".

Italy has, however, contributed funds to parallel initiatives to the Global Plan to Stop TB, such as the Global Fund, to which it has pledged USD177,595,628 for 2007, and the International Finance Facility for Immunisation (IFFIm) to which Italy has pledged EUR473,450,000 over 20 years.

Analyst: Brian Kolenda and Maria Ionescu

**Japan: 0**

Japan has partially complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to support the Global Plan to Stop TB. Japan has yet to announce new funding commitments to the Global Plan to Stop TB in the period between 20 July 2006 and 1 May 2006. Despite its lack of funding for the St. Petersburg commitment, Japan has nonetheless contributed to parallel initiatives such as the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, to which the Japanese Department of Foreign Affairs contributed USD130 million on 15 March 2006.

Analyst: Jonathan Scotland

**Russia: 0**

Although Russia has shown progress towards complying with its St. Petersburg commitment to support the Global Plan to Stop TB, pledging USD500 million to G8 programs to fight infectious diseases.

---


diseases, fighting TB inside the country and working closely with other donors, there is no evidence that the country has contributed funds directly to the Global Plan to Stop TB.

As President of the G8 in 2006, Russia selected the fight against infectious diseases as one of the three central themes of the St. Petersburg summit. Russia has yet to announce new funding commitments to the Global Plan to Stop TB in the period between 20 July 2006 and 31 March 2007, but Russian State Sanitary Inspector Gennady Onishchenko did state that Russia’s contribution to G8 programs to fight infectious diseases would total USD500 million between 2006 and 2010.

Russia is also taking measures to fight TB inside the country. Goals to fight TB are included in the Russian Federal Target Program on Prevention of and Fight Against Social Diseases (2002-2006), which is currently being implemented. On the International day for fighting TB in Russia (24 March 2007), organized on the initiative of the WHO together with Russian Ministry for Health and Social Development, a press-conference was held in Moscow on 22March 2006. There, the Director of Russian Science Academy Central Research Institute for TB, Vladimir Erohin, stated that in the nearest future a new efficient TB vaccine will appear in Russia. Deputy Chief of Population Medical Assistance Department Ekaterina Kakorina stated that for 2007-2011 USD26.3 billion will be allocated to Federal Target Program for fighting TB, 40% of which derives from the federal budget. Deputy Director of Federal Service for Penalty Execution of Russian Federation Alexander Kononc announced that TB infection rates among prisoners are two-times less prevalent now than seven years ago.

Russia works with other parties concerned with fighting the disease. An international conference “Global challenges – global actions. Putting forward G8 initiatives on fight against infectious diseases” was held in Moscow on 8 December 8 2006 in the framework of the Russian Federation’s G8 Presidency. Representatives of the G8 countries and international organizations shared information about ongoing activities, aimed to move forward on related decisions undertaken at the 2006 Summit. At the conference Russia urged countries to honor their commitments to fighting TB both individually and multilaterally. The issue of fighting against infectious diseases was also raised at the 7th meeting of the Africa Partnership Forum in Moscow.

Analysts: Maria Kaloshkina and Elvira Omarbagaeva

United Kingdom: 0

In spite of its St. Petersburg commitment, the UK’s support of the Global Plan to Stop TB remains a work in progress. Failure to announce new funding commitments to the Global Plan to Stop TB in the period between 20 July 2006 and 1 May 2007 remains the primary impediment to full compliance. Like other G8 countries, however, the UK has not been idle in its efforts to combat TB. On 10 August 2006, International Development Minister Gareth Thomas announced GBP20 million for the UK’s new Three Diseases Fund designed to help fight TB, Malaria and HIV/AIDS. Additionally, prior to St. Petersburg, the UK gave GBP20 million to save 1 million lives in Burma.

89 About the 7th meeting of the Africa Partnership Forum, Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, (Moscow), 27 October 2006. Date of Access: 29 December 2006, www.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/sps/E7AF11CBBF1C1A01C3257214004E4123
in a 7 March 2006 declaration, Mr. Thomas announced a UK contribution of GBP6.5 million to, "kick start" funding to the Global Alliance for TB Drug Development.91

On 13 March 2007, the UK attended a high-level ministerial meeting hosted in Bremen, Germany, between other European nations and international organizations entitled "Responsibility and Partnership Together Against HIV/AIDS". The resulting Bremen Declaration, which the United Kingdom signed, reiterated a commitment to Goal 6 of the Millennium Development Goals “to have halted and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis and other major diseases by 2015”.92

Other initiatives to which the UK has contributed include the Global Fund to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, to which it has pledged USD200,400,802 for 200793 and, the International Finance Facility for Immunisation (IFFIm) to which the UK has pledged GBP1,380,000,000 over 20 years.94 Prior to St. Petersburg, on 27 January 2006, the UK also committed USD74 million to help combat TB in India.95

Analyst: Jonathan Scotland

United States: +1

The United States fully complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to support the Global Plan to Stop TB. In March 2007 the US Congress began acting to introduce legislation to authorize expenditures to the Global Plan to Stop TB in 2007. Senators Barbara Boxer and Gordon Smith introduced the Stop Tuberculosis (TB) Act of 2007 in the US Senate; the same bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative Eliot Engel.96 On 19 March 2007, the bill was sent to the Committee on Foreign Affairs’ Committee on Energy and Commerce for consultation; as of 1 May 2007, the bill has yet to be passed into law.97 “The bill would authorize $330 million for fiscal year 2008 and $450 million for fiscal year 2009 for foreign assistance programs that combat international TB. The bill also authorizes $70 million for FY08 and $100 million for FY09 for the Centers for Disease Control programs to combat international TB.”98 It explicitly authorizes that this money go to foreign assistance for the prevention and treatment of TB under the Stop TB Strategy as described in the Global Plan to Stop TB.99

Additionally, like many of its G8 counterparts, the U.S. has continued to work within various TB related initiatives outside of the Global Plan to Stop TB such as the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, to which it has pledged USD200,000,000 for 2007.100

Analyst: Brian Kolenda and Jonathan Scotland

European Union: 0

The European Union has not fully complied with its commitment to support the Global Plan to Stop TB. The EU has yet to announce new funding commitments to the Global Plan in the period between 20 July 2006 and 1 May 2007. Although it has yet to provide a specific commitment outlining its support for the Global Plan to Stop TB, it has nonetheless moved to increase funding for parallel initiatives. On

---


1 December 2006, members of the European Parliament voted in support of increasing its contributions to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria to EUR1 billion. The EU also released a statement supporting the WHO Executive Board resolution for long-term planning on TB prevention and control, which will go before the World Health Assembly in May 2007. The European Parliament has called for the EU-Africa health plan to train health practitioners in the region in TB management, to be included in the agenda of the EU-Africa summit in December.

Analyst: Sophia Huda


3. Health: Polio [43]

Commitment

“We urgently call for mobilization of financial support and will continue to work collectively and with bilateral and multilateral donors to close the funding gap for 2007-2008, and will continue to work with others towards securing the resources necessary to finish the program and declare our planet polio-free in the near future.”

Fight Against Infectious Disease

Background

The commitment for the eradication of polio is an integral part of the G8’s fight against infectious diseases. Polio is a communicable disease that plagues countries in the developing world. The objective of the G8 Polio Commitment is to garner financial aid from bilateral and multilateral donors to support logistics and resource allocation for anti-polio virus programs, specifically the Global Polio Eradication Initiative (GPEI), sponsored by the World Health Organization (WHO), Rotary International, the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF).

Since its inception in 1988, the GPEI has been highly effective, eradicating 99% of polio cases worldwide. Current assessments project that four nations—Nigeria, India, Pakistan, and Afghanistan—continue to suffer the polio epidemic, and that there remains an imminent risk of international spread through re-infection in twelve African and Southeast Asian countries. To sustain and improve upon these levels of polio eradication, adequate funding, participation and partnership between governments, civil society, and the private sector are essential.

Upon completion of the interim compliance period in December 2006, the GPEI faced a funding gap of USD575 million for the 2006-2007 period. Nearing the expiry of the St. Petersburg compliance period (2006-2007), the GPEI funding requirements have significantly increased, reaching USD695 million, with an immediate funding shortfall of USD235 million required to ensure planned immunization projects in 2007.

Much of this gap comes as a result of lower than expected contributions from public sector, NGO, and IGO donors for the 2006 and 2007 funding periods. Additional funding gaps of approximately USD340 million and USD140 million for polio eradication activities in 2008 and 2009, respectively, must also be closed. On 28 February 2007, an Urgent Consultation on Polio Eradication sponsored by the WHO was convened in Geneva to address these issues. Participants included representatives from G8 member countries, the European Commission, polio-endemic countries, and Spearheading Partners. The Consultation reviewed partnership capacities to meet the remaining operational and financial challenges, and to reaffirm objectives for global polio eradication.

Team Leader: James Meers

---


Assessment

2006 Final Compliance Score

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

Overall: +0.44

Canada: +1

Canada registers full compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment to eradicate polio. According to the GPEI Donor Contributions Report, published on 11 January 2007, Canada pledged USD42.52 million in 2006, making it the third largest public sector donor, with a 14.5 percent share of public-sector donor funding.\(^{112}\) According to the report, Canada has also earmarked USD3.15 million in GPEI donations for the 2007 fiscal year.\(^{113}\)

In addition, Canada has also supported other multilateral initiatives to fight polio. On 9 September 2006, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) announced that it will allocate over one-third of its CAD1.39 billion budget in 2006-2007 to multilateral partners that specifically target the health sector, which include the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization, the Canadian International Immunization Initiative, the World Health Organization, and the Global Polio Eradication Initiative.\(^{114}\) In September 2006, CIDA also assigned USD450 million in funding over 10 years (already previously committed at St. Petersburg) for the African Health Systems Initiative, an envelope of CIDA projects that will work to strengthen health systems and human resources for health in Africa.\(^{115}\) On 5 October 2006, Canada pledged a bilateral contribution of USD5 million to Afghanistan to vaccinate over seven million children against polio between October 2006 and December 2007.\(^{116}\) Most recently, on 25 March 2007, the Canadian government announced that it would pledge an additional contribution of USD1.5 million to fund a joint initiative to fight polio in Afghanistan in conjunction with the WHO, UNICEF, and the Government of Afghanistan.\(^{117}\)

Analyst: Haley Hatch


France: 0

France has partially complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to fight polio. According to the 2007 GPEI Donor Report, France was the fifth-largest public sector donor with a contribution of USD12.8 million—approximately 4.4 percent of total financial GPEI contributions from public sector donors in 2006. France, however, has yet to arrange any specific contribution for the 2007 funding period. On 9 May 2006, the French government pledged USD2 billion for bilateral and multilateral polio eradication to be allocated during the period of 2007-2021, however, the budget will not come into effect until its parliamentary approval in 2007. Although France made a large financial contribution to the GPEI in 2006, until it registers a specific funding pledge for 2007, it receives a score of “0” for partial compliance with its commitment.

Analyst: Dana Lepshokova

Germany +1

Germany has fully complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to fight polio. As of 11 January 2007, the GPEI has reported a pledge of USD13.61 million, ranking Germany as the fourth largest public sector donor with a 4.6 percent share of total public sector donations received in 2006. The GPEI reports that Germany has contributed USD13.74 million and USD13.06 million in additional funding for the 2007 and 2008 GPEI funding periods, respectively. In 2006, Germany’s Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development also worked closely with the WHO and UNICEF in establishing viable partnerships to implement polio immunization campaigns in the Philippines and Malawi.

Analyst: Christopher VanBerkum and Igor Churkin

Italy: -1

Italy has not complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to fight polio. According to the GPEI Donor Contribution Report issued on 11 January 2007, Italy has yet to arrange any specific pledges for the 2006-2008 funding period despite commitments made at previous G8 Summits, most recently in St. Petersburg. On 9 February 2007 however, Italy, in conjunction with other G8 countries, Norway and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, pledged USD635 million in funding for the Advance Market Commitment, a pilot vaccination program. The program is designed to establish a market that would encourage manufacturers to develop vaccines for communicable diseases, including polio, in developing countries; Italy specifically committed funds towards particular vaccines to be marketed at a set price for each individual that is immunized. Although Italy has made some effort in working on  

several multilateral and bilateral initiatives to fight polio,127 its failure to make any GPEI contributions for the 2006 and 2007 funding periods warrants a score of “-1” for non-compliance.

Analyst: Christopher VanBerkum

Japan: 0

Japan has demonstrated some effort to honour its commitment to eradicate polio. The 2007 GPEI Donor Report recorded a USD12.47 million contribution from Japan for the 2006 fiscal year, making it the sixth-largest public sector donor at 4.3 percent of the total financial contributions in 2006.128 However, the report also indicates that Japan has not registered any new pledges between January and May 2007 to close the funding gap for 2007 and beyond.129

In 2006, Japan provided generous bilateral and multilateral funding to fight polio in Ethiopia, contributing USD2.5 million, and USD16 million to UNICEF to combat childhood diseases, including polio, in Nigeria, Sudan and Ghana.130 Further, on 15 December 2006, the Government of Japan extended a grant of USD3.85 million for a polio eradication initiative in Pakistan that will be used to fund the production of 27.77 million doses of oral polio vaccines, comprising approximately 9.3% of the required amount.131 Despite Japan’s support for bilateral and multilateral initiatives in 2006 and 2007, until new funds are issued for the GPEI 2007 fiscal year Japan receives a partial compliance score of 0.

Analyst: Haley Hatch

Russia: +1

Russia receives a score of “+1”, registering full compliance with its commitment made at the 2006 St. Petersburg Summit to eradicate polio.

As host of the St. Petersburg G8 Summit, Russia selected the ”Fight Against Infectious Diseases” as one of its central themes.132 Russia’s political leadership and mandate to combat polio at the St. Petersburg Summit was lauded by the WHO.133

During the St.-Petersburg summit Russia committed to contribute USD18 million to the Global Polio Eradication Initiative134 though the terms were not indicated. Between September and December 2006 Russia contributed USD10 million to the GPEI: USD3 million for 2006, USD3 million for 2007, and USD4 million for 2008135. Russian Health and Social Development Minister Mikhail Zurabov stated that Russia is no longer a recipient and will become a donor in polio eradication.136 The WHO recognized that the Russian Federation carried on the G8 tradition of supporting polio eradication.137

Russia also effectively initiated efforts to build relationships with partners focused on eradicating polio. It recently sponsored an international conference focused on the G8’s initiatives to fight infectious diseases in Moscow on 8 December 2006. Delegates from the G8 and supporting organizations shared

---


Furthermore, the United States annually sponsors 500 million doses of oral polio vaccine (OPV), fiscal year, comprising 56.3 percent of the current USD159.72 million in public sector donations.

According to the Report, the United States earmarked USD90 million in GPEI donations for the 2007 funding period, comprising 33.5 percent of the USD293 million in total contributions from public sector donors in 2006. Additionally, the GPEI reports that the UK made an impressive contribution of USD37.60 million in donations for the 2007 funding period, comprising 23.5 percent of the current USD159.72 million in public sector donations for 2007, with USD3.6 million allocated for the 2008 fiscal year. The UK has also supported other multilateral initiatives to fight polio. Between August and October 2006, the UK Department of International Development contributed USD5.5 million to a polio and measles immunization campaign in Uganda. In November 2006, the UK also launched a special bond fund to vaccinate approximately 500 million children worldwide against endemic diseases including polio, measles, diphtheria and hepatitis. The fund will sell long-term bonds to international money markets to raise money for developing countries, with interest on these paid by future aid funding.

**United Kingdom: + 1**

The United Kingdom has fully complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to fight polio. The GPEI reports that the UK has registered significant funds for the 2006 funding period, and has also arranged for large contributions covering the 2007-2008 period. According to the 2007 GPEI Donor Report, the UK made a pledge of USD53.65 million making it the second largest donor with a financial composition of 18.3 percent of the USD293 million in contributions from public sector donors in 2006. Additionally, the GPEI reports that the UK made an impressive contribution of USD37.60 million in donations for the 2007 funding period, comprising 23.5 percent of the current USD159.72 million in public sector donations for 2007, with USD3.6 million allocated for the 2008 fiscal year. The UK has also supported other multilateral initiatives to fight polio. Between August and October 2006, the UK Department of International Development contributed USD5.5 million to a polio and measles immunization campaign in Uganda. In November 2006, the UK also launched a special bond fund to vaccinate approximately 500 million children worldwide against endemic diseases including polio, measles, diphtheria and hepatitis. The fund will sell long-term bonds to international money markets to raise money for developing countries, with interest on these paid by future aid funding.

**United States: + 1**

The United States has fully complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to fight polio. According to the GPEI Donor Contributions Report for 2007, the United States has pledged approximately USD132.40 million in 2006, representing 45.0 percent of the USD293 million in total contributions from public sector donors in 2006. In 2006, the United States was the largest GPEI contributor (contributions include those from the Centre for Disease Control and Prevention and USAID). According to the Report, the United States earmarked USD90 million in GPEI donations for the 2007 fiscal year, comprising 56.3 percent of the current USD159.72 million in public sector donations. Furthermore, the United States annually sponsors 500 million doses of oral polio vaccine (OPV),

---

138 Russia Urges G8 to Honor Commitments on Infectious Diseases, G8 Russia, (St. Petersburg), 8 December 2006. Date of Access: 27 December 2006. en.g8russia.ru/news/20061208/1272224.html


purchased through UNICEF, and supports National Immunization Days in priority countries, providing funding and technical expertise.\textsuperscript{150} On 6 October 2006, the United States government announced that it would work to establish stronger links between U.S.-based private voluntary organizations and community-based organizations to achieve a higher efficiency in carrying vaccination campaigns in polio-affected areas, providing greater sensitivity to local communication and cultural differences in challenging and isolated communities.\textsuperscript{151}

In 2006, the mandate to eradicate polio has emerged as an important foreign focus-area of the current administration. Speaking on 10 October 2006, U.S. Under-Secretary of State for Democracy and Global Affairs, Paula Dobriansky, stated that the eradication of polio is “a key foreign policy objective and one of [the Bush administration’s] highest international public health priorities.”\textsuperscript{152} During the recent Stakeholder Consultation on Global Polio Eradication hosted by the WHO on 28 February 2007, Dobriansky and the U.S. delegation demonstrated strong leadership in working with other donor countries and organizations in establishing goals and securing commitments for polio eradicate.\textsuperscript{153}

\textit{Analyst: Dipna Singh}

\textbf{European Union: 0}

The European Union has partially complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to work towards polio eradication.

As of 11 January 2007, the GPEI reports that the European Commission has registered a pledge of USD28.18 million for the 2006 fiscal year, comprising 7.0 percent of the funding allocated from IGO and NGO donors.\textsuperscript{154} Since the expiry of the Interim Compliance period however, the EU has not yet arranged for a contribution for the 2007 fiscal period.\textsuperscript{155}

The GPEI reported that in 2006 the Commission provided a grant of USD70 million for polio eradication activities in 14 African countries. The European Commission Humanitarian Office also provided an emergency grant of USD580,000 to support immunization efforts to combat the polio epidemic in Yemen.\textsuperscript{156} Historically, the EU has provided healthy financial contributions to the GPEI and supported polio eradication initiatives through other bilateral and multilateral channels; however, until the EU commits funds to reduce the GPEI funding gap in 2007, it receives a score of “0” for partial compliance.

\textit{Analyst: James Meers}


4. Energy: Oil and Energy Reserve Data Collection – JODI [76]

Commitment

“We welcome the beginning of implementation of the Joint Oil Data Initiative (JODI) and will take further action to improve and enhance the collection and reporting of market data on oil and other energy sources by all countries including through development of a global common standard for reporting oil and other energy reserves.”

Global Energy Security

Background

The Joint Oil Data Initiative (JODI) is an international and freely available database containing data on the production and consumption flows and stocks of seven petroleum products. JODI was first proposed in 2002 at the 8th International Energy Forum in Osaka as a means of increasing the timeliness and transparency of oil-related data. The idea was to increase the market’s understanding of the actual state of oil supply and demand around the world and thereby decrease volatility of oil prices in international markets. Since its inception in 2003, seven agencies (EUROSTAT, OPEC, OLADE, APEC, IEA, IEFs and UNSD) as well as individual countries’ statistical agencies have pledged to aid in the collection and verification of the data reported to JODI. At the Gleneagles Summit in 2005, G8 leaders expressed their support for the Joint Oil Data Initiative and encouraged other nations to join, although they stopped short of an explicit commitment on the topic. Although the database tracks 92 different nations, the top 30 consumer/producer nations account for over 90% of oil demand and supply in the international marketplace. The main challenges facing JODI include both the widening of its reporting base as well as the improvement of data collection and accuracy in reporting nations.

Team Leader: Michael Erdman

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>+1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada: +1

Canada has registered a score of +1 indicating full compliance with its 2006 St. Petersburg JODI commitment. The country was awarded a ‘good’ score for timeliness, submission, and completeness of its data for the period January-June 2006.160

On 16 September 2006 in Singapore, Canada issued a joint statement with the other G7 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors, reaffirming the need to promote transparency and reliability in energy market data through the development of "global standards for reporting oil reserves," and encouraged "investment in exploration, production, transportation and refinery capabilities." On 25 October 2006, at the APEC workshop on energy statistics in Tokyo, an entire day was dedicated to discussions relating to JODI. These discussions, in which a Canadian representative participated, resulted in the creation of a conceptual format for the expression of JODI to be presented to the other JODI members at the upcoming conference in Riyadh.

During the G-20 Meeting of Ministers and Governors in Melbourne, 18-19 November 2006, participants released a communiqué that stated their continued support for JODI and their support for its extension into other sectors.

From 25-26 November 2006, Canada participated in the Sixth International JODI Conference in Riyadh. The International Energy Forum Communiqué from this conference acknowledged the database's success and stressed the continuing need for improvement of data quality. Participants outlined a list of priorities to improve the quality of data and to expand the initiative.

Finally, as a member of several JODI partner organizations, Canada participated in the organization of several training workshops. The first of these workshops was designed for energy statisticians from Sub-Saharan African countries and took place 30 January–2 February 2007 in Johannesburg. On 12 February 2007, the IEA hosted an inter-secretariat JODI meeting in Paris to discuss the expanded questionnaire, the program of work for JODI lessons from the Johannesburg workshop. Further workshops are expected in the Middle East and for Caspian and Central Asian Countries later this year.

**Analyst: Erin Haines**

**France: +1**

France has registered a score of +1 indicating full compliance with its 2006 St. Petersburg JODI Commitment. In addition to being awarded a good score for the timeliness, submission and completeness of its data for the period January-June 2006, the French government has maintained its early stated support for increased transparency in the reporting of oil data. Since 24 April 2006, the French government has supported the publishing of oil stock figures every 15 days, and continues to press this issue at the international level.

On 16 September 2006 in Singapore, France issued a joint statement with the other G7 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors reconfirming the need to promote transparency and reliability in energy market data through the development of a "global standard for reporting oil reserves" and encouraged "investment in exploration, production, transportation and refinery capability." 

---
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On 18-19 November 2006, France participated in the G20 Meeting of Ministers and Governors in Melbourne. In a Communiqué from this meeting, the G20 Ministers not only stated their support of JODI but also the value of extending it into other sectors.\(^{172}\)

Finally, along with the other JODI partners, France sponsored a workshop for Sub-Saharan African governments that took place from 30 January to 2 February 2007.\(^{173}\) Government officials from South Africa, Angola, Cameroon, Republic of Congo, Ghana and Nigeria participated in the workshop, which focused on oil data collection.\(^{174}\) Further workshops are expected in the Middle East and for Caspian and Central Asian Countries later this year.\(^{175}\)

**Analyst: Michael Erdman**

### Germany: +1

Germany has registered a score of +1 indicating full compliance with its 2006 St. Petersburg JODI Commitment. It is meeting its obligations to JODI and has actively participated in the International Energy Forum, thereby supporting efforts to develop a global standard for reporting energy reserves. Most of Germany’s work towards this goal was completed prior to January 2007.

Germany has submitted production, demand, closing stock and stock change levels of crude oil, liquefied petroleum gases, motor gasoline, kerosene gas/diesel oil and residual fuel oil to JODI for the months of August 2006 to January 2007.\(^{176}\) The JODI Secretariat gave Germany a rating of “good” for “submission”, “timeliness”, and “completeness” in its most recent compliance cycle, which ran from January to June 2006.\(^{177}\)

On 16 September 2006 in Singapore, Germany issued a joint statement with the other G7 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors reconfirming the need to promote transparency and reliability in energy market data through the development of a “global standard for reporting oil reserves”.\(^{178}\)

On 18-19 November 2006, Germany participated in the G20 Meeting of Ministers and Governors in Melbourne. In a communiqué, the G20 Ministers stated their support for extending JODI to other energy sectors.\(^{179}\)

Germany is contributing to the International Economic Forum’s work to expand JODI membership and to enhance and complete its data. Germany was one of four countries to deliver special financial support to JODI, above their regular annual financial contribution in 2006. A German representative currently serves on the Executive of the International Energy Forum Secretariat.\(^{180}\)

Finally, along with the other JODI partners, Germany sponsored a workshop for Sub-Saharan African governments that took place from 30 January to 2 February 2007.\(^{181}\) Government officials from South Africa, Angola, Cameroon, Republic of Congo, Ghana and Nigeria participated in the workshop, which focused on oil data collection.\(^{182}\) Further workshops are expected in the Middle East and for Caspian and Central Asian Countries later this year.\(^{183}\)

**Analyst: Doug Sarro**

---


Italy: +1

Italy has registered a score of +1 indicating full compliance with its 2006 St. Petersburg JODI Commitment. Italy reports to the JODI Database via the European statistical agency EUROSTAT and has been awarded a grade of “good” for the submission, timeliness and completeness of its data for the period January-June 2006. The Italian government also maintains its own website for the publication of current statistics on energy consumption and production in Italy and the European Union. Unlike JODI, the purpose of the Italian government’s website is the transparent and accurate exposition of the importance of energy in the national accounts and especially in the country’s balance of trade. On 16 September 2006 in Singapore, Italy issued a joint statement with the other G7 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors reconfirming the need to promote transparency and reliability in energy market data through the development of a “global standard for reporting oil reserves” and encouraged “investment in exploration, production, transportation and refinery capability.”

On 18-19 November 2006, Italy participated in the G20 Meeting of Ministers and Governors in Melbourne. In a Communiqué from this meeting, the G20 Ministers not only stated their support of JODI but also the value of extending it into other sectors. Italy, along with the other JODI partners, sponsored a workshop for Sub-Saharan African governments that took place from 30 January to 2 February 2007. Government officials from South Africa, Angola, Cameroon, Republic of Congo, Ghana and Nigeria participated in the workshop, which focused on oil data collection. Further workshops are expected in the Middle East and for Caspian and Central Asian Countries later this year.

The Italian government is also an active participant in the International Energy Forum (IEF), the eleventh meeting of which will be held in Italy in 2008. The IEF aims to promote dialogue between major producers and consumers of energy products, including private corporations. The IEF has thus far been a means of reinforcing global support for the JODI Database and has allowed G8 member states, including Italy, to encourage other nations to increase their data flows to JODI.

Analyst: Michael Erdman

Japan: +1

Japan has registered a score of +1 indicating full compliance with its 2006 St. Petersburg JODI commitments. Japan is meeting its obligations to JODI and has actively encouraged the expansion of JODI since the St. Petersburg summit; most of Japan’s work towards this goal was completed prior to January 2007.

Japan has submitted production, demand, closing stock and stock change levels of crude oil, liquefied petroleum gases, motor gasoline, kerosene gas/diesel oil and residual fuel oil to JODI for the months of August 2006 to January 2007. The JODI Secretariat gave Japan a rating of “good” for submission,
timeliness, and completeness in its most recent compliance cycle, which ran from January to June 2006.\textsuperscript{195}

On 16 September 2006 in Singapore, Japan issued a joint statement with the other G7 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors reconfirming the need to promote transparency and reliability in energy market data through the development of a "global standard for reporting oil reserves”.\textsuperscript{196}

Japan's Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry sponsored a workshop on energy statistics in the APEC region from 23-25 October 2006 in Tokyo. "Improving JODI data quality" was listed as one of three key issues discussed.\textsuperscript{197}

Japan's Minister of Economy, Trade and Industry, Akira Amari, met with counterparts from China, India, South Korea and the United States in Beijing on 16 December 2006. In a joint statement, they pledged to support JODI, cooperate in "improving transparency of data” and provide "timely market data on oil".\textsuperscript{198}

On 18-19 November 2006, Japan participated in the G20 Meeting of Ministers and Governors in Melbourne. In a communiqué, the G20 Ministers stated their support for extending JODI to other energy sectors.\textsuperscript{199}

Finally, along with the other JODI partners, Japan sponsored a workshop for Sub-Saharan African governments that took place from 30 January to 2 February 2007.\textsuperscript{200} Government officials from South Africa, Angola, Cameroon, Republic of Congo, Ghana and Nigeria participated in the workshop, which focused on oil data collection.\textsuperscript{201} Further workshops are expected in the Middle East and for Caspian and Central Asian Countries later this year.\textsuperscript{202}

**Analyst: Doug Sarro**

**Russia: +1**

Russia has fully complied with its St. Petersburg JODI commitments. Results of new JODI assessment have not been published yet, however, results covering the time period from January to June 2006 and published in November, 2006 show that Russia was given "fair" for submission of information, "poor" for timeliness and "fair" for completeness.\textsuperscript{203} At the date of February, 2007 (the date of last update of JODI data) Russia submitted all necessary information\textsuperscript{204} and thus, Russia is complying with the implementation of JODI.

Confirming its commitment, Russia has made numerous official announcements on the necessity of JODI and informational openness of energy markets. In January 2007, at the 15th annual session of the Asia-Pacific Parliamentary Forum, the Federation Council Chair D. Mezencev said that it is very important for Russia to improve international cooperation in the framework of international initiatives, such as the Joint Oil Data Initiative (JODI).\textsuperscript{205}

In September 2006 at the conference of OPEC oil ministers in Vienna, Russia's Deputy Minister of Industry and Energy Andrey Reus announced that increasing transparency, predictability and stability of global energy markets is a vital prerequisite of energy security. Deputy Minister Reus noted that


\textsuperscript{199} Meeting of Ministers and Governors in Melbourne, Group of Twenty (Melbourne) 18-19 November 2006. Date of Access: 20 April 2007. http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/g20/g20-061119australia.pdf


\textsuperscript{204} Joint Oil and Data Initiative, All Data, Date of Access: 16 April 2007. http://www.jodidb.org/IEFS/TableViewer/tableView.aspx?ReportId=83

informational transparency of the world oil markets signifies a tendency to the transition from the outdated competitive strategy of assessing price risks to the contemporary informational strategy of energy resources market evaluation. Later, in February 2007 at the international conference CERA in Houston, Texas, Reus said that there are two main directions of work: efficiency improvement and stabilization of the energy resources market, and market transparency is its main instrument.

In December 2006 joint work on the TACIS project “Harmonization of energy policies of Russia and the EU” was accomplished. The topics considered included the issues of conformity of forecast energy balances of Russia and the EU for the long-term perspective, the volume of Russian export of oil and gas, the conditions of mutual improvement of the investment climate for participation of foreign partners in the development of Russian mineral wealth and the appearance of Russian companies on the retail energy market of Europe.

Finally, in November 2006 Russia’s Ministry of Industry and Energy and UNESCO opened the International Centre for Information and Analysis on Sustainable Energy Development in Russia. This is the fulfillment of a commitment made just before the St. Petersburg Summit.

Analysts: Natalia Churkina and Iryna Lozynska

United States: +1

The United States has registered a score of +1 indicating full compliance with its 2006 St. Petersburg JODI commitment. In its own assessment of participation for the months leading up to the St. Petersburg Summit, the JODI Secretariat awarded the United States a “good” ranking for all three categories: submission, timeliness and completeness.

On 16 September 2006, at the G7 Meeting of Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors in Singapore, the participants issued a joint statement, reconfirming the need to promote transparency and reliability in energy market data through the development of a “global standard for reporting oil reserves.” Just over a month later, the United States participated in the APEC Workshop on Energy Statistics in Tokyo at which an entire day (25 October 2006) was dedicated to JODI. Discussions resulted in the creation of a conceptual format for the expansion of JODI, to be presented at the upcoming conference in Riyadh.

On 18-19 November 2006, the United States participated in the G20 Meeting of Ministers and Governors in Melbourne. In a Communiqué from this meeting, the G20 Ministers not only stated their support of JODI but also the value of extending it into other sectors. Six days later, at the Sixth International JODI Conference in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia a joint Communiqué was released which acknowledged the success of the JODI World Database one year after becoming available to the public.

On 1 December 2006, in a keynote address made to the Corporate Council on Africa Oil & Gas Forum, Energy Secretary Samuel Bodman stated that the Department of Energy is not only a participant in JODI, it also encourages other countries to participate in the Initiative. On 29 January, funding was requested in the FY2008 Budget to continue ongoing operations to maintain energy data and to improve reliability and statistical accuracy of the information.


Recently the United States, as a member of several JODI partner organizations, participated in the organization of several training workshops. The first of these workshops was designed for energy statisticians from Sub-Saharan African countries and took place 30 January – 2 February 2007 in Johannesburg. On 12 February 2007, the IEA hosted an inter-secretariat JODI meeting in Paris to discuss the expanded questionnaire, the program of work for JODI and lessons from the Johannesburg workshop. Further workshops have been planned and are expected to occur in the Middle East and for Caspian and Central Asian Countries later this year.

Analyst: Erin Haines

United Kingdom: +1

The United Kingdom has registered a score of +1 indicating full compliance with its 2006 St. Petersburg JODI commitment. The United Kingdom (one of the world’s top 30 producers and consumers of petrochemicals) has been an important supporter of JODI, “providing financial and technical assistance, and political impetus.” For the period January-June 2006 JODI assessed the UK data submission as “good” in all three categories of “submission, timeliness and completeness.”

The United Kingdom has participated in all major JODI events, such as the Inter-Secretariat JODI meeting in Vienna, on 12 September 2006, and the 6th JODI International Conference, in November 2006, where issues such as data collection, the extension and the improvement of JODI data quality were discussed.

On 16 September 2006 in Singapore, the United Kingdom issued a joint statement with the other G7 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors reconfirming the need to promote transparency and reliability in energy market data through the development of a “global standard for reporting oil reserves” and encouraged “investment in exploration, production, and transportation and refinery capability.”

On 18-19 November 2006, the United Kingdom participated in the G20 Meeting of Ministers and Governors in Melbourne. In a communiqué from this meeting, the G20 Ministers not only stated their support of JODI but also the value of extending it into other sectors. Six days later, at the Sixth International JODI Conference in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia a joint Communiqué was released which acknowledged the success of the JODI World Database one year after becoming available to the public.

Recently the United Kingdom, as a member of several JODI partner organizations, participated in the organization of several training workshops. The first of these workshops was designed for energy statisticians from Sub-Saharan African countries and took place 30 January–2 February 2007 in Johannesburg. On 12 February 2007, the IEA hosted an inter-secretariat JODI meeting in Paris to discuss the expanded questionnaire, the program of work for JODI and lessons from the Johannesburg workshop. Further workshops have been planned and are expected to occur in the Middle East and for Caspian and Central Asian Countries later this year.
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European Union: +1

The European Union has registered a score of +1 indicating full compliance with its 2006 St. Petersburg JODI commitment. The EU reports to the JODI Database via the European statistical agency EUROSTAT and has been awarded a grade of “good” for the submission, timeliness and completeness of its data.\(^{227}\) EUROSTAT is responsible for the submission of data on all 27 members of the EU and is one of the seven statistical organizations coordinating the pooling and processing of data in the JODI database.\(^{228}\)

Although the European Union is tasked with the collection and reporting of data on oil consumption and production in the 27 member states, it is not directly involved in the discussions of contributing states. Rather, the nations that participate in the JODI initiative represent themselves at both Joint Oil Data Initiative and International Energy Forum meetings.\(^{229}\)

Recently, the European Commission created the Energy Market Observatory System to provide reliable and transparent energy market data.\(^{230}\) It also reports on a website maintained by the EC the oil stock data of its member states.\(^{231}\) The stock data reported includes information on those states with 90-day obligations of petroleum.\(^{232}\) Aside from all these actions that improve the statistical collection of data, the EU attends many high profile international gatherings related to energy, such as the Euro Mediterranean Energy Forum and the World Forum on Energy Regulation.

**Analyst: Michael Erdman**

---


5. Energy Intensity [99]

Commitment:

“consider national goals for reducing energy intensity of economic development to be reported by the end of the year”

Global Energy Security

Background

Energy intensity has not featured prominently at past G8 Summits but is an issue of increasing importance as the industrialized world considers the double pressures of increased energy demand from transition economies and volatile oil prices. At the 2005 G8 Summit in Gleneagles, leaders sought to examine mechanisms that might isolate their economies from energy price shocks in the international market. In St. Petersburg attention was shifted away from price stabilization to input substitution. Energy intensity or efficiency essentially refers to the amount of energy used per production of a unit of output. At the heart of energy intensity, however, is the desire to switch input dependence of economic activities from fossil fuels – of which many G8 nations are net importers – to renewable sources of energy whose prices are not subject to the volatility of energy markets. To this end, the G8 nations and the European Union sought to explore various opportunities to encourage private individuals to adopt technologies and techniques less intensive in fossil fuels. G8 heads of state agreed that public consultations on the issue of energy intensity should be confirmed before 31 December 2006. Although many governments have long considered energy intensity or efficiency as priorities in national development, only public consultations established on or after 17 July 2006 will be considered actions taken towards compliance with the St. Petersburg commitment on energy intensity.

Team Leader: Michael Erdman

Note: Note, because of the commitment’s deadline of 31 December 2006, scores have been frozen to reflect government’s action up until that date. General information on energy intensity in the G8, including actions taken by G8 countries from January 2007 onwards will be included for information only in future drafts of this report.

Assessment

2006 Final Compliance Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada: 0

Canada has partially complied with its St. Petersburg energy intensity commitment. The Government of Canada does undertake several outreach programs on energy efficiency through its Office of Energy Efficiency within the Department of Natural Resources. The purpose of the outreach, however, is to educate individuals about the need for conservation, rather than to consult the public about how energy efficiency might be improved.227 Indeed, at a meeting of the Federal and Provincial Energy Ministers on 19 August 2006, the participants noted the need to better inform a public concerned with energy efficiency about Canada’s energy strategy, but they did not establish consultations with the public on the issue.228 Despite several information campaigns instituted before the St. Petersburg Summit, a lack of tangible changes regarding the energy intensity commitment since the last G8 Summit has earned Canada a score of 0.

Analyst: Pippa Leslie

France: 0

France has partially complied with its St. Petersburg energy intensity commitment. France has pushed for greater efforts to address energy related issues in the context of the European Union (EU). In September 2006, French Prime Minister, Dominique de Villepin, proposed the creation of the post of special energy representative in the EU.229 The objective of the new post would be to relay the joint positions as decided upon by the appropriate Council formations so as to enable the EU to "speak with a single voice" in regards to energy issues.230 Prime Minister de Villepin’s proposal is in keeping with a 24 January 2006 memorandum issued by the French government to "re-launch European energy policy in a perspective of sustainable development." The memorandum discusses the need to implement integrative energy policies in Europe and encourage more efficient energy consumption and production which, in part, entails the reduction of energy intensity.231

Analyst: Gunwant Gill

Germany: 0

Germany has partially complied with its St. Petersburg energy intensity commitment. At the annual meeting of the Energy Efficiency Initiative of DENA (German Energy Agency), Federal Minister of Economics and Technology Michael Glos stated that "[i]t is neccessary to reduce noticeably the energy needs of industry, of private and public consumers through the most efficient and intelligent use possible of the available energy."232 Chancellor Angel Merkel stated that security of supply, economic efficiency and environmental sustainability are central to energy policy. Chancellor Merkel commented that "[i]t is clear that there should be an increase in exporting technology and that Germany must be a leader in energy efficiency".233 She also stressed the need to expand the availability of vehicles powered by biofuels.244 Despite the German government’s continued public support of energy efficiency measures, and its extensive programs to encourage energy efficiency in the private sector, no new consultations on the

---

issue have been established since the St. Petersburg Summit. For this reason, Germany has been awarded a score of 0.

Analysts: Natalia Churkina and Ristana Kardasovski

Italy: 0

The Italian government has partially complied with its St. Petersburg energy intensity commitment. The Ministry of the Environment maintains a website that provides the public with information on ways in which it may help conserve energy. The Ministry of Economic Development likewise runs several programs aimed at encouraging the public and industry in particular to be more conscious of energy efficiency. On 23 October 2006, the Italian government also approved new European directives on decreasing energy consumption as complementary to its policies on energy efficiency. Nevertheless, no new consultations on the issue have been introduced since the St. Petersburg Summit. For this reason, Italy has been awarded a score of 0.

Analyst: Michael Erdman

Japan: 0

Japan has fully complied with its St. Petersburg energy intensity commitment. To this end, it has established the Meeting of the Council of Ministers for Global Environmental Conservation with the aim of securing close communication among all administrative agencies concerned with energy use and conservation. The Meeting also aims to promote the implementation of measures for addressing global environmental issue.

Analyst: Pippa Leslie

Russia: +1

Russia has fully complied with its St. Petersburg energy intensity commitment. Goals for reducing energy intensity of economic development are set in Russia's Energy Strategy (approved in 2003) and in the Federal Special Program “Energy Efficient Economy in 2002-2005 and till 2010”. In September 2006 the Russian government made a decision to reconsider and to develop a new Energy Strategy. The new Strategy should change thoroughly the federal government's attitude towards increasing energy efficiency. Russia plans to make changes to legislation to determine structures responsible for the development and policy for increasing energy efficiency; to create a new program “Energy efficiency of the economy” and to determine the sources of its financing; to create new technical standards on energy efficiency of buildings and equipment; to begin programs of power demand management; to allow to use the received savings from utility resource payments for investments into repairing of public facilities.

The public will be involved in considerations of national goals for reducing energy intensity. Director of the Department on Economic Analysis and Prospective Planning of the Ministry of Industry and Energy Stanislav Naumov announced that his department welcomes the proposal of the Public Chamber to form the Public Council under the Ministry of Industry and Energy. He said that the Council will discuss questions of energy efficiency and energy safety and will be formed soon. The first session of the Working Group of the Public chamber “Perspectives of Russian Energy Development” took place on the 20th of November, 2006. This analytical group will work towards amendment of Russian energy strategy and work out measures on reducing energy intensity.

---


It was announced that the work on new Russian Energy Strategy till 2030 is to be finished by the end of this year and the Federal Target Programme (FTP) "Enhancing efficiency of energy consumption in the Russian Federation" is being finalized for 2008-2010 and up to 2015. Though new Energy Strategy is not finalized yet, Russia reported some goals for reducing energy intensity. The main outcome of the programme's implementation should be 62.5% of the GDP energy intensity in 2015 as compared to 2006. In April 2007 at the Russian-German forum on energy efficiency, Russian Minister of Industry and Energy Viktor Khristenko said that Russia had the unique potential of reducing energy intensity and would be able to save 100 million tonnes of fuel equivalent a year.

Analysts: Natalia Churkina and Ristana Kardasovski

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom registered full compliance with its St Petersburg commitment on energy intensity, successfully establishing a number of public consultations to address reductions in energy intensity. On 11 July 2006, the Department of Trade and Industry published their Energy Review to focus on the challenges of meeting the UK's long-term goals set out in the 2003 Energy White Paper. The Energy Review included a package of policy proposals and public consultations that will feed into the 2007 Energy White Paper.

On 8 November 2006, DEFRA, the Welsh Assembly Government, the Northern Ireland Administration, and the Scottish Executive launched a joint consultation on measures to reduce carbon emissions in large non-energy intensive business and public sector organizations by 1.2 million tonnes of carbon per year by 2020. The consultation particularly invites comments on the proposals for a mandatory cap and trade (Energy Performance Commitment), and a system of voluntary benchmarking and reporting. In addition, the Government has scheduled a series of public workshops throughout the UK for January 2007, to provide further information. On 14 November 2006, the Department for Trade and Industry issued a consultation on energy billing and metering in domestic and business sectors to help reduce energy consumption. The consultation seeks responses on the billing and metering proposals outlined in the Energy Review, as well as on the implementation of the EU Energy Services Directive, which contains provisions on metering and billing.

Analyst: Bonny Poon

**United States: 0**

The United States has partially complied with its St. Petersburg commitment on energy intensity. In keeping with its 2005 Energy Policy Act, the US federal government continues to make efforts to reduce its energy intensity by 2 percent per year. As outlined in the US Department of Energy's 2006 Strategic Plan, the department is investing in alternative fuels and energy efficient technologies...

---

to reduce energy intensity in the American economy. The US Department of Energy’s Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy’s Industrial Technologies Program is currently working with key sectors in the US economy to improve energy efficiency.

On 6 October 2006, Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Alexander Karsner commented that “[t]hrough the President’s Advanced Energy Initiative as well as with help from the Energy Policy Act of 2005, we are working to lead energy efficiency efforts across the nation”. It is therefore obvious that the Bush administration is serious about implementing in full the energy intensity policies outlines in the 2005 Energy Policy Act. For these reasons, the United States has been awarded a score of 0

**Analyst: Gunwant Gill**

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has fully complied with its St Petersburg commitment on Energy Intensity. The Green Paper on a European Strategy for Sustainable, Competitive and Secure Energy, published on 8 March 2006, was a consultation document designed to open debate on developing a common, coherent European Energy Policy. In addition to the open debate, a public hearing was organized in Brussels on 22 September 2006. The consultation period ended on 24 September 2006. The results of the Green Paper’s consultations combined with the results from the consultation period of the Green Paper on Energy Efficiency from 2005 were collectively evaluated to form the priority measures of the European Commission’s Action Plan on Energy Efficiency.

**Analyst: Bonny Poon**

---

6. Surface Transportation [116]

Commitment

“develop programs in our respective countries, consistent with national circumstances, to provide incentives for consumers to adopt efficient vehicles, including clean diesels and hybrids; and introduce on a large scale efficient public hybrid and/or clean diesel transportation systems, where appropriate;”

Global Energy Security

Background

At St. Petersburg, the G8 reaffirmed its commitment to addressing energy concerns in surface transportation by encouraging a transition to more efficient vehicles through consumer incentive programs, and support for cleaner public transportation initiatives. At the 2005 Gleneagles Summit, member states made a similar commitment, pledging to promote the sales and market development of more efficient vehicles. In June 2006, the G8 research Group reported a high level of compliance for all G8 members except Japan and Russia. The commitment made at St. Petersburg is considerably more focused than the commitment made at G34, as it does not include market development and emphasizes consumer incentive programs.

As a high level of aggregate compliance to the 2005 commitment would suggest, many member states had pre-existing consumer incentive programs and clean public transportation investments prior to the 2006 summit. In addition, several member states, including Japan, the United Kingdom and France, have continued to pursue initiatives other than consumer incentive programs that promote the sales and development of efficient vehicles, such as the introduction of biofuel floors in national fuel supplies for surface transportation. While these programs would have made these states compliant with the 2005 commitment, they are not compliant with the 2006 commitment. Therefore, while aggregate compliance with the 2006 commitment is low through the compliance period, pre-existing initiatives and the specific scope of the commitment should be considered when appraising the following compliance studies.

Team Leader: Jeff Claydon

Assessment

$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{Country} & \text{Lack of Compliance} & \text{Work in Progress} & \text{Full Compliance} \\
\hline
\text{Canada} & -1 & 0 & +1 \\
\text{France} & 0 & & \\
\text{Germany} & 0 & & +1 \\
\text{Italy} & 0 & & \\
\text{Japan} & 0 & & \\
\text{Russia} & 0 & & \\
\text{United Kingdom} & 0 & & \\
\text{United States} & & & +1 \\
\text{European Union} & & & +1 \\
\hline
\text{Overall} & & & +0.44 \\
\hline
\end{array}$

Canada: +1

The Canadian government has registered a high level of compliance with the St. Petersburg surface transportation commitment. The Canadian government had a considerable platform of pre-existing...
initiatives in promoting clean public transportation from which to build. This platform included the Urban Transportation Showcase Program (UTSP); part of Canada's Action Plan 2000 on Climate Change.\textsuperscript{270} On 24 November 2006, a Department of Transportation Press release announced the launch of the Winsmart Showcase in Winnipeg, Manitoba. As the sixth city in the UTSP, this showcase is intended to promote innovative approaches to urban transportation that increase energy efficiency and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The federal government committed CAD3.5 million to help the city of Winnipeg buy hybrid diesel electric buses.\textsuperscript{271}

On 19 March 2007, the federal government tabled its 2007 Budget, which included multiple consumer incentives for purchasing hybrid and fuel efficient vehicles, before more rigorous fuel standards are implemented in 2011. Effective 20 March 2007, consumers were afforded rebates of up to CAD2000, based on the perceived fuel efficiency of new vehicles purchased. In addition, a ‘Green Tax’ was levied on purchased vehicles deemed to be fuel inefficient.\textsuperscript{272}

\textit{Analyst: Jeff Claydon}

**France: 0**

The French government had already implemented much of the commitment made at St. Petersburg, but failed to build on strong pre-existing programs and therefore only achieved partial compliance. In November 2005, French Prime Minister Dominique de Villepin announced a €2000 tax credit for consumers who purchase energy efficient vehicles. This rebate was a thirty percent increase on pre-existing rebates available in France, and remains in place as of 17 April 2007.\textsuperscript{273} In addition, On 8 February 2007 Dominique Perben, Minister of Transportation, stated a federal government intention to have cars that are 20% less heavy and emit less than 130 grams of carbon dioxide receive discounts on highway fares. The federal government hopes to introduce legislation to this effect in 2008.\textsuperscript{274}

On 14\textsuperscript{275} and 20\textsuperscript{276} December 2006, the Ministry of Transportation announced several new spending initiatives for 2007 that will further develop rail infrastructure in France. However, these spending initiatives do not specify that these initiatives are to promote clean energy surface transportation alternatives. With the notable exception of France’s ratification of the Transport Protocol of the Alpine Convention in December 2006, French commitments in surface transportation infrastructure have not been specifically aimed at promoting more efficient methods of transportation.\textsuperscript{277} Therefore, France cannot be considered in full compliance with the St. Petersburg commitment.

\textit{Analyst: Greg Beres}

**Germany: +1**

The German government registered full compliance with its commitment made at St. Petersburg by promoting cleaner public transportation initiatives and stating its intention to provide incentives for consumer purchases of fuel efficient vehicles. Germany scored a high level of compliance on the Gleneagles commitment by supporting the research and development in the alternative fuels automotive sector, and more efficient public transportation initiatives, such as the Cleaner Energy Partnership (CEP), a federally funded programme aimed at promoting alternative energy


transportation. The German government continued its support of the CEP throughout the compliance period, which announced the deployment of fourteen new hydrogen cell buses to be deployed in Berlin by the end of 2007. In addition, nine fuel cell buses were deployed in the city of Hamburg.

On 17 September 2006, the German Minister of Transportation, Wolfgang Tiefensee, stated in a press release that the German government understood the importance of an expanded and cleaner public transit system in the coming years. On 30 October 2006, Tiefensee reiterated the federal government’s commitment to research and development in the alternative energy transportation sector through the National Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Technology Innovation Programme, but did not specify tax incentives for consumers, emphasizing instead financial commitments to research. On 19 October 2006, Minister Tiefensee announced the German government’s intention to lobby the European Commission for permission to amend national Motor Vehicle Tax levels for heavy goods vehicles to encourage the purchase of environmentally friendly vehicles. However, this policy is expected to be implemented in 2007. On 16 December, Germany signed the Transport Protocol of the Alpine Convention, and thereby committed to promote and develop environmentally friendly public transportation infrastructure in the region. While German commitments to the research and development in alternative fuel transportation and fuel efficient public transportation projects are notable, Germany cannot be considered in full compliance because they have failed to successfully implement any consumer oriented incentives for the purchase of energy efficient vehicles.

In March 2007, the Bundesrat passed legislation changing the Law on Motor Vehicle Tax; diesel passenger cars backfitted with a soot particle filter will be given tax breaks of EUR330 (roughly half the cost of fitting the filter). The German government intended this initiative as an incentive to phase out older diesel models with modern filters. This tax exemption will be open to any cars fitted between 1 January 2006 and 31 December 2009. The German government has also successfully lobbied the German auto industry to help in this endeavour; large German auto manufacturers have responded to this request by pledging to fit all new diesel cars with a particle filter by the end of 2008.

Analyst: Augustine Kwok

**Italy:** 0

Italy has partially complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to developing clean surface transportation. While it has introduced a significant program of incentives for the purchase of cleaner, low-emission vehicles, there is no evidence to suggest that Italy has moved on its commitment to public hybrid and/or clean diesel transport.

On 30 November 2006, the Italian government introduced a series of measures to comply with this commitment in the 2007 Budget. Among a series of measures, the government re-introduced a

---


previously defunct scheme to provide incentives to consumers who send old automobiles to be recycled and purchase newer vehicles. The scheme provides only a modest incentive of EUR80 for those who replace old vehicles with ones that conform to Euro 0 or Euro 1 carbon emissions standards. Replacing old Euro 0 or Euro 1 vehicles with a vehicle that conforms to the newest Euro 4 or Euro 5 emissions standards (less than 140 g CO/km) will net the consumer a payment of between EUR800 and EUR2,000 and an exemption from certain vehicular taxes for a period of two years (or three years if the vehicle has an engine displacement of less than 1,300 cc). This scheme will be instituted as of 1 January 2007 but will apply to all purchases made between 3 October 2006 and will continue until at least 31 December 2009. The measures include similar incentives for scooters and trucks. Importantly, part of the new scheme also provides for incentives of EUR650 to support the conversion of cars to use hybrid electric, hydrogen or liquefied petroleum gas technology. The government is expected to spend EUR50 million on these programs in 2007, 2008 and 2009.

** Analyst: Brian Kolenda**

**Japan: 0**

Japan’s government has not yet shown evidence of full compliance with the St. Petersburg commitments to surface transportation, but Japan’s policies have warranted partial compliance. Despite the lack of success of the Voluntary Emissions Trading Scheme, there has been a rise in the development of environmentally-friendly fuel technology as well as stricter fuel efficiency regulations. On 15 December 2006, the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI) proposed stricter regulations that would require Japanese automakers to increase the fuel efficiency of passenger cars by 23.5 percent by 2015. Making fuel efficient automobiles a priority for large automobile manufacturers should make such vehicles more affordable; a more competitive market for fuel efficient vehicles is one of the primary expectations of this initiative. These regulations would become the world’s strictest. In addition, the Ministry announced JPY2.4 billion to promote energy efficient vehicles for 2007, though they did not specify whether this funding would provide any consumer specific incentives. November 2006 was declared by METI as the “Eco-Drive Promotion Month,” during which the use of environmentally-friendly vehicles was promoted using advertising and seminars. These actions are not indicative of full compliance as they are not, strictly speaking, consumer incentives. However, they do reflect the spirit in which the commitment was made, and this should be considered when evaluating Japanese compliance.

** Analyst: Egor Ouzikov**

**Russia: 0**

Russia has not yet fulfilled its St. Petersburg surface transportation commitment, but has taken several measures aimed at improving its vehicle technical standards. In October 2006 the order banning the import of used vehicles that do not meet the Euro-2 efficiency standard came into force.

---


It was also decided to ban production and import of automobiles which do not satisfy Euro-3 standard from January 2008. Moreover in April 2007 the Ministry of Industry and Energy passed to the Government the bill on technical standards which would ban use of fuel lower than Euro-2 standard from January 2009 and lower than Euro-3 standard from January 2010.297

On 16 October 2006, in a meeting with Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) of the UN, Russian Deputy Minister of Industry and Energy Andrey Dementyev indicated that the federal government would continue to pursue an environmentally friendly energy policy. Dementyev stated that Russia was interested in expanding the collaboration with the ECE in the sphere of technical standards.298

In March 2007, the Russian representative of the Ministry of Industry and Energy noted that the Ministry expected the development of bill on using of alternative vehicle fuel.299 Minister of Agriculture Alexey Gordeev said that Russia is going to produce fuel from corn and rape, the first enterprises are being built and in future Russia could export the fuel.300

In October 2006, the state owned railway company, Russian Railways, signed a partnership with the Russian Academy of Science aimed at the development of energy saving technologies and alternative energy sources. Russian Railways CEO Vladimir Yakunin stated that development and eventual use of hydrogen powered locomotives was a priority for Russian Railways and a centerpiece of the agreement. 301 While Russia has demonstrated compliance with most dimensions of its St. Petersburg commitment, the federal government has implemented no programs to provide incentives for consumers to adopt efficient vehicles, thus Russia receives a score of 0.

**Analyst: Natalia Churkina and Egor Ouzikov**

**United Kingdom: 0**

The United Kingdom registered partial compliance to the commitments made at St. Petersburg, building on pre-existing programs to establish clean public transportation, while failing to provide substantial incentives to consumers for fuel efficient vehicle purchases. Prior to the compliance period, the British government had already implemented several initiatives that demonstrated British concern about surface transportation emissions. In March 1998 the British government introduced the Vehicle Excise Duty (VED), a duty partially based on emissions, providing incentives for consumers to purchase vehicles with lower emissions. Hybrid and fuel cell vehicles were exempt from paying any VED.302 On 6 April 2002, the British government linked taxation rates of company cars to carbon dioxide emissions, provide tax incentives for more efficient vehicles, including hybrids and clean diesels.303 On 22 March 2006, the Her Majesty’s Revenue and Customs Agency announced higher emission standards for company cars and a ten percent reduction for cars with emissions of 120g/km or below.304 On 29 November 2006, Transport Minister Dr. Stephen Ladyman reaffirmed the government’s commitment to these programs and reiterated their importance in promoting fuel efficient alternatives.305 The UK will introduce the **Renewable Transport Fuel Obligation**306 – which requires that 2.5% of all fuels sold on forecourts must be from renewable resources, eventually rising

http://www.vcacarfueldata.org.uk/search/companyCarTaxSearch.asp
http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_sustravel/documents/page/dft_sustravel_613747.hcsp
http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_roads/documents/page/dft_roads_610329-01.hcsp#P18_263
to 5% in 2010/11. The United Kingdom cannot be considered in full compliance with the G8 commitment, as it failed to implement new incentives for consumer purchases of low emissions vehicles. However, its pre-existing programs must be considered.

The British government has announced no federal initiatives to promote hybrid and fuel cell specific public transportation initiatives during the compliance period. Instead, the government emphasized public transit development as an alternative to private vehicle usage. On 29 November 2006 Ladyman stated the government will provide up to £200 million per annum through the Transport Innovation Fund to support schemes which will tackle road congestion, and encourage the use and expansion of public transit systems.

The British government has also pledged to spend approximately £1 billion to replace its fleet of government vehicles with environmentally friendly vehicles, a move projected to reduce emissions by 15%. This announcement, made by the Office of Government Council on 2 December 2006, was not noted in the previous interim report.

**Analyst: Augustine Kwok**

### United States: +1

The United States has registered a high level of compliance with the commitments made at St. Petersburg, funding numerous public transportation initiatives and promoting the development of alternative fuel programs. The United States was well on its way to compliance before the 2006 summit; the Departments of Energy and Transportation had established consumer incentives and had invested considerably in cleaner public transportation. On 8 August 2005, the federal government passed Energy Policy Act (EPACT), which included a tax rebate of up to USD4,000 for the purchase of hybrid or clean diesel vehicles. Though the federal government failed to build on these initiatives in the compliance period, they remain amongst the most substantial consumer incentives in the G8. In October 2006, the Federal Transit Administrator James Simpson and Congresswoman Mary Bono announced that USD49 million in federal grants for researchers around the country to explore new ways to make commercially viable hydrogen fuel cell bases a reality. Three non-profit organizations were competitively selected by the FTA to receive a share of the USD49 million.

U.S. Transportation Secretary Norman Y. Mineta announced a plan to spend $1.5 billion on light rail transit programs in Dallas, Denver, Portland, and Salt Lake City in February 2006, with funding allotted for the 2007 fiscal year. Once again, the commitment was made prior to the compliance period, but reflects a commitment to energy efficient public transportation initiatives.

**Analyst: Sarah Kim**

### European Union: +1

The European Union achieved a high level of compliance with the St. Petersburg commitment on surface transportation, by committing considerable capital to cleaner public transportation systems across Europe. On 19 July 2006 the European Commission granted the Dutch province of Gelderland €4.6 million in aid for a local project designed to explore new ways to make the public transportation system more environmentally friendly and attractive to the public. On 5 October 2006, the European Commission announced it had brokered an agreement between six European and Canadian cities for...


Furthermore, European Mobility Week was also established, where all European citizens enjoyed events from 16 September 2006 to 22 September 2006, dedicated to sustainable mobility. “The objective [was] to facilitate widespread debate on the necessity for changes in behaviour in relation to mobility and in particular the use of the private car.”\footnote{European Mobility Week. Official Website. Date of Access: 20 April 2007. http://www.mobilityweek-europe.org/}

Another European Mobility Week is planned for 16 and 22 September 2007.

The Commission Vice-President responsible for transport has expressed that effort should be made to ensure that transportation is environmentally-friendly and that more measures are necessary to ensure sustainable mobility. The Commission will present a strategic technology plan for energy in 2007, and a programme on green-powered vehicles will be introduced in 2009.\footnote{New transport policy focuses on citizens’ needs, EU Commission, (Brussels), 30 June 2006. Date of Access: 2 May 2007. http://ec.europa.eu/transport/060630_1_en.htm}

To prepare for this plan, the Commission announced its intention to publish a Green Paper on urban transport, examining whether there exist any impediments to build environmentally-friendly urban transport systems. This Green Paper will constitute the basis for the upcoming legislation on the European transport policy, which will address all forms of transportation, including walking and cycling. Interested people wanting to voice their opinion can do so on the internet until 30 April 2007.\footnote{Clean Urban Transport, European Commission, (Brussels), 26 February 2007. Date of Access: 13 April 2007. http://ec.europa.eu/transport/clean/green_paper_urban_transport/index_en.htm}

The Commission has also tackled the fuel suppliers, indicating that between 2011 and 2021 fuel suppliers must reduce their fuels’ greenhouse gas emissions by 10% when they are refined, transported and used. In essence, this will allow consumers a variety of clean fuels to purchase at the pump.\footnote{Healthy citizens, sustainable car industry. Press releases, European Commission, (Brussels), 8 February 2007. Date of Access: 13 April 2007. http://ec.europa.eu/news/environment/070208_1_en.htm}

Finally, it is noteworthy to add that the European Union has not only been compliant in regards to the St. Petersburg commitments, it has also taken the lead in the G8 to fight climate change. During a summit meeting on 8 to 9 March 2007, European heads of state committed to slash carbon emissions by 20% by 2020 and increase biofuel use by 10%.\footnote{Ambitious targets agreed to reduce global warming. Press releases, European Commission, (Brussels), 19 February 2007. Date of Access: 13 April 2007. http://ec.europa.eu/news/environment/070309_1_en.htm}

Analyst: Greg Beres
7. Renewable Energy [156]

Commitment

“We will facilitate development of local energy resources, including those based on core generation technologies and on renewable energy, such as hydropower, wind power, geothermal power, biomass, and the effective use of solar energy, to contribute to poverty reduction and long-term energy sustainability in developing countries.”

Global Energy Security

Background

In the context of energy security, many G8 members have seen renewable energy technologies as a means of opening up new sources of energy supply and tackling climate change and development, particularly in the context of rapidly-industrializing developing nations whose per-capita energy use is increasing quickly. This commitment parallels a similar commitment made at the 2005 Gleneagles Summit to support renewable energy technologies for development.

Local renewable energy technologies are one of the key opportunities for both development and carbon emissions mitigation efforts and G8 countries have shown some willingness to engage in both bilateral and multilateral efforts to address these issues. A number of G8 members have participated via the United National Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and associated Clean Development Mechanism process to undertake or otherwise support internationally-recognized projects. G8 members who are also members of NATO, APEC and other international fora have also acted multilaterally to express support for expansion of renewable energy technologies in developing countries.

However, at the 3-4 October 2006 Ministerial Meeting on the Gleneagles Dialogue on Climate Change, Clean Energy, and Sustainable Development in Monterrey, Mexico, G8 members failed to concretely re-iterate this commitment. The chair’s conclusions recognized the threat of climate change, the importance of renewable energy resources and technologies and re-iterated the importance of sustainable development for developing nations. Unfortunately, the communiqué did not explicitly speak to the issue of renewable energy technologies in developing countries.

Team Leader: Brian Kolenda

Assessment

2006 Final Compliance Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Canada: +1**

Canada has complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to encouraging renewable energy in developing nations. It participated in several meetings which discussed the growth and application of renewable energy technologies in the developing world, and supported several energy development projects since St. Petersburg. In the most recent meeting, the March 2007 G8 Environment Ministers’ Meeting, Canada participated in discussions with developing nations such as China, India, and Mexico, calling for “long-term policy frameworks giving clear incentives for the development, deployment and transfer of climate-friendly technologies, in particular energy efficiency, renewables and carbon capture and storage.”

Since the St. Petersburg Summit, the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Executive Board of the UNFCCC has approved four Canadian-supported energy development projects. Canada has authorized the participation of a number of Canadian firms in these projects, which include biomass energy plants in Malaysia. Importantly, the government of Canada is a direct participant in the El Canadá hydroelectric project in Guatemala, which was approved in December 2006. Canada has supported the development of the project since 2004 via its membership on the board of the World Bank’s Prototype Carbon Fund, which it also funds.

At a NATO Parliamentary Assembly meeting on 17 November 2006 in Quebec, Canada and other NATO nations passed a Resolution on Improving Global Energy Security. Delegates agreed to “redouble support for research, development and investment in renewable energy resources” and to “work with developing country governments, business leaders and civil societies to advance energy efficiency ... while recognising that increased energy use in these regions is essential to their development.”

Canada’s Minister of the Environment John Baird attended the February 2007 G8+5 Legislators Forum on Climate Change, allowing Canada to “share knowledge and expertise to identify further measures to address climate change at home and abroad” and among other climate efforts, approaches to technology transfers and market mechanisms between developed and developing nations were also discussed.

Canada attended the November 2006 Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Forum in Hanoi, Vietnam. Noting the rapidly increasing energy demands and concerns for environment, APEC leaders urged all member economies, including developing economies, to pursue programs to attract investments in the energy sector, and to foster cross-border energy trade and the “development of new and renewable energy sources.” Canada, through its membership in the APEC Energy Working Group (EWG), authorized the expenditure of USD50,000 in fall 2006 to launch the Local Banks Training Program for Financing Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Projects. The first phase, which determined the scope of the program, was recently completed in March 2007. By December 2007, this program is expected to have developed an understanding of renewable energy technologies among financial institutions in Mexico and other developing APEC economies.

*Analyst: Sina Hariri*

**France: 0**

France has made some progress towards complying with its St. Petersburg commitment to promote renewable energy in developing countries. Unfortunately, it has only announced funding for one such project since St. Petersburg.
France has notably undertaken a Kyoto Protocol Clean Development Mechanism project to comply with this commitment. On 31 August 2006, France’s Agence Français de Développement (AFD) concluded an agreement with the city of Durban, South Africa, to capture methane emissions from a rubbish dump in order to produce electricity. The project is one of the first that will enable South Africa to earn carbon credits through the CDM.329

At a NATO Parliamentary Assembly meeting on 17 November 2006, France and other NATO nations passed a Resolution on Improving Global Energy Security. Delegates agreed to “redouble support for research, development and investment in renewable energy resources” and to “work with developing country governments, business leaders and civil societies to advance energy efficiency … while recognising that increased energy use in these regions is essential to their development”.330

Analyst: Katherine Kanczuga

Germany: +1

Germany has fully complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to renewable energy in developing countries. Through verbal support as well as funding for both direct projects and third-party organizations focusing on renewable energy, Germany has made renewable energy a top international development priority.

Germany has provided funding for a number of multilateral and bilateral developing country renewable energy projects. On 17 November 2006, Stavros Dimas, the European Commission’s representative at the COP12 meetings in Nairobi, Kenya, announced that the “Government of Germany has agreed to contribute an additional EUR24 million” to the EU’s Global Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Fund” which will act to fund renewable energy projects in developing countries, particularly in Africa.331

At a bilateral economic meeting between Germany and Nepal on 28 and 29 November 2006, the German government committed special priority to projects relating to health, family planning, and promotion of local self-governance and development of renewable energy.332 On 6 October 2006 German Minister for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, Sigmar Gabriel, and Mehmet Gülter, Turkish Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, jointly announced a strategic partnership for the increased use of renewables in Turkey. While no specific funding was announced, the partnership will focus on the development of biomass, wind, solar and geothermal energy via political, trade, industrial and scientific cooperation.333

Speaking at the Egyptian-German economic forum in Cairo, German Chancellor Angela Merkel said the German government would help to fund a training and research center for renewable energies in Egypt334. At the opening of the two-day Africa-Europe Energy Forum in Berlin, Germany’s Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development, Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul, announced, “If we are to eradicate poverty in Africa, then we must eradicate energy poverty”. The aim, Minister Wieczorek-Zeul explained, is to support African countries in meeting the huge energy needs involved in achieving economic growth. Renewable energy resources will be promoted as a matter of priority to avoid potential negative impacts on the climate.335

On 19 October 2006, Minister Gabriel highlighted priority areas for the German Environment Ministry. In addition to focusing on ecological industrial policy, climate protection, energy efficiency, biodiversity and sustainable means of transport, his ministry will make renewable energy development a priority.

At a NATO Parliamentary Assembly meeting on 17 November 2006 Germany and other NATO nations passed a Resolution on Improving Global Energy Security. Delegates agreed to “redouble support for research, development and investment in renewable energy resources” and to “work with developing country governments, business leaders and civil societies to advance energy efficiency ... while recognising that increased energy use in these regions is essential to their development”.336

Germany attended the 15th Session of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD15) meetings in New York from 30 April 2007 to 11 May 2007. In a joint press release with EU Environment Commissioner Stavros Dimas, Gabriel expressed regret at what he called the CSD’s inability to “agree on an ambitious text on energy, climate, air pollution and industrial development” and highlighted that Germany, particularly as he highlighted Germany efforts at those meetings to work towards a UN agreement “poverty eradication through access to affordable and sustainable energy services”.337

Analyst: Fritz Bartel and Yuriy Zaitsev

Italy: +1

Italy has taken many significant steps to comply with its St. Petersburg commitment to develop renewable energy in developing countries, including multilateral initiatives.

Italy has been a key supporter of international efforts to promote renewable energy in developing countries. Italy, along with all G8 members, supported the May 2006 creation of the Global Bioenergy Partnership (GBEP) at the 14th Session of the UN Commission for Sustainable Development. Italy was a key proponent of this initiative,338 which aims “to promote bioenergy and to encourage the production, marketing and use of “green” fuels, with particular focus on developing countries.” Italy was selected as the first chair of the Secretariat of the GBEP, which was launched the week of 25 September 2006 at the headquarters of the UN Food and Agriculture Organization in Rome, Italy, and which is supported by the Italian Ministry for the Environment, Land and Sea.339

This has led Italy to take a more proactive stance in funding renewable energy projects in developing countries. After Italian Prime Minister, Romano Prodi, met with the Sao Paulo Federation of Industries and Brazilian President Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva on 26 March 2007, Prodi announced that “Brazilian and Italian energy companies are planning to build four biodiesel plants...to cost about USD480 million.”340 Italy is also looking to expand investment of sustainable bioenergy in African countries, focusing primarily upon Angola, Mozambique, and Congo and the construction of biodiesel plants in conjunction with its part state-owned energy company, Eni.341

Italy has also played a large role in developing geothermal energy. On 30 March 2007, Prime Minister Prodi stated, "We will make a special effort to increase Italy’s presence in Chile ... [in] two particular areas of interest: energy and infrastructure."342 This is to be led by Italy’s National Energy Company (ENEL), announcing two potential projects in the north and south of Chile that would aid Chile in taking advantage of its geothermal resources.343

At a NATO Parliamentary Assembly meeting on 17 November 2006 Italy and other NATO nations passed a Resolution on Improving Global Energy Security. Delegates agreed to “redouble support for research, development and investment in renewable energy resources” and to “work with developing

---

country governments, business leaders and civil societies to advance energy efficiency ... while recognizing that increased energy use in these regions is essential to their development”.

Analyst: Giovanni Bruno

Japan: +1

Japan has taken a significant number of steps to comply with its G8 renewable energy commitments. Japan has participated in multilateral and bilateral meetings which promoted and discussed the development and application of renewable energy technologies in developed and developing countries, particularly in Asia.

Such participation included the dialogue between Japanese and Chinese delegations held in Tokyo on 30 August 2006 to discuss climate change. Japan agreed to further cooperate with China on Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) projects including renewable energy. Both countries emphasized the importance of continuing talks and agreed to hold a further meeting in China in 2007 to discuss specific details of any renewable energy projects.

Japan’s New Energy and Industrial Technology Development Organization (NEDO) also co-organized the "International Workshop on Renewable Energy/Energy Efficiency and the Clean Development Mechanism" with the Indonesian Ministry of the Environment on 29 August 2006. At the conference, Ken Okaniwa, representative of the Embassy of Japan, stressed the importance of renewable energies and Indonesia’s "considerable potential with regard to energy conservation and new energy".

On 9 September 2006, Prime Minister Koizumi signed a joint statement with the government of the Philippines, agreeing to technical cooperation between both nations to utilize sustainable energy for rural electrification, and encouraged the use of renewable energies as alternative fuels for transport. Japan took further initiative on 10 September 2006 at the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM 6) in Helsinki, where then-Prime Minister Koizumi encouraged ASEM developed nations to provide the financial and technical assistance to ASEM developing countries in order to “scale up” their use of new and renewable energy sources.

Prime Minister Shinzo Abe signed a joint statement on 15 December 2006 with India, forming a strategic partnership recognizing the importance of securing the energy needs of both countries and encouraging greater cooperation in the energy sector, including on energy efficiency and renewable energy.

Japan attended the November 2006 Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Forum in Hanoi, Vietnam. Noting the rapidly increasing energy demands and concerns for environment, APEC leaders urged all member economies, including developing economies, to pursue programs to attract investments in the energy sector, cross-border energy trade, "development of new and renewable energy sources.” Japan, through its membership in the APEC Energy Working Group (EWG), authorized the expenditure of USD50,000 in fall 2006 to launch the Local Banks Training Program for Financing Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Projects. The program, set to begin in January 2007, will develop understanding of renewable energy technologies among financial institutions in Mexico and other developing APEC economies.

Analyst: Sina Hariri

---

Russia: +1

Russia continued to make progress in fulfilling its St. Petersburg commitments. The Federation Council Deputy Chair D. Mezentsev at the 15th annual session of the Asia-Pacific Parliamentary Forum in January 2007 said that Russia will gradually increase the role of alternative energy.252 In February 2007 Russian Deputy Minister of Industry and Energy Ivan Materov met with Gabriel Nguema Lima, the Deputy Minister of Natural Resources, Industry and Energy for the Republic of Equatorial Guinea, and agreed on conditions for partnership in building hydropower stations in Guinea.253

In November 2006, the Ministry of Industry and Energy of the Russian Federation and UNESCO announced the creation of an International Centre for Information and Analysis on Sustainable Energy Development for solving energy problems and particularly the problem of energy poverty in developing countries.254 This Center will help to harmonize positions of leading countries in taking measures against energy poverty.255

Another important event in the sphere of renewable energy development was the First World Congress “Alternative Energy and Ecology” under the aegis of the Ministry of Industry and Energy of the Russian Federation on 21-25 August 2006.256 Russia attended the November 2006 Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Forum in Hanoi, Vietnam. Noting the rapidly increasing energy demands and concerns for environment, APEC leaders urged all member economies, including developing economies, to pursue programs for development of new and renewable energy sources.257 Russia, through its membership in the APEC Energy Working Group (EWG), authorized the expenditure of USD50,000 in Fall 2006 to launch the Local Banks Training Program for Financing Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Projects. The program will develop knowledge of renewable energy technologies among financial institutions in Mexico and other developing APEC economies.258

Russia has joined the international Global Village private-public partnership and allocated USD30 million to its budget. The Program is developing renewable energy projects for African States.

Analyst: Natalia Churkina and Katherine Kanczuga

United Kingdom: +1

Since the United Kingdom devised a climate change strategy at the 2005 Gleneagles Summit, the UK has remained the major driving force in advancing renewable energy and has fully complied with its St. Petersburg commitment in this area.

The UK is a leading investor country in the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) and has supported a significant number of CDM renewable energy projects in developing countries. On 15 November 2006, UK Environment Secretary David Miliband highlighted his government’s belief that the “Kyoto Protocol’s Clean Development Mechanism played an important role in helping to spread low carbon solutions.”259 He further states that the UK “will support CDM projects as a vital symbol of global commitment”.260 The UK ranks first in the world in terms of approved CDM projects261 with 154

approved and authorised projects.\textsuperscript{362} A review of all projects registered by the CDM Executive Board indicates that of the 69 projects approved since the St. Petersburg Summit where the UK has supported British firms’ participation, the vast majority have featured the generation of renewable energy and/or electricity cogeneration. These projects include 26 methane recovery and electricity generation projects in Mexico, 13 similar projects in India, and a total of over 140 MW of wind power capacity in China.\textsuperscript{363} It must be noted, however, that all of these projects are being privately funded and UK government involvement is limited to authorization under the Kyoto Protocol CDM mechanism.

In addition, at a NATO Parliamentary Assembly meeting on 17 November 2006 the United Kingdom and other NATO nations passed a Resolution on Improving Global Energy Security. Delegates agreed to “redouble support for research, development and investment in renewable energy resources” and to “work with developing country governments, business leaders and civil societies to advance energy efficiency … while recognising that increased energy use in these regions is essential to their development”.\textsuperscript{364}

Finally, the UK has played a defining role in creating bilateral partnerships with developing countries in the field of renewable energy. Since the 2006 St. Peters burg Summit, the United States has made agreements with Brazil, Mozambique and South Africa on biofuels; India on clean energy investment, and Mexico on carbon markets.\textsuperscript{365} The UK Chancellor of the Exchequer, Gordon Brown, thereafter announced a £800 million increase to the environmental trust fund that will insure that developing countries gain “higher standards and investment”\textsuperscript{366}, through renewable energy, in reducing emissions.

Analyst: Giovanni Bruno

United States: +1

Through verbal support and participation in international organizations, the United States has shown support for the energy development goals of the St. Petersburg summit. It has authorized one relevant multilateral project, and has signed one bilateral agreement to further renewable energy in the developing world.

The United States attended the November 2006 Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Forum in Hanoi, Vietnam. Noting the rapidly increasing energy demands and concerns for environment, APEC leaders urged all member economies, including developing economies, to pursue programs to attract investments in the energy sector, cross-border energy trade, "development of new and renewable energy sources."\textsuperscript{367} The United States, through its membership in the APEC Energy Working Group (EWG), authorized the expenditure of USD50,000 in fall 2006 to launch the Local Banks Training Program for Financing Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Projects. The program, set to begin in January 2007, will develop understanding of renewable energy technologies among financial institutions in Mexico and other developing APEC economies.\textsuperscript{368}

In addition, at a NATO Parliamentary Assembly meeting on 17 November 2006 the United States and other NATO nations passed a Resolution on Improving Global Energy Security. Delegates agreed to “redouble support for research, development and investment in renewable energy resources” and to “work with developing country governments, business leaders and civil societies to advance energy efficiency … while recognising that increased energy use in these regions is essential to their development”.\textsuperscript{369}


On 9 March 2007, the United States signed a renewable energy agreement with Brazil in order to further research and development cooperation between the world’s two leading ethanol producers.370 During three days of meetings with Indian government officials and business leaders, US Energy Secretary Samuel Bodman highlighted the necessity of and potential for renewable energy production in the Indian market.371

 Analyst: Fritz Bartel

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has registered a high level of compliance with its St. Petersburg Renewable Energy commitment. In addition to speaking about the importance of renewable energy projects for development, the EU has undertaken a number of concrete projects aimed at expanding renewable energy initiatives in developing countries.

At the 2006 EU Energy Conference in November 2006, EU Commission President José Manuel Barroso spoke about the importance of developing country energy projects for the EU. He highlighted a meeting he had had with African leaders in Brussels and said that the EU “must work more closely with Sub-Saharan Africa. Several African countries have substantial energy resources, and yet their populations have the lowest rate of access to energy services in the world, hampering all aspects of development.”372 At the same conference, EU Energy Commissioner Andris Piebalgs highlighted several specific EU renewable energy efforts in African countries. The Africa-Europe Partnership on Infrastructure, which was created in December 2005, is set to “develop cross-border and regional energy infrastructure” in African countries.373 According to Piebalgs, “the first batch of projects is ready for approval by the end of” 2006.374 In November 2006, the EU completed a call for proposals for its Africa-Caribbean-Pacific-EU Energy Facility program, which “focuses on improving access to energy”; projects are expected to begin in 2007. Approved in 2004, the program is “a EUR250 million Energy Facility to increase access to modern energy services for people in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific”.375 The COOPENER programme was created in 2004 and “is an initiative aiming at promoting renewable energy sources and energy efficiency in developing countries, as well as sustainable energy services for poverty alleviation”.376 Funding for projects has been provided through 2008 in many cases, but in December 2006 the European Commission earmarked funding of EUR730 million for the Intelligent Energy Europe initiative for the 2007-2013 period.377

On 10 October 2006, the European Commission proposed a project to create a “global risk capital fund to mobilise private investment in energy efficiency and renewable energy projects in developing countries and economies in transition.”378 The European Union would provide EUR80 million in funding for the Global Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Fund (GEEREF) over the next four years with a further EUR20 million being provided by “other public and private sources”. The Commission projects that the fund would provide financing for projects of a total value of EUR1 billion.

EU leaders have also re-iterated their commitment to renewable energy in developing nations in multilateral fora. On 17 November 2006, Stavros Dimas, the European Commission’s representative at the 2006 UN Climate Change Conference in Nairobi, Kenya, remarked that the EU is “fully aware of the need to increase access to affordable, secure and sustainable energy in developing countries,


375 europa.eu/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/r12532.htm


particularly in Africa... The Global Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Fund, or GEEREF, recently launched by the European Commission is a very concrete example of how to make capital and technology transfer work in practice.\textsuperscript{379}

EC representative Dimas has again highlighted the GEEREF in a number of recent meetings, including at the 25 April 2007 Asia-Europe (ASEM) Environment Minister’s Meetings in Copenhagen. At that meeting, he spoke of the need to cooperate on renewable energy technology transfer, particularly with respect to EU-Asian partnerships, including European Commission efforts to propose “a new dialogue facility under the ASEM umbrella for the period 2007-2013.” Mr Dimas also attended the 15\textsuperscript{th} Session of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD15) meetings in New York from 30 April 2007 to 11 May 2007.\textsuperscript{380} He spoke at a High-Level side event sponsored by the European Presidency and highlighted that the GEEREF had thus far secured a total of EUR122 million in pledges, including the EUR80 million that the EU had previously pledged.\textsuperscript{381}

\textit{Analyst: Brian Kolenda}


8. Climate Change [162]

Commitment

“We reaffirm our intention to deliver on commitments made in Gleneagles in order to meet our shared ... objectives of reducing greenhouse gas emissions”

Global Energy Security

Background

First introduced in 1997, the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) came into force on 16 February 2005. The Protocol established a set of mandatory targets for the reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions for the leading economic powers, which have ratified it. Industrialized countries generate the overwhelming majority of GHG emissions -- combined the G8 countries account for about 65 percent of the world’s GDP, and for about 47 percent of the world’s CO2 emissions. Accordingly, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, and the United Kingdom all signed and ratified the Kyoto Protocol. The United States, however, has not ratified the Protocol. Although it initially signed the Protocol, the United States withdrew in 2001, listing fundamental flaws in its “arbitrary” goals. Another cited problem with the Protocol is that it exempts emerging industrialized countries, such as China and India – two of the top five emitters of GHG. Instead of lowering emissions, the United States has concentrated its attention on sustainable energy: it signed onto the Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate with Japan, a non-legally binding framework, focused on the production and trade of clean energy technologies.

At the 2005 Gleneagles Summit, G8 leaders acknowledged the problem of global warming, and agreed to a wide range of climate change-related initiatives, including commitment to the UNFCCC and to its ultimate objective to stabilize GHGs in the atmosphere at a level that prevents dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system and taking forward a Dialogue on Climate Change, Clean Energy and Sustainable Development. G8 members pledged to advance “the global effort to tackle climate change. Significantly, G8 leaders agreed that those “who have ratified the Kyoto Protocol remain committed to it, and will continue to work to make it a success.”

As a result of the breadth of commitments made at Gleneagles there were a multitude of standards against which to measure G8 countries’ performance vis-à-vis their St. Petersburg re-commitment. To allow for meaningful year-on-year comparison against a commitment that had previously been measured, the G8RG Compliance Team decided to focus its assessment against the statement that those “who have ratified the Kyoto Protocol remain committed to it, and will continue to work to make it a success.” This was the exact statement that we assessed during the Gleneagles compliance period as a representative measure of climate change efforts.

Recognizing that this is necessarily a limited view of the climate change efforts of G8 countries, the G8RG Oxford Team is preparing a broader and deeper analysis of G8 countries’ climate change efforts.

Team Leader: Courtney Hood

Assessment

2006 Final Compliance Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>+0.78</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada: 0

Canada registers a score of 0, indicating partial compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment on climate change. Canada ratified the Kyoto Protocol and promised at Gleneagles in 2005 to "remain committed to it" and it is this promise that Canada recommitted to at St. Petersburg in 2006. Since the July 2006 Summit, the Canadian government has announced long-term GHG emissions reduction targets, dedicated over CAD3.5 billion of the 2007 budget to the mitigation of climate change and has put forward a plan to reduce emissions from 2006 levels by 2020. In spite of this, Canada has disavowed its commitment to meet Kyoto targets of emissions reductions against 1990 levels.

Although Canada is a signatory of the Kyoto Protocol, in September 2006 then-Environment Minister Rona Ambrose announced that Canada would not fulfill its commitment to reduce GHG emissions by 6% from 1990 levels by 2012. On 10 October 2006 Canada introduced the Clean Air Act as an alternative “Made in Canada” approach based on more “tenable measures” to reduce GHG emissions. The Act pegs Canadian emission targets to economic industrial production, allowing the potential for emissions to increase with outputs. In defence of its change in policy and perceptions of abandonment of the Kyoto Protocol, Ms Ambrose reaffirmed Canada’s commitment to climate change, stating that the new targets "would exceed those proposed by the previous government and will produce real environmental progress here in Canada." On 19 October 2006, Canada announced that it would strive to achieve "an absolute reduction" of 45 to 65 percent in GHG emissions by 2050, and issued a notice of intent on 21 October 2006 recognizing Canada’s lack of action on climate change in comparison to other OECD nations. Canada has continued to be involved in the UNFCCC and Kyoto Protocol negotiations, including via its delegation to the UN on Climate Change Conference in Nairobi in November 2006. Following this broad-based meeting, Environment Canada issued a communiqué expressing Canada’s interest in discussing new emission-cutting targets after 2012.

---

On 19 January 2007 Prime Minister Stephen Harper declared the intent to boost renewable energy to 4,000 megawatts between 2007 and 2011. On 8 February 2007, Environment Minister John Baird announced plans to implement legislation in 2010 concerning the regulation of pollutants as per the Clean Air Act to reduce emissions by the year 2050. The budget released on 19 March 2007 pledged CAD1.5 billion towards a Canadian ecoTrust plan for the support of province- and territory-led initiatives towards clean air and climate change. The Canadian government further introduced a “Green levy” on the heaviest-polluting vehicles on 19 March 2007, dedicated CAD36 million between 2007 and 2009 for the plan, and pledged CAD2 billion between 2007 and 2014 for research and development of renewable fuels totaling over CAD3.5 billion in investments towards the reduction of greenhouse gases and amelioration of climate change. On 27 March 2007 the Commons Committee reviewed the the Clean Air Act proposed several amendments that, including the trading of Carbon Credits and the establishment of short, medium, and long-term emissions goals. The proposed alterations were tabled at the 39th parliamentary session 29 March 2007 and the Clean Air Act remains unimplemented as of 1 May 2007.

On 26 April 2007, Minister Baird announced the Canadian government’s Turning the Corner plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution. The plan calls for a regulatory reduction in certain industrial sectors of 18% in GHG emissions per unit of output by 2010 over 2006 levels and a 2% yearly reduction thereafter. The plan also creates a Climate Change Technology Fund that will be funded by levies on each tonne of GHG emissions. Finally, the plan puts in motion a domestic emissions trading scheme and gives emitters access to international Kyoto Protocol Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) credits. This plan has a goal of an overall 20% reduction in annual Canadian GHG emissions over 2006 levels by 2020.

In light of this, it is apparent that the Canadian Government has displayed diplomatic and fiscal attention to the issue of climate change. However, with Canadian GHG emissions up by over 35 percent from their 1990s levels, the government’s target of 20% reductions over 2006 represents an increase in annual emissions over 1990 levels of five percent, far above its Kyoto target of a six percent reduction over 1990 levels. As a result of a public repudiation of its Kyoto commitments and no policy goals to meet those obligations which it recommitted to at St. Petersburg, Canada cannot receive a score higher than 0.

Analyst: Courtney Hood

France: +1

France has demonstrated full compliance with its St. Petersburg climate change commitment, registering a score of +1. At the November 2006 Nairobi United Nations Climate Change Conference, the French delegation reiterated its commitment to address climate change. In a 15 November 2006 speech at the conference, French President Jacques Chirac stated that France is committed to its responsibilities and will adhere to its obligations under the terms of the Kyoto Protocol. President Chirac announced that France is currently establishing regulatory measures to meet its long-term commitment of reducing 75% of its GHG emissions by the year 2050. On 16 November 2006, Nelly Olin, the French Minister of Ecology and Sustainable Development, further reiterated France’s pledge.

---

396 Tories push $1.5B in green initiatives, Toronto Star. 20 January 2007.
403 Tories push $1.5B in green initiatives, (Ottawa), Allan Woods: Toronto Star. 20 January 2007.
404 http://www.canada.com/topics/news/politics/story.html?id=501e96f2-64a2-4e40-b2d7-fadc10b572e5&k=77039
to the Kyoto Protocol for the period of 2008-2012, and encouraged the international community to increase its support for their commitments.\textsuperscript{408}

In early 2007, France facilitated a number of international conferences to encourage multilateral discussions on climate change. In January 2007, France organized the first working group of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) which started to publish its fourth evaluation report on climate science on 2 February 2007.\textsuperscript{409} From 2-3 February 2007, President Jacques Chirac hosted the Paris Conference for international environmental governance called “Citizens of the earth” in order to push for the establishment of an international action plan of managing the environment.\textsuperscript{410}

In addition to its efforts on the international stage, France has also implemented a number of domestic environmental reforms. On 4 October 2006, Prime Minister Dominique de Villepin announced a new National Pact for the environment,\textsuperscript{411} inspired by the August 2006 ‘Factor 4’ report produced by a French energy policy committee.\textsuperscript{412} The French government’s new National Pact, announced by Prime Minister de Villepin to begin in 2007, allocated EUR10 billion for energy savings in the housing sector.\textsuperscript{413} On 13 November 2006, Mr de Villepin also announced the reinforcement of France’s national Climate Plan in an effort to reduce 10\% of French CO\textsubscript{2} emissions by 2010.\textsuperscript{414} France has also devised plans to implement taxation reforms to encourage environmental protection through this plan.\textsuperscript{415} As well, the French government submitted its National Plan of the Assignment of CO\textsubscript{2} Quotas for the 2008-2012 period to public consultation from 23 February to 23 March 2007.\textsuperscript{416} This measure was taken in conformity with the Kyoto Protocol and led the European Commission to approve the plan on 9 March 2007.\textsuperscript{417}

**Analyst: Ioana Hancas**

**Germany: +1**

Germany has recorded a score of +1 indicating full compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment to abide by its Kyoto Protocol emissions reduction target. In a report released in September 2006, the Federal Minister for the Environment, Nature Conservation, and Nuclear Safety Sigmar Gabriel confirmed that Germany is well on its way toward meeting its Kyoto obligations.\textsuperscript{418} Germany has indicated that it is on pace to exceed requirements of the Kyoto Protocol, promising to cut greenhouse gas emissions by 21\% of 1990 emissions levels (currently at 18\%)\textsuperscript{419} between 2008 and 2012.\textsuperscript{420} The German government is advocating the extension of Kyoto beyond its current 2012 period.
mandate.® Prior to the UN Climate Change Conference in Nairobi, Mr Gabriel emphasized the need to establish guidelines for a post-2012 global climate protection agreement,®® proposing that the EU reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 30% of 1990 levels by 2020, for which Germany is committed to a 40% emissions reduction.®® Following the Conference, Minister Gabriel reaffirmed Germany’s commitment to strengthen the Kyoto Protocol.®®

Germany has also engaged in various bilateral and multilateral efforts to address the issue of GHG emissions. On 9 November 2006 Germany announced its commitment to assist Peru in carrying out the Clean Development Measure which supports climate protection investments in developing countries.®® Germany also earmarked EUR24 million for the EU’s Global Efficiency and Renewable Energy Fund (GEREF) which assists developing countries in decoupling economic growth from greenhouse gas emissions.®® In December 2006, Germany and China established an agreement to broaden their partnership on environmental protection by focusing on climate protection projects in the framework of the Kyoto Protocol’s Clean Development Mechanism, chemicals safety, waste management and water management.®® These arrangements were confirmed during a telephone conversation on 19 March 2007 between Chancellor Angela Merkel and Chinese Prime Minister Wen Jiabao.®® In October 2006, Germany also participated in the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) Summit establishing a consensus on extending the Kyoto Protocol beyond 2010®® and in November 2006, Chancellor Angela Merkel announced a new pact between Germany and the United Kingdom to prevent climate change.®®

Germany is further taking advantage of its leadership positions within the G8 and the EU. State Secretary at the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Matthias Machnig, announced on 27 November 2006 that his government will focus on environmental topics during the first six months of its presidency in the European Council in 2007.®® On 3 March 2007, the European Council, chaired by Federal Chancellor Merkel, merged the European Union’s climate and energy policies aiming to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the European Union by 30 percent by 2020 compared with 1990 levels.®® To meet this target, Germany plans to increase energy efficiency by 3 percent per year.®®

---

On 12 February 2007 the Federal Research Ministry’s Parliamentary State Secretary, Thomas Rachel, announced the allocation of EUR255 million over the next 3 years through the "Forschung für den Klimawandel" (Research for Climate Change) program funding research into zero-emissions vehicles, energy efficiency, and renewable energy sources. In March 2007, the environment ministers of the G8 countries and the five major newly industrializing countries met in Potsdam, Germany to recognize the most recent findings of scientific research on climate change, including the report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Federal Environment Minister Gabriel praised the initiative on 16 March 2007 calling it a "good interim result for the summit in Heiligendamm." In response to the IPCC report, on 12 February 2007, the German Advisory Council on Global Change (WBGU) published a policy paper entitled "New impetus for climate policy: making the most of Germany's dual presidency" with suggestions on state responses to climate change. Further, on 6 April 2007, Mr Gabriel commented that the latest IPCC report "confirms that it is necessary to pursue an ambitious climate protection policy.

On 27 March 2007 at the G8 development ministers meeting in Berlin, Federal Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development, Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul re-affirmed Germany’s commitment to climate change, stating that throughout its G8 presidency Germany intends to "adopt concrete initiatives" towards the alleviation of climate change's consequences, especially for developing nations.

**Analyst: Zeeshawn Ali and Yuriy Zaitsev**

**Italy: +1**

Italy has demonstrated compliance with its St. Petersburg climate change commitment, registering a score of +1. In 2006 Italy achieved some progress with the approval of the National Allocation Plan (NAP) Phase 2 for the 2008-2012 term. The NAP Phase 2 aims to reduce CO2 emissions from smokestack industries to 209 million tonnes per year, a decrease from NAP Phase 1 emissions, which permitted 224 million tonnes per year. At present, Italy requires reductions of 97 million tonnes per year to meet its Kyoto targets. The new NAP phase 2 will garner funds from industry emissions overruns to finance CO2 reduction programs. Italy managed to escape disciplinary action from the European Court of Justice for delaying its NAP Phase 2, which was due 30 June 2006 but not issued until December of 2006.

Italy has also made diplomatic strides towards emissions reduction, and in November 2006, Italy sent a delegation to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in Nairobi in support of

multilateral talks on climate change." On 19 February 2007, Industry Minister Pierluigi Bersani announced that EUR1 billion would be allocated for company research related to innovation in energy efficiency, and EUR1.5 billion in tax credits for companies and families using small-scale renewable power generation and energy efficient technologies. On 16 March 2007, the Italian government announced that it would switch its public transport fuel to a mix containing 20 percent biodiesel by the end of 2008 to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Italian ministers also announced that Italy would enter the voluntary carbon trading market on 2 April 2007 to help offset some of its carbon emissions. Furthermore, Italian Prime Minister Romano Prodi agreed to tackle climate change in cooperation with Japan during his meeting with Prime Minister Shinzo Abe on 16 April 2007. Nothwithstanding these domestic policies concerning climate change, Italy’s GHG emissions volume continues to increase. In October 2006, the Environmental Protection Agency (APAT) reported a 12.2 percent increase in GHG emissions from 1990 levels, a level far exceeding Italy's projected Kyoto target of 6.5 percent in reductions. However, since the Italian government has taken substantial measures to meet its Gleneagles climate change commitment, it receives a full compliance score of +1.

**Analyst: Christian Cianfrone**

**Japan: +1**

Japan registers a full compliance score of +1 for fulfilling its St. Petersburg commitment to reduce GHG emissions. On 29 September 2006, Japan’s newly elected Prime Minister, Shinzo Abe, reaffirmed Japan’s commitment to the Kyoto Protocol, outlining his government’s plans to meet its objectives: “In order to honor Japan's commitments under the Kyoto Protocol beginning in 2008, I will steadily advance the Kyoto Protocol Target Attainment Plan ... The government is also working on a global warming prevention...by promoting the introduction of solar power generation ... I will also accelerate the use of biomass, including the use of bio ethanol as a vehicle fuel.” In another statement on 1 November 2006, Prime Minister Abe announced the government's plans to replace all gasoline in the country with E10, a 10% ethanol blend, by 2030. Prime Minister Abe's pro-active approach in tackling climate change has been echoed by Japan's Environment Minister Masatoshi Wakabayashi: "We must mobilize everyone and employ all policy instruments to speed up the policies and measures spelled out in the Kyoto Protocol Target Achievement Plan, beginning with the adoption and promotion of renewable energies such as biomass energy, solar energy, wind power ..." The Ministry of Environment is also seeking new budget allocations for the fiscal year to fund studies on biofuels. The Japanese government has also recently initiated a feasibility study about an environmental tax following the FY 2007 Tax Reform Proposal, with the goal of making the system “more environment-oriented ... to support policy measures designed to arrest global warming.”

Japan has also announced its intentions to play a larger role in facilitating global environmental leadership. In October 2006 Japan issued a statement outlining plans to host the 10th Conference of the Parties on the Convention of Biological Diversity in 2010, although no date has been specified. In addition, at the Eight Tripartite Environment Ministers Meeting held on 2-3 December 2006, Japan, with China and South Korea, expressed a willingness to support the Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate (APP) to complement the Kyoto Protocol. The Ministry of the Environment (MOE) has also announced plans to host the 15th Environment Congress for Asia and the Pacific (ECO ASIA 2007) in September 2007 to offer a forum for the exchange of ideas for the promotion of regional environmental co-operation.

As of March 2006, Japan’s emissions had risen 0.6%, displaying a 14.1% gap between actual emission reductions and the country’s Kyoto goal of a 6% overall emissions reduction based on 1990 emissions levels. To mitigate this gap, Japan has taken action to strengthen domestic law to promote the reduction and increased recycling of food wastes by amending the Law for Promotion of Recycling and Related Activities. The amendment will strengthen the guidance and supervision of food-related businesses. On 30 March 2007, Japan renewed the Action Plan for Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction in Government Operations which was originally adopted in 2002. The new plan will cover fiscal periods between 2007 to 2012.

**Analyst: Zeeshawn Ali**

**Russia: 0**

Russia has only partially complied with its St. Petersburg Climate Change commitment. Unlike its other G8 partners, it has no specific greenhouse gas emissions reductions targets under the Kyoto Protocol but does have some specific procedural responsibilities along with the general responsibility of decreasing its emissions. While Russia has submitted its UNFCCC greenhouse gas inventory, it has done little of substance to decrease its emissions since the 2006 G8 Summit.

During this compliance period, Russia submitted, for the first time, its Kyoto-protocol mandated greenhouse gas inventory to the UNFCCC. In October 2006 Russia sent its Fourth National Report to the UNFCCC with data on GHG emissions in 2000-2004 and other information on climate change in Russia. In February 2007 the UNFCCC published this report. According to the Federal Center of Geocological Systems (FCGS "Ecology"), the institution tasked with administering Russia’s greenhouse gas registry, Russia could start its initialisation process with the UN’s International Transaction Log (ITL) in the summer of 2007. Thus, all necessary documents for the realization of the Kyoto Protocol in Russia are ready and Russia has fulfilled its commitment under the Protocol.

In February 2007 Russia’s government decided to accept a grant from Japan via the World Bank of USD725,000 (£560,000) to carry out a study on how Russia can implement a green investment scheme (GIS) under the Kyoto Protocol. Ministry of Economic Development of the RF passed to the...
Government the bill on JI projects.\footnote{1 billion dollars for emissions, Vedomosti, (Moscow), 23 January 2007, Date of Access: 16 April 2007. 

Russia also participated in a number of international events devoted to the problems of climate change. Russian specialists took part in the work of the XV World Forum on Global Changes in Vienna on the 10-12 October 2006 \footnote{Climate change was chosen the higher priority strategic research, WWF in Russia, (Moscow), 12 October 2006, Date of Access: 16 April 2007. http://www.wwf.ru/resources/news/article/4648} and in the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Nairobi on the 6-7 November 2006. At the 26th Session of the Subsidy Body for Scientific and Technological Advice and the Subsidy Body for Implementation of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, held from 7-18 May 2007, on 11 May, a workshop on the proposal by the Russian Federation, that appropriate procedures be developed to enable parties to the Kyoto Protocol to adopt voluntary commitments, was organized.\footnote{Sessions of the Subsidiary Bodies, UNFCC International, (Bonn), 7-18 May 2007. Date of Access: 16 April 2007. http://unfccc.int/meetings/sb26/items/39191txt.php.php.}

**Analysts: Vera Serdiuk and Natalia Churkina**

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom registers a final score of +1 indicating full compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment on climate change. According to the European Environment Agency in its Annual 2006 European Community Greenhouse Gas Inventory Report, the United Kingdom is on pace to meet its Kyoto Protocol emissions reduction target. The report cites 14.1% in GHG emissions reductions until 2004, an achievement exceeding the target of 12.5% in reductions initially committed to by the United Kingdom. UK Environment Secretary David Miliband put forth a draft climate change bill on 13 March 2007 defining a long-term plan to reduce emissions by 60% from 1990 levels by 2050. The bill also aims to make legally binding a system of five-year targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and require "all sectors of society to contribute to the transition to a low-carbon economy".\footnote{UK government outlines five-year emissions targets in draft bill, Platts Commodity News, (New York), 13 March 2007. Date of Access: 16 April 2007. global.factiva.com.myAccess.library.utoronto.ca/ha/default.aspx.}

The UK and the US state of California, signed a mission statement establishing a working partnership on 31 July 2006 to tackle climate change which would "commit [California and the United Kingdom] to urgent action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote low carbon technologies."\footnote{California and UK in climate pact, BBC News Online, (London), 31 July 2006. Date of Access: 15 November 2006. global.factiva.com.myAccess.library.utoronto.ca/ha/default.aspx.} The United Kingdom-California pact demonstrates compliance with Article 10 of the Kyoto Protocol. The United Kingdom further complied with Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol when Climate Change Minister Ian Person announced that the United Kingdom "would approve non-UK entities' participation in Clean Development Mechanism projects."\footnote{UK project recently approved was with China, which aimed to reduce an average of 109,922 tonnes of equivalent CO2 emissions each year between 2006 and 2012. The approval by the United Kingdom of non-UK entities has made the global carbon market more inclusive of additional parties focused on reducing GHG emissions. In addition, Environment Secretary David Miliband and Transport Secretary Douglas Alexander approved of the European Commission's proposal to include aviation into the EU Emissions Trading Scheme.} One non-UK project recently approved was with China, which aimed to reduce an average of 109,922 tonnes of equivalent CO2 emissions each year between 2006 and 2012. The approval by the United Kingdom of non-UK entities has made the global carbon market more inclusive of additional parties focused on reducing GHG emissions. In addition, Environment Secretary David Miliband and Transport Secretary Douglas Alexander approved of the European Commission's proposal to include aviation into the EU Emissions Trading Scheme.\footnote{UK paves way for non-Kyoto Countries to join international carbon market, Government News Network, (Beijing), 27 October 2006. Date of Access: 15 November 2006. global.factiva.com.myAccess.library.utoronto.ca/ha/default.aspx.} One non-UK project recently approved was with China, which aimed to reduce an average of 109,922 tonnes of equivalent CO2 emissions each year between 2006 and 2012. The approval by the United Kingdom of non-UK entities has made the global carbon market more inclusive of additional parties focused on reducing GHG emissions. In addition, Environment Secretary David Miliband and Transport Secretary Douglas Alexander approved of the European Commission's proposal to include aviation into the EU Emissions Trading Scheme.\footnote{Kyoto anniversary: Miliband welcomes globe agreement, Government News Network, (Beijing), 16 February 2007. Date of Access: 17 April 2007. global.factiva.com.myAccess.library.utoronto.ca/ha/default.aspx.}

In February 2007, Mr Miliband announced that the UK would host a meeting in June with key experts and businesspeople to investigate how a low-carbon economy could be achieved.\footnote{World leaders sign new climate pact, Platts Commodity News, (New York), 16 February 2007. Date of Access. 17 April 2007. global.factiva.com.myAccess.library.utoronto.ca/ha/default.aspx.} This announcement came shortly after politicians from G8 countries plus Brazil, China, India, Mexico and South Africa signed a new agreement on climate change at The Washington Legislators Forum that included developing countries for the first time. Secretary Miliband commented on the new agreement saying that it could clear the way for progress on a new global pact.\footnote{UK government outlines five-year emissions targets in draft bill, Platts Commodity News, (New York), 13 March 2007. Date of Access: 16 April 2007. global.factiva.com.myAccess.library.utoronto.ca/ha/default.aspx.} In March 2007, UK Environment
that the international community takes decisive further action to cut global emissions after 2012, achieving its Kyoto Protocol emission targets, and by leading the way it is.

Commissioner for Environment, Stavros Dimas, stated that "the European Union is committed to commitment. The EU registered a score of +1 for full compliance with its St. Petersburg climate change proposal to adjust the Montreal Protocol on ozone depleting substances. In fact, the original G8 Gleneagles commitment to the Kyoto Protocol only applied to those that had ratified it. As a result US compliance has to be considered against its more general objective of reducing greenhouse gas emissions'.

During his January 2007 State of the Union Address, President Bush announced that America will increase its supply of alternative fuels, setting a mandatory fuels standard to require 35 billion gallons of renewable and alternative fuels in 2017, some 5 times the current target. The President also unleashed "20 in 10: Strengthening America’s Energy Security." Some of the key elements in this plan are to reform and modernize corporate average fuel economy (CAFE) standards for cars and the current light truck rules, and encourage the growth of renewable and alternative fuel sources. In addition, the President’s 2008 budget calls for an increase of a further USD2.7 billion for the Advanced Energy Initiative. Moreover, the President’s Farm Bill proposal contains more than USD1.6 billion of additional new funding over ten years for energy innovation, including bio-energy research, energy efficiency grants, and USD2 billion in loans for cellulose ethanol plants. The President’s new plan also includes clean air interstate and clean air mercury rules to significantly improve air quality. In addition, the President called for a further USD143 million in new funds for priority ocean projects, and will be working with NASA, NOAA, NSF, and USGS in numerous new projects aimed at tackling climate change in all areas.

On 2 February 2007 the U.S. joined over 100 other states in completing a substantial climate change science report in Paris, France, with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, in which U.S. scientists were major players. On 14 March 2007 the U.S. made a proposal to adjust the Montreal Protocol to hasten the phase-out of ozone-damaging chemicals.

Subsequently, the U.S. joined other states in completing and approving a 1000 page climate change science summary for policy makers in Brussels that will be released later this year. Finally, the Bush Administration is providing a new deferral tax credit of up to USD3,400 for hybrid and clean diesel purchasers.

United States: +1

The United States maintained a high level of compliance with the climate change and sustainable development commitments reaffirmed at St. Petersburg, largely as a result of its lack of original commitment at Gleneagles to emissions reductions commitments. In fact, the original G8 Gleneagles commitment to the Kyoto Protocol only applied to those that had ratified it. As a result US compliance has to be considered against its more general objective of reducing greenhouse gas emissions'.

During his January 2007 State of the Union Address, President Bush announced that America will increase its supply of alternative fuels, setting a mandatory fuels standard to require 35 billion gallons of renewable and alternative fuels in 2017, some 5 times the current target. The President also unleashed “20 in 10: Strengthening America’s Energy Security.” Some of the key elements in this plan are to reform and modernize corporate average fuel economy (CAFE) standards for cars and the current light truck rules, and encourage the growth of renewable and alternative fuel sources. In addition, the President’s 2008 budget calls for an increase of a further USD2.7 billion for the Advanced Energy Initiative. Moreover, the President’s Farm Bill proposal contains more than USD1.6 billion of additional new funding over ten years for energy innovation, including bio-energy research, energy efficiency grants, and USD2 billion in loans for cellulose ethanol plants. The President’s new plan also includes clean air interstate and clean air mercury rules to significantly improve air quality.

In addition, the President called for a further USD143 million in new funds for priority ocean projects, and will be working with NASA, NOAA, NSF, and USGS in numerous new projects aimed at tackling climate change in all areas. On 2 February 2007 the U.S. joined over 100 other states in completing a substantial climate change science report in Paris, France, with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, in which U.S. scientists were major players. On 14 March 2007 the U.S. made a proposal to adjust the Montreal Protocol to hasten the phase-out of ozone-damaging chemicals.

Subsequently, the U.S. joined other states in completing and approving a 1000 page climate change science summary for policy makers in Brussels that will be released later this year. Finally, the Bush Administration is providing a new deferral tax credit of up to USD3,400 for hybrid and clean diesel purchasers.

European Union: +1

The EU registered a score of +1 for full compliance with its St. Petersburg climate change commitment. On 30 November 2006 at the European Voice Comment Forum in Brussels, the European Commissioner for Environment, Stavros Dimas, stated that "the European Union is committed to achieving [its] Kyoto Protocol emission targets, and by leading the way [it is] determined to ensure that the international community takes decisive further action to cut global emissions after 2012,

when the Kyoto targets expire.”489 During the Nairobi Climate Change Conference in November 2006, the EU succeeded in achieving its objective of advancing negotiations on developing the climate convention system after 2012.490 Also, on 15 February 2007, in anticipation of the second anniversary of the Kyoto Protocol’s entry into force, Commissioner Dimas called for the international community to begin negotiations on a comprehensive global climate change treaty that would succeed Kyoto when its targets expire in 2012.491

On 6 October 2006, the European Commission proposed the formation of a new Global Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Fund (GEEREF), a global risk capital fund to subsidize energy efficiency projects in developing countries, and in reducing climate change and air pollution, pledging EUR80 million in funding over the next four years.492 In addition, on 19 October 2006 the European Commission approved to increase funding for new Life-Environmental 2006 projects, allocating nearly EUR66 million for 50 new environmental innovation projects in 14 countries.493 EUR6.5 million for 16 new environment projects in the Mediterranean and Baltic regions,494 and EUR70.1 million for 61 nature conservation projects situated in 20 Member States.495

On 20 December 2006 the European Commission also proposed legislation to reduce GHG emissions deriving from civil air transport into the EU Emissions Trading Scheme.496 The European Commission took legal action against Austria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Hungary, Italy, and Spain for their failure to submit their national allocation plans for CO2 emissions,497 which pushed these countries to correct their policies as early as February and March 2007.498 Furthermore, on 9 February 2007, the European Commission proposed the strengthening of environmental protection by obliging Member States to treat serious offences against the environment as criminal acts.499

Analyst: Ioana Hancas

9. Education: Academic Mobility [188]

Commitment

“We will promote international academic mobility at all levels, significantly increasing the mobility of students, teachers and researchers.”

*Education for Innovative Society in the 21st Century*

Background

Education was one of the three main topics selected by Russian President Vladimir Putin for discussion at the 2006 St. Petersburg Summit 2006. Education has long been an issue of importance for the G8. The issue has been addressed on three separate occasions from 1996 to 2004. In recent years, it has been examined most often in relation to African development, and primary education in G8 countries.

Education and human capital were core issues at the 1999 Cologne Summit. In 1999, the G8 heads of government issued a separate statement on education, as they did in St. Petersburg, which highlighted the need for international exchanges, high standards, and innovation. The statement released in St. Petersburg echoed many of these same objectives. Nevertheless, the G8 Research Group’s assessment of the Summit by issue area notes the absence of new programs and processes on this commitment.

The St. Petersburg Summit marked a return to higher education, broadly defined, as a G8 priority. Initiatives promoting education in Africa also remained on the agenda. These initiatives, however, did not take centre stage. Instead, education was discussed in relation to labour market and migrant integration, issues increasingly important for Western nations. The leaders adopted a declaration highlighting the importance of education in development and growth and stressing the difficulties many developing countries experience in introducing advanced education methods and information technologies. This document was in line with the Moscow Declaration adopted by the Ministers of Education on 2 June 2006.

Accordingly, the official documents released before and during the summit addressed a wide-range of educational issues, of which educational mobility is a key point.

*Team Leader: Héloïse Apestéguy-Reux*
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500 *Education for Innovative Societies in the 21st Century, G8 Russia (St. Petersburg) 16 July 2006. Date of Access 14 January 2007. en.g8russia.ru/docs/12.html*


502 *G8 Performance Assessments by Issue, 1996-2004, G8 Information Centre (Toronto) Date of Access: 22 January 2007. http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/evaluations/assessments.htm Looking ahead to next year’s summit, once again education will not be a main agenda issue. Instead, it will come up within discussions of other issues once again - educational mobility, for example, may be important in discussions on Global Economic Imbalance and the World Economy, as well as Intellectual Property Rights and G8 Outreach initiatives.*


504 *Interestingly, this is somewhat similar to the G7’s goals in promoting education back at the 1977 London Summit, where leaders sought to improve “the training of young people in order to build a skilled and flexible labour force.” See John Kirton and Laura Sunderland, The G8 and Global Education Governance, G8 Information Centre,(Toronto), 30 May 2006.*

505 *Education for Innovative Societies in the 21st Century, G8 Russia, (St. Petersburg) 16 July 2006. Date of Access 14 January 2007. en.g8russia.ru/docs/12.html*
**Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>+0.44</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada: 0**

Canada registered a score of 0 indicating partial compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment to enhance international academic mobility. The Canadian government has traditionally shown strong support for international academic mobility. A wide variety of programs506 and scholarships507 had already been established by the government to promote international studies both for Canadian as well as foreign students.508 To achieve a higher score, Canada will have to introduce new programmes aimed at increasing academic mobility.

In late March 2007, the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) announced its continued financial support of the Commonwealth Africa Graduate Students’ Exchange.509 The program gives students from African universities grants of up to $10,000 which enable them to participate in existing graduate-level exchange programs for a maximum of six months.510

The Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade of Canada has made progress with their "Youth on the Move" initiative, signing Youth Mobility Memorandums of Understanding with Italy, Norway, Czech Republic, Belgium, and Switzerland during the compliance period.511

In early December 2006, Monte Solberg, Canada’s Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, announced that the Canadian government would begin discussions with interested provinces and territories to initiate a project that would expand the Off-Campus Work Permit program launched in April 2006. The Off-Campus Work Permit program currently allows international students at publicly-funded educational institutions to work off-campus with a permit. The expansion of the program to private educational institutions591 would allow students studying at approximately 75 additional institutions to participate in the program and work off-campus. This would make Canada more appealing to foreign students interested in studying at a Canadian privately-funded institution, as it would make it easier for these students to find part-time work to fund their studies.

From November 13-17 2006, Canada joined over 85 countries around the globe to celebrate international education week. The purpose of International Education Week is to raise awareness and

---

understanding of international education and its significant benefits to Canada, to Canadian educational institutions and to all Canadians.\textsuperscript{512} On November 15, the government of Canada announced its Advantage Canada Strategy,\textsuperscript{513} which emphasized that attracting the best and brightest international students to Canada is a priority for the current government.

On 5 December 2006, Canada and the European Union renewed an eight-year Agreement on Higher Education, Training, and Youth. This agreement triples the available funding to already existing programs and expands the scope of the agreement to cover youth.\textsuperscript{392} Human Resources and Social Development Canada (HRSDC) is funding Canada's participation, and the European Union has agreed to allocate EUR18 million over the period 2006-2013 for various cooperative programs.\textsuperscript{394} The two parties agreed to examine various policy measures to ease the recognition of credits earned in either of the jurisdictions by the authorities of the other entity, among other things.\textsuperscript{395}

As further testament to their commitment, HRSDC has recently announced a call for proposals for new projects under the International Academic Mobility (IAM) initiative of the Canada-EU Programme for Co-operation in Higher Education, Training, and Youth.\textsuperscript{514} Funds will be provided for projects that will develop and promulgate transatlantic student mobility.\textsuperscript{515}

Analyst: Oana Chivaran

France: +1

France has registered a score of +1 indicating full compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment to enhance international academic mobility. The French government participated in the annual UNESCO meeting of the high level group on Education for All (EFA) in Cairo, 14–16 November 2006, where it pledged EUR20 million to help UNESCO achieve its education goals,\textsuperscript{516} including exchanges in developing countries.

France encourages European Union (EU) students to use the EU Erasmus Program to facilitate study at French academic institutions and at other institutions within the EU.\textsuperscript{517} Although the French government has not announced any specific funding increases from their ministries to this program, a new web page has been created to educate French students about the program.\textsuperscript{518}

France is also promoting greater international academic mobility through the European Union. The European Union has developed a life-long learning programme, for which easing the mobility of students within the EU is a core principle. In financial terms, a mobility grant of EUR200 per month\textsuperscript{519} will be provided to EU citizens to offset the extra costs of studying abroad. For non-EU citizens, the Erasmus Mundus programme is launching a new External Co-Operation Window for the 2007-08 academic year in order to assist students and academics from Central Asian countries attend EU member states’ universities;\textsuperscript{520} the program will allow for a total of 1300 scholarships.\textsuperscript{521} The Erasmus Mundus programme has a number of new sub-programmes that are designed to bring outside

academics to EU member states’ universities, such as SDPROMO with a grant of EUR274,000522 and CHEMEXPASS with a grant of EUR300,000523.

The French government participated in the Helsinki Ministerial on vocational education and training (VET) on 5 December 2006. At the Ministerial, participants adopted the Helsinki Communiqué, a document that calls for greater European cooperation in harmonizing recognition of VET across the EU.524 The Communiqué also draws on the main goals for the ‘Copenhagen Process’ on European cooperation in VET, which are enhancing the quality, performance, and attractiveness of VET in Europe.525

Although the following action did not occur during the compliance period, it should be noted that just prior to the 2006 G8 Summit in July, the French government enacted a law that eases the process for universities to acquire visiting researchers, and from 2006 an extra EUR1 billion will be added to spending to help facilitate the program.526

**Analyst: Aaron Ghobarah**

**Germany: +1**

Germany has fully complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to enhance international academic mobility.

In September 2006 the Federal Minister of Education and Research Annette Schavan launched the information and advertising campaign “go out! studieren weltweit,” a joint initiative of the Federal Ministry for Education and Research (BMBF) and the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD),527 an institution financed in large part by the Federal Government.528 The goal of the campaign is to enhance the mobility of German students and to encourage them in going abroad by providing information about studying in foreign countries through the internet page www.go-out.de.529

During the Helsinki vocational education and training (VET) Meeting 2006, which took place from the 4th to 5th of December 2006, Minister Schavan demanded “more mobility for [those undertaking apprenticeships] in Europe.” “People in Europe who have to move to another country for an apprenticeship or for other job-related reasons still meet too many barriers,” she said. The meeting adopted the Helsinki Communiqué, which reviews the main challenges facing VET. The Communiqué also draws on the main goals for the ‘Copenhagen Process’ on European cooperation in VET, which are enhancing the quality, performance, and attractiveness of VET in Europe.530

Germany is also promoting greater international academic mobility through the European Union. The European Union is developing a life long learning program, of which easing the mobility of students...
within the EU is a core principle. In financial terms, a "mobility grant of EUR200 per month"532 will be provided to European Union citizens to help with the extra costs of studying abroad. For non-EU citizens, the Erasmus Mundus programme is launching a new External Co-Operation Window for the 2007-08 academic year in order to assist students and academics from Central Asian countries attend EU member states' universities.533 The program "will allow for a total of 1300 scholarships."534 The Erasmus Mundus program has a number of new sub-programs that are designed to bring outside academics to EU member states' universities, such as SDPROMO with a grant of EUR274,000535 and CHEMPEASS with a grant of EUR300,000536.

In a press release published by the BMBF on 14 December 2006, Minister Annette Schavan stated that: "Education and research are important emitters for societal development in Europe - and the source of future wealth." Ms. Schavan added that the Federal Government will look to use its presidency of the European Council in 2007 intensively to extend co-operation within Europe in the fields of education and research. In the field of education politics specifically, the Federal Government of Germany and the EU-Commission share the joint goal of further increasing the mobility of young people.537

During the India-EU Ministerial Science Conference in New Delhi, EU and Indiand representatives signed the "New Delhi Communiqué" on 7 February 2007. The goal expressed in the Communiqué is to intensify the cooperation between India and the EU in strategically important fields of research of mutual interest.538 The "New Delhi Communiqué" aims to assure assistance for qualified young researchers as well as an increased mobility for researchers between Europe and India. Within this framework, the German government aims to build up and expand German-Indian research networks and joint scientific projects, as stated by Minister Schavan, "Knowledge and talents should have the possibility to circulate worldwide."539

On 13 February 2007 the Federal Government enacted the 22nd Amendment to the Federal Education and Training Assistance Act, the Bundesausbildungsförderungsgesetz (BAföG). In a press release the BMBF highlighted that foreign students now qualify for financial support through BAFöG when they qualify for permanent residence. Formerly, parents had to contribute to German tax and social insurance revenues for several years before their children qualify for BAFöG. Minister Schavan stated that "This is a very essential step to advance the better integration of young people with migration background who are willing to study in Germany."540

The Federal Government also enacted a broad amendment of the German immigration law (Zuwanderungsrecht) on 28 March 2007. The new law eases the regulations for students and researchers from non-EU countries, such as, for example, regarding the proof of language ability and the verification of financial means for livelihood. According to Minister Schavan: "The new policy will considerably ease the bureaucratic work for researchers to get a residence and work permit in Germany and the EU. Germany and Europe will therefore clearly gain attractiveness among foreign researchers."541

Italy: 0

Italy has registered a score of 0 indicating partial compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment to enhance international academic mobility. While the Italian government seems to be supportive of international exchange programs, it lacks concrete national initiatives for its students to study abroad. Italy relies solely on the exchange programs set up by the European Union. The Italian government does support a number of programs sponsored by the European Commission, such as Erasmus and Leonardo.543

Although not new to this compliance period, the Italian government continued to offer bursaries to international students as well as to Italian citizens living abroad who wish to study or do research at Italian universities.545 The Italian government entitles all international students to the same student assistance services as Italian students, on basis of the same requisites of financial means and/or merit. This applies to scholarships, student loans, housing assistance, refectory meal tickets and fee waivers.546

On 15 April 2007, Italy renewed the Youth Exchanges Agreement with the Spain in order to develop youth mobility and information.547

On 8 October 2006, Vittorio Craxi, Italy’s Undersecretary for the United Nations signed a Youth Mobility Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Canada and Italy.548 This MoU establishes a program that will allow young Canadians and Italians between the ages of 18 and 35 to travel and work on an occasional basis in each other’s countries for up to six months.

Italy primarily promotes greater international academic mobility through the European Union. The EU is developing a life-long learning programme, of which easing the mobility of students within the EU is a core principle. In financial terms, a mobility grant of EUR200 per month will be provided to European Union citizens to help with the extra costs of studying abroad. For non-EU citizens, the Erasmus Mundus programme is launching a new External Co-Operation Window for the 2007-08 academic year in order to assist students and academics from Central Asian countries attend EU member states’ universities.549 The programme “will allow for a total of 1300 scholarships”550 The Erasmus Mundus programme has a number of new sub-programmes that are designed to bring outside academics to EU member states’ universities, such as SDPROMO with a grant of EUR274,000 and CHEMEEPASS with a grant of EUR300,000.

At the St. Petersburg Summit, Italy offered to host, in cooperation with UNESCO, a World Forum on "Education, Innovation and Research: New Partnership for Sustainable Development."551 The Italian government has scheduled for this conference to take place in Trieste, Italy from 10 to 12 May 2007.552

http://www.italia.gov.it/servlet/ContentServer?pageName=it/it/innerpage&canale=1144051494348&categoria=1150945157550&node=1150959024546#1147958721811
544 Scholarships awarded by the Italian government to foreign students and Italians living abroad, Ministero degli Affari Esteri (Rome) Date of Access: 16 April 2007.  
http://www.esteri.it/ita/4_28_67_81_93_111.asp
www.study-in-italy.it/studying/scholarships.html
http://www.esteri.it/ita/4_28_67_81_96.asp
547 Canada-Italy Youth Mobility Memorandum of Understanding 18 October 2006. Date of Access: 16 April 2006.  
http://en.g8russia.ru/docs/12.html
http://cdsagenda.ictp.trieste.it/full_display.php?id=a06355
Japan: 0

Japan has registered a score of 0 indicating partial compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment to enhance international academic mobility. The Japanese government has long supported student exchange programs abroad for Japanese students. It has also provided international students with access to Japanese universities through Monbukagakusho Scholarships grants\(^{554}\), as well as through JASSO Short-term Student Exchange Promotion Programs\(^{555}\). Though no further steps have been taken to enhance these existing programs, since the 2006 summit Japan has keenly promoted the attainment of greater academic mobility among Asian countries. In order to achieve a score of +1, Japan will have to cooperate with other G8 members to achieve more far-reaching international academic mobility for individuals residing outside of Asia.

According to the 2006 UNESCO Report on International Educational Exchange, Japan rated 7\(^{th}\) among the top 2006 global destinations for international students\(^{556}\), but as the OECD’s 2006 Education Report indicates, though 4% of foreign students worldwide are enrolled in Japan (2.7% of which are enrolled at the tertiary level), the majority of these post-secondary international students (94.3%) come from other Asian countries such as China and Korea while only 2.2% are from Europe and 1.3% from North America.\(^{557}\)

Since the St. Petersburg summit, Japan’s contribution to the enhancement of international academic mobility has continued to be overwhelmingly Asia-centric. During the compliance period, the Japanese government has supported new exchange programs for Chinese and Indonesian students through partial funding from the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs.\(^{558}\) Prime Minister Shinzo Abe has signed a pledge on 23 March 2007 to contribute USD52 million to support the promotion of the ASEAN-Japan Comprehensive Economic Partnership and East Asia Youth Exchange Fund.\(^{559}\) Yet Japan has not demonstrated any interest in the revival of the EU-Japan Pilot Cooperation in Higher Education which had been intended to advocate student exchanges between university consortia in Japan and the EU under specific research topics in the period from 2002 to 2006.\(^{560}\)

Likewise, in an effort to strengthen its international cooperation in the fields of science and technology, Japan has also predominantly sought to reach out to other Asian countries. In October of 2006, Japan held a Science and Technology Initiative meeting with India in order to consider developing joint programs in areas of mutual interest as well as to discuss the possible exchanging of outstanding scientists.\(^{561}\) In January 2007, Japan attended a Trilateral Korea-Japan-China Ministerial Meeting on Science and Technology Cooperation where the respective ministers discussed the importance of encouraging scientist exchanges among the three countries and “stated their willingness to promote exchange of information and personnel in connection with the evaluation of R&D programs and performance-based management techniques among relevant institutions.”\(^{562}\)

Though the updated Basic Plan 2006-2010 White Paper on Science and Technology released by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology in March 2007 highlights Japan’s desire


to support more international science and technology activities by way of "acceptance of talented foreign researchers," Japan has so far done little to promote the mobility of students and researchers.

**Analyst: Nadjiba Karimi and Pascale Latulippe**

**Russia: +1**

Russia has complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to enhance international academic mobility. Although Russia has shown a certain degree of commitment to the promotion of international academic mobility, many of the steps taken are limited as they remain within existing frameworks. As President of the G8 in 2006, Russia selected education as one of the three central themes of the St. Petersburg summit, marking a return since the 1999 Cologne Summit to the idea of directly addressing the interconnection between education, research, and innovation.

Academic mobility is one of the objectives of the Federal Target Programme for Education Development (FTPED) adopted on 23 December 2005. There are indications that FTPED for 2007, currently being discussed, will include a significant section on academic mobility development. A project on "elaboration and piloting of academic mobility models of students and teachers from institutions of higher professional education" realized under government contract between the Russian Federal Agency on Education and State educational institution of higher professional education "Academy of National Economy under the Government of Russian Federation", which aims to promote schemes facilitating and enhancing inward and outward academic mobility.

Support of academic mobility is an important element of the State Innovative Educational Programs, which are part of the National Project "Education". In 2006 17 Russian higher education institutions received state financing, totaling at RUR10 billion (plus RUR3 billion of HEIs co-financing), 5 per cent of which was specifically targeted to promote mobility. In 2007 an additional 40 Russian higher education institutions received state financing, totaling RUR20 billion (plus RUR4 billion of HEI co-financing), 8 per cent of which was specifically targeted at promoting mobility.

A Federal Chamber of Commerce and Industry Subcommittee on higher professional education was created on 29 September 2006. One of its goals is assisting with the establishment of closer relations between Russian and foreign educational institutions of higher professional education and realization of international projects aimed at the development of innovative activity.

Under the auspices of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation several international conferences aimed at discussing the ways of increasing and promoting the mobility of researchers were organized. The Third Europe and Central Asia (ECA) Education Conference – Quality and Relevance of Education (Saint-Petersburg, October 4-6 2006, jointly with the World Bank), and

---


565 Putin praises G8 summit for progress on migration, education and health, Kremlin, (Moscow), 17 September 2006. Date of Access 29 December 2006. en.g8russia.ru/news/20060917/1262663.html

566 Federal Target Program for Education Development, List of measures, (Moscow), Date of Access 20 December 2006. www.fcpro.ru/index2.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=18&pop=1&page=0&Itemid=80


570 Chamber of Trade and Industry of the Russian Federation for the Aid of Professional and Business Affairs, Chamber of Trade and Industry (Moscow), Date of Access 28 December 2006. www.tpprf.ru/ru/main/committee/komibr/komibr1/

571 Statute on Subcommittee on higher professional education, Chamber of Commerce and Industry (Moscow), 04 October 2006, Date of Access 28 December 2006. www.tpprf.ru/img/uploaded/2006100414365779.doc

the EU-Russia science and technology conference, hosted by the State University – Higher School of Economics (Moscow, 22 February 2007).  

Analysts: Maria Kaloshkina and Matthias Gerber

United Kingdom: 0

The United Kingdom has registered a score of 0 indicating partial compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment to enhance international academic mobility. While the UK government initiated several programs relating to academic mobility in early 2006, there have been few real initiatives since the summit.

Before the summit period, in an effort to attract more international students to the UK, and thus international academic mobility, Prime Minister Tony Blair launched the Prime Minister's Initiative for International Education in April 2006. The five-year strategy aims to attract an additional 100,000 overseas students to study in the UK and encourages partnerships between universities and colleges in the UK and overseas. A second project was also announced, entitled the UK-India Education Research Initiative (UKIERI). This program is meant to improve educational and research links between India and the UK.

Under the UK-India Education Research Initiative (UKIERI), on 18 January 2007, a total of over GBP5 million were awarded to UK and Indian research teams. These awards are part of the biggest education initiative between the UK and India.

To demonstrate its support for international mobility, the UK government has allocated over GBP27 million in funding over the next two years to the aforementioned programs. Prime Minister Blair declared that, "these links highlight the growing internationalization of education at all levels. Increasingly, education is crossing national boundaries as preparation for careers in the global economy."

On 28 March 2007, the government introduced a new scheme that will enable international students to stay on in the UK for a year to work after they complete their studies. The New International Graduates Scheme will come into effect on 1 May 2007.

The United Kingdom is also promoting greater international academic mobility through the European Union. The European Union is developing a life-long learning programme, of which easing the mobility of students within the EU is a core principle. In financial terms, a "mobility grant of EUR200 per month will be provided to European Union citizens to help with the extra costs of studying abroad. For non-EU citizens, the Erasmus Mundus programme is launching a new External Co-Operation Window for the 2007-08 academic year in order to assist students and academics from Central Asian countries attend EU member states' universities. The programme "will allow for a total of 1300 scholarships". The Erasmus Mundus programme has a number of new sub-programmes that are...
designed to bring outside academics to EU member states universities, such as SDPROMO with a grant of EUR274,000 and CHEMESPASS with a grant of EUR300,000.

**Analyst:** Oana Chivaran

**United States: 0**

The United States has registered a score of 0 indicating partial compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment to enhance international academic mobility. Through its world-renowned Fulbright Program, the U.S. Government has over the years provided approximately 275,000 students, scholars, professionals, teachers and administrators both from the U.S. and from other countries with the opportunity to seek personal enrichment through a wide variety of state sponsored international education programs. In 2006, the U.S. had over half a million international students in its colleges and universities, 60% of them from Asia. Since the 2006 G8 Summit, the United States has also successfully introduced a number of new international student exchange programs, but its international academic mobility compliance score is undermined by prevailing accounts of foreign academic, student, and researcher dissatisfaction with post-911 American immigration procedures.

In honour of International Education Week (13-17 November 2006), U.S. Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings led a delegation of twenty U.S. university presidents to Japan, Korea, and China with the aim of marketing US academic institutions to the international community. In her address to Beijing Normal University, Secretary Spellings emphasized the importance of exchange programs in higher education, and the benefits of creativity, diversity, and critical thinking in US universities for international students. In a similar address at Waseda University in Tokyo, Secretary Spellings stressed the important role that foreign students play in the American education system and encouraged greater numbers of Japanese students to study in the United States.

On 4 December 2006, the United States approved a new eight-year US-EU partnership agreement on higher education and vocational training. It has also enhanced its Gilman Study Abroad scholarships by granting an additional USD3000 Critical Need Language Supplement to 25 of its recipients. These bursaries are designated for foreign language training in key tongues such as Arabic, Chinese, Korean, Russian, as well as a number of Turkic, Persian, and Indic languages. Furthermore, through the newly created Community College Summit Initiative Program, the United States launched in December 2006 a Community College Scholarship Exchange Initiative with the Egyptian government. This initiative “will bring 1,000 Egyptians to U.S. community colleges for one year of vocational and professional certificate study in fields critical to Egypt’s economic growth and development.”

Despite noted improvements to recent US visa approval procedures, many international students and scholars continue to find the U.S. foreign admission process particularly discouraging. Though State Department’s assistant secretary Maura Harty explained in January 2006 “that almost all visa applications—some 97.5 percent—are processed within two days, and that the screening process for

---


the 2.5 percent of visa applicants subject to special screening requirements for security reasons has been streamlined, typically taking one week to two weeks,"595 a recent survey conducted by UCLA’s Dashew Center for International Students and Scholars revealed that there is still "widespread frustration" among foreign students over US visa and immigration policies. The study, based upon the reported personal experience of 1,540 UCLA international students found that many had to "endure long waits and rigid rules for visas and security clearances."596 Sharing similar concerns, a coalition of academic, exchange, and trade groups put forth a proposal for new visa policy recommendations in January 2006. "The efforts of the United States to reach out to the world, whether to recruit talent, train the world’s future leaders, or improve our image abroad, continue to be ill-served by the visa system that is currently in place," said NAFSA: Association of International Educators Executive Director and CEO Marlene Johnson. "The diverse voices of this coalition urge the government to take a number of key steps to ensure that the United States presents a truly welcoming face, both in word and in deed, to the academic, exchange, and business travelers that are so important to our global leadership, competitiveness and security."597

Analyst: Farnam Bidgoli and Pascale Latulippe

European Union: +1

The European Union (EU) has registered a score of +1 indicating full compliance with its G8 commitment to facilitate and improve academic mobility. On 15 November, the Parliament and Council adopted a lifelong learning programme for 2007-2011. With a budget of EUR7 billion over seven years, it will foster interchange, cooperation and mobility between education and training systems within the EU.598 It will also double the figure of some 1.5 million students who have already benefited from mobility schemes under previous programmes, spending academically validated periods of at least a term and generally a full academic year in another country. Specifically, a "mobility grant" of EUR200 per month599 will be provided to European Union citizens to help with the extra costs of studying abroad.

For non-EU citizens, the Erasmus Mundus programme is launching a new External Co-Operation Window for the 2007-08 academic year in order to assist students and academics from Central Asian countries attend EU member states’ universities.600 The programme “will allow for a total of 1300 scholarships.”601 The Erasmus Mundus programme has a number of new sub-programmes that are designed to bring outside academics to EU member states’ universities, such as SDPROMO with a grant of EUR274,000602 and CHEMEPASS with a grant of EUR300,000.603

The EU and Canada are to increase their cooperation regarding the mobility of students, youths, and academics. Through a new agreement announced on 4 December 2006, the EU will “...allocate almost...
EUR18 million to the co-operation programme over the period 2006-2013.” 604 The same day, the US and the EU announced a renewal of their Education and Training partnership to promote academic mobility. 605 Together, these eight-year renewals of co-operation agreements will allow for 10 000 students and academics to participate in international mobility programs. 606 This new agreement represents a tripling of the funding available from the previous Canada-EU agreement, 607 The European Commission plans to allocate EUR63 million (EUR45 million for the United States 608 , EUR18 million for Canada 609 ) to these programmes.

Finally, the new European Council regulation "Industrialised Countries Instrument (ICI),” 610 also adopted in December 2006, will provide, for the period 2007-2013, a legal basis and substantial resources for enhanced co-operation in the field of education (in particular higher education) with a range of industrialised and high-income countries and territories. It has been stipulated that the implementation of this regulation will include "joint consortia projects supporting multilateral partnerships for setting up joint study programmes,” including joint/double degrees and transatlantic mobility of students and faculty, as well as policy-oriented measures addressing comparative higher education and vocational training issues. 611

Analyst: Aaron Ghobara

---

611 European Commission Update on St Petersbourg commitments, DG EAC contribution (addendum)
10. Education: Qualification Systems [191]

“We will share information about qualification systems in our countries to increase understanding of national academic practices and traditions.”

*Education for Innovative Society in the 21st Century*[^12]

**Background**

The G8 members agreed at St. Petersburg to promote education and labour mobility by sharing information about their national qualification systems and academic practices, entering into mutual recognition agreements where possible. Distinctions are made between concerted efforts at the sub-state and state level towards this end, though only the latter counts towards compliance. Full compliance requires concerted efforts to share information about national standards of qualification (competence in a learned skill or concept), and attempted engagement into bilateral or multilateral equivalency agreements. One example of such an agreement is the European Qualification Framework, initiated by the European Union in 2005. This comprehensive agreement addressed issues such as informal (non-academic) learning, self-certification, and sector relationships with considerable transparency, and should serve as a benchmark for future qualification equivalency initiatives. While the G8 has long preached the importance of education in economic development and labour market mobility, this is the first commitment specifically targeting academic qualification systems.

**Team Leader: Jeff Claydon**

**Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>+0.33</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada: 0**

Canada has partially complied with its St. Petersburg qualification standards commitment. The Canadian Constitution ensures provincial jurisdiction of education in Section 92. As such, the federal government has a limited capacity to influence education qualification standards and risks low compliance.[^50] The federally funded Council of Ministers of Education in Canada funds and operates the Canadian Information Centre for International Credentials, which provides the public with information about education qualifications programs, however limited, in Canada. This centre promotes and supports the work of non-governmental organizations that hold international (though unofficial) conferences on International Qualifications regulation. One such conference is the Future of Professional Regulation in Canada Conference, to be held in Toronto in April 2007.[^51]

[^12]: *Education for Innovative Societies in the 21st Century, G8 Russia (St. Petersburg) 16 July 2006. Date of Access 14 January 2007. en.g8russia.ru/docs/12.html*


On 5 December 2006, the Canadian government signed the Agreement on Higher Education, Training, and Youth with the European Union, which committed the Canadian government to the promotion of increased bilateral cooperation on education qualification equivalency over the next eight years.\footnote{ EU Canada Relations: Signature of a new agreement to boost cooperation in higher education, training, and youth, European Union, (Brussels), 5 December 2006. Date of Access: 12 January 2007. http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/06/1684&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en}

Canada is one of eighteen countries involved in the pilot project of the UNESCO Portal on Recognized Higher Education Institutions. This is the first stage of a project that hopes to facilitate online access to information on recognized higher education institutions with an objective to providing authoritative and up-to-date information on the status of these institutions. UNESCO’s pilot project has an objective “to build capacity in developing countries for collecting and sharing information (through a website) on recognized higher education institutions (including all means of identifying the recognition authority).”\footnote{ Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications Concerning Higher Education in the European Region, 1997. Date of Access: 12 January 2007. www.dfes.gov.uk/bologna/index.cfm?fuseaction=news.view&NewsID=42&NewsCategoryID=1}

Canada and other participating countries have concluded the Preparatory Phase and are now in the Implementation Phase; the whole pilot project is expected to occur over a twenty-one month period from January 2006 to September 2007. While this initiative debuted before the St. Petersburg summit, Canada’s participation in the 19-20 March 2007 progress meeting should be considered in compliance with the spirit of the St. Petersburg commitment.

However, Canada has failed to pursue the establishment of specific education qualification frameworks with fellow G8 members, and though Canada signed of the Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications Concerning Higher Education in the European Region (henceforth referred to as the Lisbon Process) in 1997, it has thus far failed to ratify the conditions stipulated in the agreement.\footnote{ Analyst: Jeff Claydon}

\textbf{France: 0}

France registered partial compliance with its St. Petersburg academic qualifications commitment. On 5 September 2006, the European Commission announced a recommendation for the establishment of the European Qualifications Framework for lifelong learning (EQF). The EQF will provide a common language to describe qualifications which will help Member States, employers and individuals compare qualifications across the EU’s diverse education and training systems. The draft recommendations require that Member States relate their national qualifications systems to the EQF by 2009. This draft was developed following extensive consultation with member states and is expected to be adopted by the end of 2007 by the Council and the European Parliament.\footnote{ The European Qualifications Framework: a new way to understand qualifications across Europe, (Brussels) 5 September, 2006. Date of Access: January 11, 2007. europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/06/1148&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=fr}


France continues to engage G8 members and other states in exchanges of information about education qualification programs. Direct cooperation with Germany is seen at the seventh Franco-German Council of Ministers meeting on 12 October 2006 in France. French President Jacques Chirac and German Chancellor Angela Merkel discussed European competitiveness in the fields of research of energy, aeronautics and space, as well as the integration and equal opportunity for French and German youths in 2007.\footnote{ 7ème Conseil des ministres franco-allemand, L’actualité franco-allemand, (Paris), 12 October 2006. Date of Access: 5 January 2007. www.franceallemande.fr/public/index.php?sssid=LsO4FBOOoTSPhR3qEmJDj7jWqGTjsid_menu=53&i=contentLanguage=1} However, in 2007, France has not provided any further sharing of information about education qualification standards beyond its prior responsibilities
Analyst: Yinuo Geng

Germany: 1

The German government has thus far registered a high level of compliance with the commitment made at St. Petersburg. On 1 January 2007, Germany assumed the presidency of the European Union and declared European education initiatives a top priority for the duration of its presidency. In a document released by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research, titled *German EU Council Presidency 2007: Education and Research Policy Priorities*, the German government declared its continued support for the Lisbon and Bologna processes, and that "it is our aim during the German Council Presidency to intensify the work on the European Qualifications Framework on the basis of the Commission proposal and in close cooperation with the European Parliament and, if possible, to conclude these activities."622 The German EU Presidency will also launch a European Research Council and continue to promote the SOCRATES and LEONARDO exchange programmes. The Ministry of Education and Research contends that support for academic mobility and EU supported research (as opposed to national funding) will cause "greater synergy between European measures."623 The German government will host a launch conference for the SOCRATES and LEONARDO affiliated Lifelong Learning Programme on 6 May 2007 in Berlin.624

As part of the Bologna Process, Germany hosted the Official Bologna Seminar on Joint Degrees in Berlin on 21-22 September 2006.625 The German and British governments, will co-chair a Ministerial Conference in London, 16-18 May 2007. According to the Bologna Secretariat and the Federal Ministry of Education and Research, the objective of this conference is to determine the next steps to be taken within the Bologna framework to realize the European Higher Education Area by 2010.626 On 1-2 March 2007, the German Ministry of Education and Research hosted an informal meeting of European Education Ministers to promote greater understanding and synergy of continuing and vocational education practices across the region.627

Germany thus far failed to make concerted efforts to promote education qualifications synergy outside of the Bologna process and Europe. Yet, preexisting partnership programs with other G8 members such as Canada, the United States, and former CIS states (including Russia) should be acknowledged when considering German inaction outside of the Bologna process.

Analyst: Golta Shahidi

Italy: 0

Italy has not registered full compliance with its education qualification systems commitment. On 5 September 2006, the European Commission announced a recommendation for the establishment of the EQF for lifelong learning, which will help Member States, employers and individuals compare qualifications across the EU's diverse education and training systems.628 Italy has taken some steps to implement this recommendation and move the EQF forward since the St. Petersburg Summit. The most significant measure is the Italian-Russian cultural and education agreement. The agreement focuses on exchanging teachers and information as well as increasing contact between Italian and Russian university faculties, which goes a limited distance in improving the knowledge of each others

---

education qualification systems. More commendable are Italy’s recent agreements with Spain that focuses on supplying aid to help for student travel and stay as well as improving coordination on a large number of academic programs. Italy, however, has also failed to commit fully to the convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region. As of 20 April 2007, Italy is one of seven (of fifty) signatories who have failed to ratify the treaty. Italian ratification is necessary to show a deeper commitment to broadening the recognition and understanding of Italian qualification systems throughout Europe and the world.

Analyst: Eric Sehr

Japan: 0

Japan has registered partial compliance with its St. Petersburg academic qualifications commitment. The Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology announced the Third Basic Plan for Science and Technology on 28 May 2006, which promises increased funding for academic exchange and integration in East Asia from 2006 through 2010. In spite of the spirit of this action, it was completed before the St. Petersburg summit and thus cannot be counted as compliance. Japan has made no attempt to revive the European Union-Japan Pilot Cooperation in Higher Education initiative, delayed since 2004 because of a lack of funding.

On 12 January 2007, the first Trilateral Korea-Japan-China Ministerial Meeting on Science and Technology Cooperation was held in Seoul. The ministers of science and technology from the three countries "shared the view on the important role played by the technology intensive SMEs and venture firms for the economic growth, and reached a consensus on strengthening cooperation at the innovation clusters such as technoparks where these firms, research institutions and universities are clustered."

Japan is one of eighteen countries involved in the UNESCO Portal on Recognized Higher Education Institutions. This is the first stage of a project that hopes to facilitate online access to information on recognized higher education institutions with an objective to providing authoritative and up-to-date information on the status of these institutions. UNESCO's pilot project has an objective "to build capacity in developing countries for collecting and sharing information (through a website) on recognized higher education institutions (including all means of identifying the recognition authority)." Japan and other participating countries have concluded the Preparatory Phase and are now in the Implementation Phase; the whole pilot project is expected to occur over a twenty-one month period from January 2006 to September 2007. While this initiative was started before the St. Petersburg summit, Japan’s participation in the 19-20 March 2007 progress meeting should be considered in compliance with the spirit of the St. Petersburg commitment.

Analyst: Yinuo Geng

Russia: 0

Russia has partially complied with its Saint-Petersburg academic qualifications commitment and receives a score of 0.

In February 2007 Russia has submitted to the OECD Education Policy Committee its Country Background Report, prepared in the framework of OECD Thematic Review of Tertiary Education project under the contract with the Federal Educational Agency by the State University – Higher School of

---

Economics. Chapter 2 "Overall description of the tertiary education system" includes comprehensive information on the Russian qualifications system, as well as national academic practices and traditions in the sphere. Chapter 9 "Assuring the quality of tertiary education" considers problems of international comparability of qualifications.636

An international workshop "Tertiary Education in Russia: Equity, Quality, Efficiency, Competitiveness. Wrap-Up International Seminar on the OECD project "Thematic Review of Tertiary Education" was organized on the 12-13th of April 2007 with the support of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation. The workshop participants included representatives of OECD Directorate for Education. Issue of international comparability of the Russian qualifications system as a key factor of enhancing efficiency and competitiveness of the Russian tertiary education system was debated by the network of experts.637

In order to share information about qualification systems in Russia and European countries, and to increase understanding of Russian academic practices and traditions outside the country Russia joined the international project "Tuning educational structures in Europe" (TUNING), which encompasses nearly 200 universities from 50 countries of Europe and Latin America, and seeks the elaboration of a framework of transparent, comparable, and compatible qualifications in the signatory countries of the Bologna process, which should be described in terms of workload, level, learning outcomes, competences and profile. The “Tuning educational programmes in Russian HEIs” project (TUNING–Russia) is supported by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation and the National Training Foundation. 638

On 19-21 October, 2996 an international workshop “Establishing common understanding of educational programmes, curricula and learning outcomes: methodology, methods and tools of “Tuning educational structures in Europe” project” was held in the framework of the TUNING-Russia project.639 More than 70 participants took part in the workshop, including heads of departments of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, representatives of the Delegation of the European Commission in Russia, academic staff from the leading Russian and European universities. During the workshop the questions of ensuring qualifications systems transparency and comparability in Russia and Europe were widely discussed.

So, Russia is participating in international projects, aimed at sharing information about qualification systems, on a Federal level. But as there is no special state programmes for sharing information about qualification systems with other countries in order to increase understanding of Russian academic practices and traditions abroad, Russia receives a 0 score for compliance with the commitment.

Analysts: Maria Kaloshkina and Katya Gorbunova
Analysts: Golta Shahidi and Maria Kaloshkina

United Kingdom: 0

While the United Kingdom has made considerable efforts in the past to promote the international exchange of information about education qualifications systems, the UK has taken insufficient measures to achieve full compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment on education qualification systems. The British government had already implemented several programs and initiatives aimed at promoting information about its national qualification standards before the 2006 commitment. In 1997, the British government established the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority to oversee the development of national curriculums and qualifications standards. The QCA has since worked with national education bodies in Wales, and Northern Ireland to implement the National Qualifications Framework, the most recent version of which was implemented in January 2006.640 Prior to the summit, the QCA had established clear national qualifications standards for the United Kingdom, and

maintained a website with detailed explanations merits of the various accreditations issued in the United Kingdom.641

On 5 September 2006, the European Commission announced a recommendation for the establishment of the European Qualifications Framework for lifelong learning (EQF). The EQF will provide a common language to describe qualifications which will help Member States, employers and individuals compare qualifications across the EU’s diverse education and training systems. The draft recommendations foresee that Member States relate their national qualifications systems to the EQF by 2009. This draft developed following extensive consultation with member states and is expected to be adopted by the end of 2007 by the Council and the European Parliament.642

In July 2005, the British government assumed the responsibilities of the Secretariat of the Bologna Process, which is intended to create a European Higher Learning Area by 2010.643 In this capacity, the Department of Education continues to co-chair Official Bologna Process Seminars, including the Nice Seminar 7 December 2006,644 and will host a ministerial Summit in London in May 2007.645

The United Kingdom is one of eighteen countries involved in the pilot project of the UNESCO Portal on Recognized Higher Education Institutions. This is the first stage of a project that hopes to facilitate online access to information on recognized higher education institutions with an objective to providing authoritative and up-to-date information on the status of these institutions. UNESCO’s pilot project has an objective “to build capacity in developing countries for collecting and sharing information (through a website) on recognized higher education institutions (including all means of identifying the recognition authority).”646 The United Kingdom and the other participating countries have concluded the Preparatory Phase and are now in the Implementation Phase; the whole pilot project is expected to occur over a twenty-one month period from January 2006 to September 2007. While this initiative was started before the St. Petersburg summit, UK participation in the 19–20 March 2007 progress meeting should be considered in compliance with the spirit of the St. Petersburg commitment.

Analyst: Taleen Jakujyan

**United States: 1**

The United States has fully complied with its St. Petersburg education qualifications commitment. The United States has on several occasions reaffirmed its commitment to opening American up to greater number of foreign students as well as recognizing the need to give more American’s the opportunity to learn abroad. On 9 November 2006 Karen Hughes, Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs spoke about the American Governments focus on educational outreach from student and teacher exchanges, English language training, literacy classes and scholarships for girls to increase women’s access to education. The American government has created 500 new consular positions in order to streamline the visa process for foreign students.647

On 16 November 2006, during International Education Week President George W. Bush, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings all made statements that recognized the importance of facilitating international student exchanges to America not only so that Americans could come to better understand other education systems but also in recognition that students who return home from American schools often become leaders in their own countries spreading a greater understanding of American educational and cultural practices. America’s willingness to be more accommodating to students around the world was highlighted by a three-

---

647 Remarks to American Council on Education: A Strategic View of Study Abroad.
country Asian tour involving Spellings, joined by Assistant Secretary of State Dina Habib Powell and twelve U.S. university presidents in an attempt to better understand what these countries were demanding in terms of qualifications, such as the types of skills businesses in China are looking for, as well as promoting America's exchange program. On 26 March 2007 the Assistant Secretary of State Dina Habib Powell was in India and reaffirmed America's goal "to make an American education possible for every international student who wishes to study in the U.S."649

The United States is one of eighteen countries involved in the pilot project of the UNESCO Portal on Recognized Higher Education Institutions. This is the first stage of a project that hopes to facilitate online access to information on recognized higher education institutions with an objective to providing authoritative and up-to-date information on the status of these institutions. UNESCO's pilot project has an objective "to build capacity in developing countries for collecting and sharing information (through a website) on recognized higher education institutions (including all means of identifying the recognition authority)."650 The United States and the other participating countries have concluded the Preparatory Phase and are now in the Implementation Phase; the whole pilot project is expected to occur over a twenty-one month period from January 2006 to September 2007. While this initiative was started before the St. Petersburg summit, UK participation in the 19-20 March 2007 progress meeting should be considered in compliance with the spirit of the St. Petersburg commitment.

Analyst: Eric Sehr

European Union: 1

The European Union registered a high level of compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment on education qualification systems. On 5 September 2006, the European Commission adopted a proposal for a Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the establishment of the European Qualifications Framework (EQF) for lifelong learning.651 The new framework will allow for the use of a common language to describe qualifications in the EU. The intent is to help Member States, employers and individuals compare qualifications across the EU's diverse education and training systems.652 At the heart of the framework is a set of eight reference levels describing the individual's "learning outcomes", in other words, what he or she "knows, understands and is able to do ... regardless of the system where a particular qualification was acquired."653 These reference levels provide a new approach that emphasizes the outcomes which a learner is able to produce based on his or her education, rather than the traditional factors such as the length of one's learning experience and the type of institution.654 The EQF will also function as a "translation device to make relationships between qualifications and different systems clearer."655 This will aid in the creation of a more transparent and accessible system across the board, increasing the general public's understanding of national academic practices and traditions, as the commitment requires, and eliminating mobility barriers in the employment market due to the lack of understanding member state standards.656

---


652 The United States and the other participating countries have concluded the Preparatory Phase and are now in the Implementation Phase; the whole pilot project is expected to occur over a twenty-one month period from January 2006 to September 2007. While this initiative was started before the St. Petersburg summit, UK participation in the 19-20 March 2007 progress meeting should be considered in compliance with the spirit of the St. Petersburg commitment.


The European Union also hosted conference in Brussels, on 5 and 6 March 2007, to design the next phase of Tempus, the EU’s flagship program for higher education cooperation with Europe’s neighbours. Tempus is an EU funded program aimed to support the modernization of higher education in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, the Western Balkans and the Mediterranean region. For the period 2007-2013, the annual Tempus budget is expected to be in the order of € 50 million.657 Furthermore, the European Union has committed EUR 18 million to a renewed eight-year education agreement signed between the EU and Canada on 5 December 2006. The renewed agreement will bring even more Canadians and Europeans together by tripling the available funding and expanding its scope to cover youth actions as well over the period 2006-2013 with a target of some 210 projects implemented and 4,430 EU and Canadian people participating in mobility activities over the duration of the program.658

Analyst: Taleen Jakujyan

11. Education: Gender Disparities [205]

Commitment

“We regret that interim targets related to eliminating gender disparities in primary and secondary education have not been achieved. Greater concerted action by all will be needed to fulfill these key goals by 2015. We reaffirm our commitments in this regard.”

Education for Innovative Society in the 21st Century

Background

This commitment relates to the UN’s Millennium Development Goal (MDG) of eliminating gender disparities in education by the year 2015. This goal is addressed primarily by the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) through their Education for All (EFA) Campaign. The EFA movement articulates six major goals, one of which is achieving gender equality in education. All six goals relate to the overarching EFA objective of providing quality basic education to all children, youth and adults by 2015. The EFA Fast Track Initiative (FTI), a global compact on education, encourages low-income countries to reach the EFA’s six major goals. As per the Director General of UNESCO’s press release concerning his presence at the G8’s St. Petersburg Summit, the Education for All program requires an increase in financial aid by the order of USD12 billion per year, greater priority to be given to the most needy nations, more predictable distribution of aid amounts over time, and innovation in the provision of educational services. Commitment standards are therefore relative to the needs of the Education for All campaign as stated by the Director General. The current budget for the EFA-FTI totals USD57.5 million, USD31.5 million of which represents future monetary donations until the year 2008. Donations to the FTI have more than doubled over the past year and financial disbursements are projected to improve drastically over the upcoming months to programs throughout the developing world for the development of equal and universal opportunities for education among children, youth, and adults. It is estimated, however, that a financing gap of USD513 million for education programs existed in 2006, and that this gap will rise to USD644 million in 2007 and USD752 by 2008.

Team Leader: Courtney Hood

---

Assessment

2006 Final Compliance Score

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

Overall: +0.22

Canada: +1

The Government of Canada has registered a score of +1 indicating full compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment to facilitate the elimination of gender disparities in education. The Canadian Government has exhibited compliance through verbal reiterations of the commitment, and increases in bilateral monetary donations to the Education for All Program. At the 2006 St. Petersburg Summit, for example, the country pledged CAD24 million to the Education for All-Fast Track Initiative (EFA-FTI) and CAD1 million to the EFA Global Monitoring Report (GMR).

The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)’s budget for 2006-2007 reserves 9.5% of the total aid budget for basic education. CIDA also recently issued a departmental overview that aims to make gender equality a key focus of all of its program areas. On 8 September 2006 the CIDA Gender Equity Support Programme contributed CAD26,225.70 to send 80 young female students to the Youth Employment Summit in Nairobi to promote equal hiring practices and equality of opportunity between genders.

On 17 September 2006 Canada released a joint statement with the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and the UK reaffirming its support for the Fast Track Initiative and for long term, predictable financing for education initiatives in developing countries. Canada’s Minister of Finance, Jim Flaherty, released a statement to the Development Committee of the Boards of Governors of the World Bank and IMF on 18 September 2006, reaffirming Canada’s commitment to increasing financial aid to the EFA-FTI. He further affirmed Canada’s commitment of CAD46 million to the EFA through its bilateral aid program.

The following month, Canada attended the FTI Technical meeting in Brussels, Belgium. Canada has also become a donor to the EFA’s Catalytic Fund aimed at complementing other donor instruments to impoverished nations, and has since donated USD20 million to the Fund.

The FTI’s 2006 Status
Report listed Canada as one of the five country donors that account for over two-thirds of total bilateral aid towards basic education.674

On 22 October 2006 Development minister Josee Verner announced a $14.5 million girls’ education project in Kandahar, Afghanistan and the training of 4,000 female school teachers.675

On 8 November 2006 Canada contributed to a $80 million World Bank Project facilitating equitable access to education in Kenya with the aim of increasing elementary school enrollment to 100% by the year 2010.676 Further, on 12 April 2007 Development Minister Verner announced the allocation of $9 million towards women’s rights in Afghanistan, including $5 million towards gender equity in Afghanistan and the creation of an institute for Gender Studies at the University of Kabul, and $4 million towards skills training and literacy campaigns for women throughout the country.677

Analyst: Courtney Hood

France: +1

France has registered a score of +1 indicating full compliance with St. Petersburg commitment to eliminate gender disparities in education through its support of the Fast-Track Initiative (FTI), its commitment to finding solutions to end gender disparities, and its provision of bilateral aid to FTI endorsed national education programs.

At the Sixth Meeting of the High-Level Group on Education for All held in Cairo in November 2006, the French government announced that it would increase its funding for the FTI by EUR20 million over three years678, including a EUR1.35 million commitment to the Education Program Development Fund679. At the meeting, the French government reconfirmed its commitment to eliminate gender disparities when it participated in endorsing the meeting’s final communiqué which committed the meeting’s participants to initiate “more targeted efforts to remove barriers to girls’ access to school”680.

Following up on commitments to remove such barriers, on 23 November 2006, the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs hosted, along with UNESCO, a roundtable to discuss violence against girls in school and how it should be addressed. The objective of the roundtable was to spread awareness of the issue and identify best practices for addressing it.681

The French government has also indirectly supported the commitment to eliminate gender disparities in education through its provision of bilateral aid to FTI endorsed national education programs. On 19 July 2006, the French Development Agency (AFD) approved a EUR650,000 project to assist in the reform of the education system of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania. This project will assist in financing Mauritania’s FTI-funded National Program for the Development of the Education System (PNDSE).682 In August and September 2006, the AFD approved two programs in support of the government of Burkina Faso’s Ten-Year Plan for Basic Education Development (PDDEB). Both programs, valued at EUR16.5 million683 and EUR10 million684 respectively, aim to increase girls’ access

---

Germany registered a score of 0 indicating partial compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment to eliminating gender disparity in education. While the German Government has participated in a wide range of programs targeting gender disparities in education, it remains low on the list of financial contributors to the FTI and EFA campaigns.

In 2006, along with many other donor nations, Germany promised to help Guinea, Honduras, Mozambique, and Tajikistan fund FTI programs in their countries before 2007 though the exact amount of promised funding is not listed in the Fast Track Initiative’s November 2006 Status Report. Germany also reiterated its commitment to eradicating gender disparity in education by its reaffirmation of this commitment through policy, and has declared that its goal is to expand access and improve the quality of universal education.

On 18 September 2006, the German Federal Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development, Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul, reaffirmed Germany’s support for gender equity in education and the EFA-FTI pledging to double the country’s financial donations to EUR120 million by 2007.

Between 9-10 October 2006, Germany attended the FTI Technical meeting in Brussels, Belgium. Germany sent a large delegation to the Cairo Conference on 12 November 2006 where it reiterated its support to the FTI and led an update for the Capacity Development Task Team. At the Cairo conference Germany did not, however, commit donations to the Catalytic Fund, a supplemental source of money for the FTI.

At the conference “Women’s Economic Empowerment as Smart Economics: A Dialogue on Policy Options” held in Berlin on 22-23 February 2007 German Chancellor Angela Merkel expressed the need for a stronger focus on gender equity worldwide and Development Minister Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul pointed to gender equity as crucial to achieving the objective of halving world poverty. The German government’s financial donations to the FTI and EFA campaigns currently total less than 0.002 percent of Germany’s GDP and the country remains relatively low on the list of financial contributors to the projects.

---


initiative, and Germany must spend and additional USD94 million in order to meet the 2015 deadline.

Analyst: Esmahan Razavi and Arina Shadrikova

**Italy: -1**

Italy registered a score of -1 indicating negative compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment to eliminate gender disparity in education. Italy has displayed a lack of budgetary commitment to the EFA-FTI and the Catalytic Fund, evidenced by the decrease in Italian funding for the FTI Catalytic Fund.

Though as of 7 September 2006 Italy pledged financial aid to several countries attempting to adopt FTI program goals, including Ethiopia, Mozambique, and Albania, the 2006 Global Campaign for Education labeled Italy as one of the least compliant G8 countries in terms of its FTI donations. Italy has contributed USD4.8 million to the FTI’s Catalytic Fund since the fund’s inception, an amount far exceeded by several other G8 countries. As of 12 November 2006, Italy had donated USD1.2 million to the FTI’s Catalytic Fund, a 50% decrease in funding from 2005, and has released no plan for Catalytic Fund donations in 2007.

On 12 November 2006, Italy sent a delegation to the EFA-FTI Cairo Conference concerning the goal of abolishing gender disparity in education by 2015. Italy’s current total donations towards the EFA’s Catalytic Fund are USD6.1 million, and as of 2 February 2007 Italy has not specified the amount of further funding it will put towards the Catalytic Fund. In order to attain the funding objectives set by the Italian government for the FTI Italy must donate an additional USD54 million. On 2 May 2007 Italy is pledging to send its Minister of Finance to Brussels for the Keeping Our Promises conference concerning the attainment of universal primary education by 2015.

Analyst: Esmahan Razavi

**Japan: 0**

Japan has registered a score of 0 indicating partial compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment to eliminate gender disparities in education. Japan has not increased development assistance for education despite a consistent display of political support for the EFA and FTI agendas. Japan remains

---


one of lowest on the list of donor nations to the Fast-Track initiative.\textsuperscript{706} In order to achieve a score of +1, Japan will need to increase its financial support of the FTI Catalytic Fund.

Japan’s strategy to support basic education in developing countries, the Basic Education for Growth Initiative (BEGIN), incorporates the EFA goals in its policies, and one of its priority areas is “assistance for elimination of gender disparities (girl’s education).”\textsuperscript{707}

According to the FTI’s 2006 Status Report released 7 September 2006, Japan has joined with several other nations to support initiatives for universal and equitable education programs in Burkina Faso, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Madagascar, Mozambique, Yemen, Timor-Leste, Nicaragua, Benin, Cambodia, Cameroon, Mali, and Rwanda.\textsuperscript{708}

According to the World Bank’s Data Report 2006 on education in Africa, Japan needs to increase its development assistance to primary education in Africa from its 2004 level of USD70 million to a total of USD276 million in 2006 for the G8 goal of universal primary education in Africa to be achieved.\textsuperscript{710}

The FTI’s Catalytic Fund Status Report, released 12 November 2006, cites that Japan has yet to contribute financially to the Catalytic Fund, the main multi-donor trust fund of the EFA-FTI.\textsuperscript{711}

During a visit to India in March 2007, the President of the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) Sadako Ogata said that her organization is emphasizing a “human security” approach to development projects, which involves a “bottom-up” approach with the overall aim of empowering people through education and health care.\textsuperscript{712} In conjunction with the aim of gender mainstreaming, JICA incorporates the MDG’s goals of basic education and gender equality in its projects.\textsuperscript{713} According to the JICA 2006 Annual Report, based on 2004 figures, basic education and gender equality together make up 13% of the total operating costs in JICA projects.\textsuperscript{714} JICA is currently involved in projects focusing on education and gender in Afghanistan, Nepal, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Ethiopia, Malawi, Senegal and Tanzania.\textsuperscript{715}

Analyst: Frida Wallin

**Russia: 0**

The government of Russia has partially complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to eliminate gender disparities in education, through its support of the FTI, its efforts to improve the quality of basic education, and its contribution of new funds to support education in the developing world.

Since the St. Petersburg Summit, Russia has participated in several forums dedicated to advancing the EFA agenda. In October 2006, Russia attended the FTI Technical Meeting in Brussels as one of the co-chairs and as a member of both the FTI Steering Committee\textsuperscript{716} and the FTI Catalytic Fund Strategy Committee.\textsuperscript{717} In November 2006, Russia attended the 4th Meeting of the EFA-FTI Partnership in Cairo as a Donor Partner.\textsuperscript{718} At the 4th Meeting of the EFA-FTI Partnership, Russia took the lead in discussing two proposals. First, Russia led a discussion on a proposal to create a Quality Development Task


The objective of the proposed Task Team is to develop methods and indicators of quality assessment of learning outcomes in basic education towards improving the quality of basic education.\textsuperscript{721} Second, Russia put forward its proposal for the Basic Education Quality Improvement Program (BEQIP). The objective of BEQIP is to increase the quality of learning outcomes by developing national capacity in quality education assessment and by developing content and methods of teaching based on assessment results.\textsuperscript{722} Part of the program will involve the establishment of an International Support for Education Development (ISED) Centre in Russia. The BEQIP, which is a Russian contribution to the Fast Track Initiative,\textsuperscript{723} is expected to cost USD 67.8 million and will be implemented over the period 2007-2010.\textsuperscript{724}

It is not clear, however, what part of the program budget will actually be covered by Russia. Russia’s activity in participating in FTI meetings and advocating policy initiatives has been accompanied by new financial commitments to foster education in the developing world.

On 16 September 2006, Russia’s Finance Minister, Alexei Kudrin, announced that Russia will allocate USD 60 million to foster education in “the poorest countries”. Russia’s initiative in this regard will focus on the issue of improving the quality of education.\textsuperscript{725}

Russia as a new member of the Catalytic Fund has demonstrated compliance with the commitment of gender disparities elimination in education. As the member of Catalytic Fund Russian government continues to finance FTI programs. It paid USD 1 million by November 2006 and plans to invest USD 2 million in 2007 and up to USD 4 million in total by 2008.\textsuperscript{726}

According to the officials, Russia has pledged its commitment for the year 2007 equivalent USD 2 million. According to FTI Newsletter (Issue, November-February 2006-2007)\textsuperscript{727} Russia along with the other G8-donors (Canada, Italy, France and the United Kingdom) has pledged to the Catalytic Fund USD 4 million for the period 2003-2008 and 3.2 million to the Education Program Development fund USD for the period 2005-2008.

Through its increased contribution to international aid (up to USD 500 million in federal budget-2007\textsuperscript{728}), of which a portion is designated for educational programs, the Russian government contributes to compliance with this commitment.

The Deputy Finance Minister of Russia S. Storchak stated in an interview to the newspaper “Vremya novostey” of April, 2\textsuperscript{nd} on the priorities of Russia as a donor-country, that Russia will mobilize more resources for the assistance in the sphere of energy, health and education\textsuperscript{729}.

However there are no developed aid programmes and actions specially targeted at elimination of gender disparities, thus Russia gets a score of “0”.

Analyst: Yulay Sultanov and Arina Shadrikova

\textbf{United Kingdom: +1}

The United Kingdom (UK) has registered a score of +1 indicating full compliance with its St. Petersbursk commitment to financially support the elimination of gender disparities in education. Since the summit, the UK government has demonstrated a high level of support towards the EFA and FTI through its policy developments and financial contributions. The UK has also explicitly mentioned gender equity in education as a primary and driving policy goal.

\textsuperscript{722} Concept of the Program to Improve the Quality of Basic Education in CIS and African Countries, World Bank, (Washington),14 November 2006. www.fasttrackinitiative.org/education/efafti/documents/Cairo/ConceptNote_ImprovingQuality.pdf.
\textsuperscript{723} Concept of the Program to Improve the Quality of Basic Education in CIS and African Countries, World Bank, (Washington),14 November 2006. www.fasttrackinitiative.org/education/efafti/documents/Cairo/ConceptNote_ImprovingQuality.pdf.
\textsuperscript{724} Russia to allocate $60 million to foster education in the poorest nations, Russian Federation, (Moscow), 16 September 2006. en.g8russia.ru/news/20060916/1260427.html
\textsuperscript{727} Russian information agency, RIAN, (Moscow ), 20 November, 2006. www.rian.ru/politics/foreign/20061120/55800127.html
In September 2006, Mozambique was promised GBP150 million over the span of 10 years,730 and Bangladesh a sum of GBP100 million over six years to support education initiatives.731 The UK government has extended efforts to monitor the effectiveness of their ongoing EFA-FTI contributions, as demonstrated by the execution of monthly progress updates regarding the Gleneagles Implementation Plan for Africa.732

The UK’s commitment to the EFA-FTI and gender equality were reflected in its contributions at the October EFA-FTI Technical meeting where it was decided that the Catalytic Fund be expanded, and the UNESCO High Level Group on the EFA in November where the British delegation was critical in scrutinizing current forms of resource mobilization.733 This Catalytic Fund increase prompted the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Secretary of State for International Development to later pledge at a meeting with the World Bank, to increase the UK’s contribution to the Fund by GBP100 million.734

The UK has also engaged with the World Bank, the Netherlands, and France "in developing joint instruments and to ensure overall harmonization" of their EFA-FTI gender programs.733 736 Furthermore, explicit references to the importance of gender equality in education are made in various DFID country plan documents. For example, gender equity is listed as a primary ambition in its programming with Ethiopia. The UK Government also pledged GBP7 million over a period of three years towards this specific goal in Nigeria.737

While continuing with monthly self-evaluations on the government’s efficacy in attaining the Gleneagles Implementation Plan for Africa, the UK government has also made key financial contributions to individual countries via the EFA-FTI initiative.738 For example, on 22 February, 2007, the UK government granted Rwanda an allocation of GBP70 million from the EFA-FTI fund for the hiring of teachers, building of classrooms, and production of textbooks.739 Further, on 18 January 2007 the UK pledged GBP200 million to India in order to achieve universal primary education.740

The United Kingdom supported its financial contributions with verbal commitments to the EFA-FTI. At the constructive meeting held at Gleneagles on 5 April 2007 UK officials met with Kofi Annan and various NGOs to review the progress on their goal of universal primary education by 2015.741 In this meeting, Hillary Benn, Secretary of State for International Development, made a statement that her government would provide additional UK support for education in Sierra Leone, Burundi, Somalia, Afghanistan, Nepal, and the Democratic Republic of Congo and listed Liberia as a benefactor via the FTI.742 At the World Bank and IMF meetings on 14-15 April 2007 the UK called for the World Bank to provide details of its plan to increase spending on education via the EFA-FTI program.743

Analyst: Jen Quito

United States: 0

since the St. Petersburg Summit commitment to eliminate gender disparities in education. Notably, the EU has been relatively inactive. The European Union has registered a score of 0 indicating partial compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment to gender equality in education. Although the US Government demonstrates a political focus on gender equality in education, its financial contributions fall short of commitments made during previous years. To achieve a score of +1, the US will need to increase its funding of EFA-FTI related activities and projects, and to increase its funding of the FTI Catalytic Fund.

In August 2006, the US government allocated USD18.5 million to Tajikistan through the auspices of the EFA-FTI program and provided for the training of approximately 3000 teachers. This contribution operated in tandem with a specifically designed program by USAID entitled "Basic Education, Especially for Women and Girls" which was in full operation in Yemen during the latter half of 2006. The US Government supported India’s EFA program in late 2006 through the provision of 23 grants to various Indian NGOs and the training of approximately 160,000 teachers. USAID reaffirmed its commitment towards gender equality within education in its proposed budget for 2007, stating that "[i]t is particularly through the education of girls that countries accrue a wide range of benefits, including improved health and survival rates of infants and children, reduced rates of fertility, and greater use of modern contraceptive methods." The US has contributed to various bilateral aid programs for the promotion of gender equity in education such as the ‘Safe School Program’ in Ghana, Ethiopia, and Malawi, where gender-equitable relationships are encouraged among students in an effort to reduce school based gender violence, and increase scholastic female participation. Through the second phase of President Bush’s Africa Education Initiative (AEI), beginning in the 2007 fiscal year and ending in 2010, 550,000 scholarships will be provided to African girls in Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Cote d’Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Togo by 2010 in the form of tuition fees, books, uniforms, and other essentials so that they can "grow up to play positive roles in the education, political, and economic sectors of their countries". The US’ commitment to gender equality in education is also displayed throughout its ‘Promoting Gender Equality in Basic Education Activities’ program which delivers training and technical assistance to enhance USAID’s ability to execute its gender-oriented goals.

Despite noteworthy bilateral financial contributions and written reaffirmations of the US’s commitment to the EFA-FTI program, there remains no evidence of USD65 million being granted to African FTI recipients for the purposes of defraying school fee barriers as promised in 2005. The only recent mention of the EFA-FTI initiative by the US is contained in a project proposal for Honduras elaborating plans for the decentralization of Honduran basic education in order to bring in local and private-sector entities. There further remains little evidence that the US government has contributed directly to the Catalytic fund or participated in the development of the EFA-FTI program.

**Analyst: Jen Quito**

### European Union: 0

The European Union has registered a score of 0 indicating partial compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment to eliminate gender disparities in education. Notably, the EU has been relatively inactive since the St. Petersburg Summit.

---


Significantly, the EU has become a major donor to the Catalytic Fund, which is the main multi-donor trust fund in support of the EFA-FTI.753 EU grants to Africa and Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries have been established and the EU will pay its contribution to the Catalytic Fund in three stages until 2008.754 This is, however, a fulfillment of a pledge made prior to March 2006.755 The EU is committed as one of the co-chairs of the FTI until June 2007.756

In St. Petersburg, the EU strongly emphasized the importance of girls’ education in poverty reduction and sustainable development.757 In a 20 December 2005 joint statement, representatives of EU member states, the European Parliament and the European Commission declared their commitment to gender equality by promising to include “a strong gender component in all its [the EU’s] policies and practices in its relations with developing countries.”758 The EU is the second-largest multilateral donor for education and its support is in the form of grants.759 According to an November 2006 UNESCO report on EFA, the EU allocates greater shares of its education aid to sub-Saharan Africa and to basic education than do donors overall.760 The above report, however, is based on figures and analyses updated in June 2006.

In connection to the International Women’s Day on 8 March 2007, the European Commission adopted a European strategy to promote gender equality in development cooperation through the instatement of gender equality in its development policy, with a particular focus on education.761 Further, Commissioner Ferrero-Waldner stated that women’s rights are central to the future prosperity of any developing country and that the EU supports gender equality at all levels.762 The strategy is part of a series of EU policy initiatives aiming to better coordinate development assistance by providing concrete suggestions for gender equality, such as an increase in the efficiency of gender mainstreaming in political dialogue with partner countries.763

According to the 2007 EU general budget, donations to Human and Social Development (HSD) has decreased from EUR 172 million in 2006 to EUR 117 million in 2007.764 The European Commission has promised to allocate from its HSD budget a minimum of 12% to education and a minimum of 2% to gender for the period 2007 to 2013.765 The EU has fulfilled this financial commitment in its 2007 general budget through the allocation of EUR22 million to education (18.8%) and EUR6.6 million (5.6%).766

Analyst: Frida Wallin

---


Commitment

“Continuing, in cooperation with the EU, UN and other partners, to assist the AU and African sub-regional organizations in further developing the African Standby Force including transportation and logistics support arrangements”

Background

Reaffirmed in St. Petersburg, the G8’s long-term goal for African security is the establishment of a 75,000 member African Standby Force by 2010. The G8’s commitment to security in Africa was founded in the African Action Plan created at the 2002 Kananaskis Summit. The plan was built on at the 2003 Evian Summit with the Joint Africa-G8 Action Plan to Enhance African Capabilities to Undertake Peace Support Operations. The primary focus of the G8’s commitment is to work with its African counterparts in developing local and regional capacities to undertake peace support operations in accordance with the UN Charter. In recognition of the financial and logistical difficulties faced by many African states when deploying troops/equipment the G8 has focused on transportation and logistical support as the primary means of assistance to its African counterparts.

Team Leader: Jonathan Scotland / Matto Mildenberger

Assessment

2006 Final Compliance Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada: +1

Canada’s commitment to African Security continued to be exceptionally strong in 2007, contributing to the capacity of the African Standby Force through a number of peacekeeping, logistics and transportation initiatives. Canada, alongside other G8 countries, participated in the development of a set of military policy approaches for the Africa Standby Force, discussed from 24 September -6 October 2006 at an African Union Peace and Security Council Meeting in Praetoria, South Africa. Along with the results of earlier


technical workshops, these policy approaches will help form the basis for the further development of
the ASF.769

Through the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), Canada has contributed to the
logistical capacity of African security initiatives in a number of ways. On August 18, Canada
announced almost $CAD 500 000 so support the development of a 4000 person Southern African
civilian police force for peacekeeping operations in Africa.770 On 23 November 2006 the Ghanaian
government, in collaboration with CIDA, opened a peacekeeping documentation center at the Police
Headquarters in Accra.771 A second center was opened in Abuja, Nigeria on 30 November 2006.772 The
centers are part of the CAD$3.12 million CIDA-funded West Africa Police Project, initiated in 2005 to
strengthen the capacity of West African police in peacekeeping operations.773 In addition, CIDA worked
in unison with the Economic Community for West African States (ECOWAS) in hosting a roundtable
seminar focused on integrating police women into peace operations in Abuja from 28-29 November
2006.774

In September 2006, Major Luc-André Racine became the first full-time Canadian teacher at an African
peacekeeping school, the EMP, in Bamako, Mali.775 As part of a continuing effort to create a viable
Standby Force, Canada offered logistical and financial support to the fifth cycle of the
Reinforcement of African Peacekeeping Capabilities (Recamp V), participating in a military and
peacekeeping exercises led by the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), the AU,
and France beginning on 13 November 2006 in Doula, Cameroon.776

Through the Canada Fund for Africa, the Canadian government continues to strengthen “the capacity
of West African countries to train and deploy civilian police operations”777. At the Kofi Annan
International Peacekeeping Training Centre in Ghana, recent efforts funded through this program have
included a course on ‘Civilian Police in Peace Operations’ from 13-24 November 2006778, and
‘Disarmament, Demobilisation Reintegration, Rehabilitation Operations’ workshop from 25 September
to 5 October 2006.779 On 29 November 2006, the Canadian Governor-General, Michaëlle Jean, made a
state visit to the Annan Centre to express support for the initiative.780 On 27 November 2006, CIDA
sponsored a conference in Abuja in partnership with ECOWAS and the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre to
expand opportunities for female involvement in African peacekeeping operations.781

The Canadian government remains committed to the provision of training for African Peacekeeping
forces. On March 17 2007 Canada attended a meeting of ECOWAS and its partners in Abuja, Nigeria
to discuss funding for training programs for the ECOWAS Western Africa Standby Force in 2008.782 On
26 March 2007 the École de Maintien de la Paix in Bamako, Mali was inaugurated, thanks to Canadian
contributions and with the promise of a further Canadian Forces officer to bolster the school’s


770 http://w01.international.gc.ca/grantdislosurepublic/main_fa.aspx?wslp=48r=10&c=380


775 Canada’s Export to Africa: Peacekeeping skills, Hamilton Spectator, (Hamilton), 28 November 2006. Date of Access: 4 January
2007.

http://www.hamiltonspectator.com/ NASApp/cs/ContentServer?pagename=hamilton/Layout/Article_Type1&c=Article&id=1164
66781344&call_pageid=102432466723

776 Recamp V – Over 1,000 officers involved in the exercise, Cameroon Tribune, (Yaoundé), 13 November 2006. Date of Access: 4


778 Civilian Police in Peace Operations comes up, Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre News Service, (Accra),


780 Governor-General plants tree of life, Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre News Service, (Accra), 4 December

781 CANADA AND ECOWAS HOST HIGH PROFILE INTERNATIONAL GENDER CONFERENCE, Pearson Peacekeeping Centre, (Ottawa),

management team. The Canadian armed forces also conducted two Military Training Assistance Program (MTAP) Tactical Operations Staff Courses at the At the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre in Ghana from 19 February-2 March 2007, and from 12-23 March 2007. The courses provided 30 Junior Officers from 15 African countries the skills and knowledge of Command Post Operations to enable them function in multi-national peace support operational environments. Canada remained committed to the preservation of the African Union mission in Sudan. As an observer to the joint commission to oversee the implementation of last year's Darfur Peace Agreement (DPA), Canada signed a communiqué on 9 February 2007 condemning attacks on humanitarian workers and African Union Personnel. Canada addressed the transport situation in Sudan on March 30 2007 by allocating $ CAD 3.6 million for landmine clearance to make Sudan’s roads passable, including for the transport of humanitarian assistance. On 1 March 2007, Peter McKay announced a further $CAD 48 million to support African Union peacekeeping efforts in Sudan.

**Analyst: Mark Donald**

**France: +1**

France has complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to bolster African security, predominantly through its leadership in the fifth cycle of the Reinforcement of African Peacekeeping Capabilities (RECAM V) project that is improving the logistics and training capacity of peacekeeping forces associated with the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS).

France provided financial and logistic leadership, alongside the AU, EU and ECCAS, in RECAM V. Activities conducted during the compliance period include: operations training in Gabon for 30 officers held 11-22 September 2006, a large training conference in Cameroon held 17-29 September 2006, tactical training held in Mali 25-29 September 2006, and intensive training in maintenance of order in Cameroon for 20 officers 8 November -9 December 2006.

Likewise, France alongside the AU, EU and ECCAS, helped organize and participated in military and peacekeeping exercises conducted from 13 November 2006 in Doula, Cameroon. These efforts were a major part of the larger effort by ECCAS to ready a Central African Standby Brigade that will constitute a significant part of the Africa Standby Force.

Further, on 22 November 2006, the French government helped ECCAS countries, along with the African Union and partner organizations, in assessing their progress in developing peacekeeping forces within Central Africa. At that time, the French High Representative in charge of Security and Prevention of Conflicts, Pierre-André Wiltzer, emphasized the success of RECAM and stressed

---

France’s role in supporting the development of African peacekeeping capability. France also helps finance the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (KAIPTC) in Bamako, Mali, alongside a wide range of international partners. France has been an active supporter of the African Union AMIS peacekeeping mission in Sudan. On 20 November 2006, Foreign Affairs Minister Philippe Douste-Blazy called for the a strengthening of AMIS’s logistical capacity through the UN. As part of the joint commission to oversee the implementation of last year’s Darfur Peace Agreement (DPA), Canada signed a communiqué on 9 February 2007 condemning attacks on humanitarian workers and African Union Personnel.

Analyst: Sumera Nabi

Germany: 0

Germany has partially complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to bolster African security. As part of a continuing effort to create a viable African Standby Force, Germany offered logistical and financial support to the fifth cycle of the Reinforcement of African Peacekeeping Capabilities (RECAM P V), participating in a military and peacekeeping exercises led by the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), the AU, and France starting on 13 November 2006 in Doula, Cameroon. Germany supports the establishment of an African Standby Force mainly through the development agency “Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit” (GTZ) and the “Center for International Peace Operations” (ZIF). GTZ provides financial and technical support for the Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanism (CEWARN) in Eastern Africa. ZIF sponsored workshops for the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Center. There was an Elections Observer Course from 11 October 2006 to 20 October 2006. And in March 2007 (14 - 16 March) a joint ZIF (Zentrum für Internationale Friedensinsätze)/ KAIPTC / DPKO Best Practices Unit Seminar on analysing and developing the UN Capstone Doctrine on Peacekeeping took place in Accra. Germany also helps finance the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (KAIPTC) in Bamako, Mali, alongside a wide range of international partners. On 18 May 2007, Ghanese Defence Minister, Kwame Addo-Kufuor, called on Germany to assist in the creation of the ECOWAS Western Africa Standby Force. Herbert Frankenhouser, head of the German Federal Parliament Budgetary Committee delegation visiting Ghana did not specifically respond to this request but affirmed Germany’s general support for peacebuilding in the region.

With the German presidencies of EU and G8 in 2007, Chancellor Angela Merkel announced that the partnership with Africa will be a focal point of both presidencies. On 27 February 2007, Merkel confirmed that support for the African Standby Force remains a commitment for the EU during her

794 http://www.kaiptc.org/aboutus/donor.asp?nav=4
time as leader. However, no concrete steps to increase African peacekeeping capabilities or to strengthen the African Standby Force have been announced so far.

**Analyst: Katrin Geenen**

### Italy: 0

Italy has only partially complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to bolster African security. To achieve full compliance, Italy will have to take a greater range of actions that more directly provide logistical and transportation support for the proposed African Standby Force. As part of a continuing effort to create a viable African Standby Force, Italy offered logistical and financial support to the fifth cycle of the Reinforcement of African Peacekeeping Capabilities (Recamp V), participating in military and peacekeeping exercises led by the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), the AU, and France on 13 November 2006 in Doula, Cameroon.

The Italian Government provided some indirect support through its pre-established Centre of Excellence for Stability Police Units (COESPU), a joint program with the United States government that supports peace operation training around the world. On 20 October 2006, the third cycle of graduates – 132 individuals from Cameroon, India, Jordan, Kenya, and Senegal – graduated from the training hosted in Vicenza, Italy. Italy also helps finance the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (KAIPCT) in Bamako, Mali, alongside a wide range of international partners.

On 11 October 2006, the Italian Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, H.E. Patrizia Sentinell, visited the African Union headquarters in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia and signed a Memorandum of Understanding that aims to strengthen general cooperation between Italy and the AU. Notably, this document makes no mention of any Italian efforts or commitment to develop continental African peacekeeping capabilities.

On 20 February 2007, the Italian representative to the Security Council gave full support to the African Union Mission to Somalia at a UN Security Council during discussion over SC Resolution 1744, authorizing AU Mission to Somalia, indicating that “a full and inclusive political process conducted by the Somalis themselves [is] key to the solution of the crisis.” However, more evidence of concrete measures that sustain Italian involvement in African peacekeeping capacity building initiatives would be necessary for Italy to achieve full compliance.

**Analyst: Frances Cation**

### Japan: 0

Africa has partially complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to bolster African Security. Much of Japan’s commitment to the consolidation of the African standby force seems to be reserved for the upcoming 4th installment of the Tokyo International Conference on African Development (TICAD) to occur in 2008. The Japanese government sent representatives to the Eighth Ordinary Session of the Assembly of the African Union from 29-30 January 2007 to discuss “peace and stability issues including situations in Somalia and Sudan,” along with “Japan’s policy on cooperation for Africa through TICAD”.

In a message to the the AU, the Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe stressed...
Japan’s commitment “to provide active support for the consolidation of peace and development in Africa on the basis of TICAD”.

In a meeting of the United Nations Security Council on 28 March 2007, Japanese Representative Kenzo Oshima commended the AU “for its efforts to establish the capability to operationalize the African Standby Force” and stressed the Japanese Government’s willingness “to increase its support further.”

The Japanese government made small contributions to the logistical and peacekeeping capacity of the African Union in the first four months of 2007. On 31 January 2007 the Japanese government donated $USD 200,000 worth of equipment to African Union comprising computers, cameras, printers, and photocopiers to be used in a training program for the 7,300 AU forces and personnel in Darfur. The Japanese contribution is part of a $USD 2.8 million fund that is primarily managed by agencies of the United Nations (UN).

Japan also offered logistical and financial support to the fifth cycle of the Reinforcement of African Peacekeeping Capabilities (Recamp V), participating in a military and peacekeeping exercises led by the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), the AU, and France on 13 November 2006 in Doula, Cameroon.

Japan also helps finance the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (KAIPTC) in Bamako, Mali, alongside a wide range of international partners.

Analyst: Mark Donald

Russia: 0

Russia partially complied with its St. Petersburg commitment on African security.

Russia currently trains Africans in their Peacekeepers Training Centre, run by the Russian Institute for Advanced Training for Ministry of Internal Affairs Employees. From 2 November 2006 to 30 November 2006, 38 representatives of 10 African countries received training through the “Civil Police Officer” program. Russian government officials have declared that Russia plans to teach up to 80 African peacekeepers per anum by 2010, and that the next course at the Peace Institute would take place from 1 March 2007 to 2 April 2007.

On 26 October 2006, at the Seventh Meeting of the Africa Partnership Forum in Moscow, Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs Sergei Lavrov proclaimed that Russia is “helping the African partners to reduce their debt burden, strengthen their peacekeeping capabilities and train national personnel of civilian professions.”

Similarly, on 20 September 2006, Lavrov affirmed in a statement to the UN Security Council that “it was necessary to build on the positive cooperation experience with such regional organizations in Africa as the African Union and the Southern African Development Community (SADC). [Russia] continued training peacekeepers from Africa and intended to expand those activities.”

On 9 August 2006, Vitaly Churkin, Russian Federation representative at the UN, confirmed that “as the current chairman of the [G8] Russia placed great importance on settling conflicts on the African continent...” and that “Russia believed in the importance of establishing open, equal and mutually advantageous partnerships with African countries”; Churkin also noted the need to use Russian
external assistance to supplement, not displace, African States’ efforts to take control of their security." The United Kingdom has partially complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to bolster African security. For the UK to have achieved full compliance it would have needed to have taken a greater range of actions that more directly provided logistical and transportation support for the African Standby Force in the period between July 2006 and 17 April 2007. In a 25 January 2007 report on the progress of the 2005 Gleneagles Summit’s commitments, the UK’s Secretary of State for International Development, Hilary Benn recognized the UK’s current position of non-compliance and the importance of moving forwards with the ASF noting “A year ago, the Government set out 11 objectives that we hoped would be achieved by the end of 2006. I am pleased to report that the majority of these have been met, although more progress is needed on the Africa Standby Force.” Under the UK’s continuing effort to create a viable African Standby Force, the United Kingdom offered logistical and financial support to the fifth cycle of the Reinforcement of African Peacekeeping Capabilities (Recamp V), participating in a military and peacekeeping exercises led by the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), the AU, and France starting on 13 November 2006 in Doula, Cameroon. The United Kingdom also helps finance the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (KAIPTC) in Bamako, Mali, alongside a wide range of international partners. The United Kingdom participated in the development of a set of military policy approaches for the Africa Standby Force, discussed from 24 September - 6 October 2006 at an African Union Peace and Security Council Meeting in Pretoria, South Africa. Along with the results of earlier technical workshops, these policy approaches will help form the basis for the further development of the ASF.

As an observer to the joint commission to oversee the implementation of the 2006 Darfur Peace Agreement (DPA), the United Kingdom also signed a communiqué on 9 February 2007 condemning attacks on humanitarian workers and African Union Personnel. However, more focused and explicit efforts would have been needed to achieve full compliance.

Analyst: Jonathan Scotland

---

United States: +1

Through both its initiation and support of a number of initiatives that aim at strengthening the Africa Standby Force and African peacekeeping capabilities, United States has exhibited a high level of compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment. US efforts to develop the Africa Standby Force have largely been funded and initiated through the Global Peace Operations Initiative Program,” and specifically through the Africa Contingency Operations Training Assistance (ACOTA) program.293 ACOTA has over 19 partners throughout Africa. The US-led ACOTA program was created in 2004 out of the African Crisis Response Initiative.294 On 6 September 2006, the US Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of African Affairs, Jendayi Frazer, pledged to “train 40 000 African peacekeepers through the Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI) and African Contingency Operations and Training Assistance (ACOTA) programs.”295

After an approximately two-month American-led training course, ACOTA provides troops with nonweapons equipment such as weapons and mine detectors. Graduates become involved in peacekeeping operations in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Liberia, Burundi, Cote d’Ivoire, Sudan/Darfur, Somalia and Lebanon.296 This program has trained a significant number of peacekeeping battalions. According to the American Bureau of Resource Management, as of November 2006, approximately 79% of all African battalions or other military contingents that are deployed on peacekeeping missions globally have significant staff or unit training experience through the ACOTA program.297

Through ACOTA, the US Sponsored an ECOWAS Multi-National Command Post Exercise at the Kofi Annan International Peace Training Centre in Ghana from 4-15 December 2006,298 which aimed at the development of African capacity to react to Peace Support operation needs.299 This effort was seen as a part of the African strategy to develop the West African brigade of the Africa Standby Force.300 Also through ACOTA, the US committed to help train Namibian Defense Forces beginning 13 September 2006 in an effort to facilitate the formation of the African Standby Force’s Southern African brigade.301 Also, in August 2006, as part of a ten day military exercise called Natural Fire 2006, the United States military partnered with members of the East African Community in delivering humanitarian aid and medical assistance. This exercise was aimed at increasing interoperability between Kenyan, Tanzanian, Ugandan and American forces.302

As part of a continuing effort to create a viable African Standby Force, the United States offered logistical and financial support to the fifth cycle of the Reinforcement of African Peacekeeping Capabilities (Recamp V), participating in a military and peacekeeping exercises led by the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), the AU, and France starting on 13 November 2006 in

---

Doula, Cameroon. The United States also helps finance the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (KAIPTC) in Bamako, Mali, alongside a wide range of international partners.

In partnership with the Italian government, the US government also supported the African Peacekeeping Forces Centre of Excellence for Stability Police Units (CoESPU) program. On 20 October 2006, the third cycle of graduates – 132 individuals from Cameroon, India, Jordan, Kenya, and Senegal – graduated from the training hosted in Vicenza, Italy.

Importantly, from 17 to 21 April 2007, the United States funded and helped coordinate preparatory and training sessions for the African Endeavour 2007 (AE-07) initiative in cooperation with KAIPTC. This initiative, that will be completed in South Africa in July 2007 aims to “test the inter-operability of the command control and information system of the armed forces of Africa”, ultimately supporting the creation of the Africa Standby Force.

The US is also a strong supporter of African Union Missions, particularly to Somalia and the Sudan. For instance, in April 2007, Assistant Secretary Frazer, during a recent visit to Somalia, indicated that the US is moving toward the dispersal of US$40 million of aid for humanitarian assistance and called for the support of the African Union Mission in Somalia. On 28 March 2007, US Alternative Representative to the UN for Special Political Affairs publicly supported the African Union, and reaffirming that the US will “continue to provide capacity building assistance to the AU peace and security architecture through training, equipment, advisors, and other logistical support.”

**Analyst: Frances Cation**

### European Union: +1

The European Union (EU) has demonstrated full compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment to assist the African Union (AU) and African sub-regional organizations (SROs) in developing the African Standby Force (ASF).

On 20 October 2006, the European Commission adopted a "EU partnership for peace, security and development in the Horn of Africa." As part of the Partnership, the EU recognizes the importance of working in cooperation with regional organizations such as the AU and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development. Within this Partnership, the EU will also consider supporting the establishment of the Eastern African Standby Military Brigade (EASBRIG) as part of the ASF. Later that month, at the 10th ECOWAS-EU Ministerial Troika Meeting in Niamey, Niger, the EU expressed its support for the development of the ECOWAS Standby Force, which was identified as "a valuable addition to the African Standby Force." In November, the European Council of the EU accepted, at its General Affairs Council meeting, “a EU concept for strengthening African capabilities for the prevention, management, and resolution of conflicts” that will, among other things, support the ongoing establishment of an African Peace and Security Architecture, including the creation of the ASF. The Council also asserted at this meeting that the EU “stands ready to step up its support for efforts of the African Union and African sub-regional organizations to promote security and..."
development on the African continent.” 852 In September 2006, the European Commission allocated nearly EUR 1000000 from the European Development Fund to fund African standby force workshops and capacity building. 853

The European Union also provided financial and logistic leadership, alongside the AU, France and ECCAS, in RECAMP V military and peacekeeping exercises conducted from 13 November 2006 in Doula, Cameroon. 854 These efforts were a major part of the larger effort by ECCAS to ready a Central African Standby Brigade that will constitute a significant part of the Africa Standby Force. 855 The European Union also helps finance the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (KAIPTC) in Bamako, Mali, alongside a wide range of international partners. 856

On 15 December 2006, the European Council approved a progress report on the EU and Africa Strategic Partnership submitted by the European Commission and the Council Secretariat entitled, “The EU and Africa: Towards a Strategic Partnership – The Way Forward and Key Achievements in 2006.” 857 The report calls for the European Council to endorse several priority actions in 2007, one of which is to provide targeted assistance to the ASF, including structured and cohesive EU training assistance, and support for logistics requirements. 858 More targeted assistance to the ASF would complement the joint EU-AU African Peace Facility established in 2004 that provides funding for the development of the AU’s Peace and Security functions. 859

Much of Europe’s efforts to promote peacebuilding capacity in Africa, largely in relation to the AMIS mission, flow through the EU’s African Peace Facility. While EU leaders agreed in May 2006, to continue funding for the facility for EUR 3 million, before the compliance period, these funds are understood to subsidize major EU efforts over the next three years to continue its presence in capacity building for African peacekeepers. 860 General actions that are still being funded under this facility, include logistical and transportation support for AMIS, support for AU civilian military action, and police training for AU forces. 861

After assuming the EU Presidency, German Chancellor Angela Merkel on 25 February 2007 confirmed that support for the African Standby Force remains a commitment for the EU during her time as leader. 862

Analyst: Sumera Nabi

13. Africa: Debt Relief [226]

Commitment

“ensuring the full implementation and financing of the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative (MDRI) according to our commitments made at Gleneagles and on a fair burden-share basis, and preserving long-term debt sustainability through the implementation of the IMF/World Bank debt sustainability framework for low-income countries.”

Update on Africa[863]

Background

At the July 2005 G8 Summit in Gleneagles, Scotland, G8 leaders pledged to "cancel 100% of outstanding debts of eligible Heavily Indebted Poor Countries to the IMF, IDA and African Development Fund, and to provide additional resources to ensure that the financing capacity of the IFIs is not reduced, as set out in the statement of 11 June." The G8 Proposal for Debt Relief, renamed the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative (MDRI) provides for 100% relief on eligible debt from three multilateral institutions – the International Monetary Fund, World Bank (International Development Association), and the African Development Fund. MDRI supplements the 1996 Initiative for Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC Initiative) by granting 100% relief for those countries completing the HIPC Initiative process. MDRI is seen as a supplementary initiative that would assist low-income countries to meet the United Nations Millennium Development Goals.

At the G8 Summit in St. Petersburg, G8 leaders affirmed their support for long-term debt sustainability through the IMF and World Bank debt sustainability framework for low-income countries. This framework (officially titled the Debt Sustainability Framework in Low-Income Countries) was implemented by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund in the spring of 2005.

Debt sustainability is the ability to manage debts so they do not grow. Many low-income countries have struggled to maintain their external debt at sustainable levels while trying to meet development objectives. The goal of the Debt Sustainability Framework in Low-Income Countries is to provide guidance on new lending to low-income countries whose main source of financing is official loans. The framework has been developed with the intention to better monitor and prevent the accumulation of unsustainable debt.

Table 1[864]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt Relief to 22 Qualifying Countries under the HIPC Initiative and MDRI</th>
<th>Eligible Fund Credit Outstanding for Qualifying Countries Under the MDRI **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(In millions and as of end-March, 2007)</td>
<td>SDR million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPCs Completion Point Countries</td>
<td>2,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For HIPCs, the amount of debt relief includes undisbursed HIPC assistance from the Fund, previously expected to be delivered over time, and MDRI assistance.

** Credit outstanding at end-2005 resulting from disbursements made prior to January 1, 2005.

*** Using the SDR/US$ exchange rates at the time of debt relief.

Team Leaders: Samreen Beg and Janet Chow

---


Assessment

2006 Final Compliance Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>+0.88</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada: +1

Since the St. Petersburg Summit in July 2006, Canada has made efforts to fulfill its commitment to debt relief and sustainability through the MDRI and DSF. Following the St. Petersburg Summit in July 2006, Canada has worked towards fulfilling its St. Petersburg commitment to debt relief and sustainability through the MDRI and DSF. Canada has identified a schedule for the financing of the MDRI, and has allocated funds to MDRI institutions. Minister of Finance Jim Flaherty announced in a statement for the Development Committee of the Boards of Governors of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund on 18 September 2006, that Canada had already paid its share of MDRI costs to the IMF. Canada, however, has so far only pledged 7% of its targeted contribution to the IDA.

In terms of bilateral debt relief, according to Debt, AIDS, Trade, Africa (DATA), Canada has offered generous terms to HIPC countries by cancelling 100% bilateral debts to HIPC countries. In October 2006, Canada also worked alongside other G8 countries to broker a Paris Club debt relief package for Malawi that would contribute to restoring the country’s debt sustainability, worth USD$137 million in nominal terms. Furthermore, in March 2007, Canada worked with its G8 partners to broker a debt relief package for Sao Tome and Principe, which became the 22nd country to reach the Heavily Indebted Poor Country (HIPC) completion point.

On the issue of debt sustainability, Mr. Flaherty stated at the same September 2006 IMF meeting that, “Canada [is a] strong supporter of the ongoing work to address unsustainable debt burdens […] Funding [for the costs of the MDRI] must be additional.” He argued that, “More can and should be done to break such a ‘lend-and-forgive’ cycle” and announced that Canada is firmly committed to lobbying for a review of the World Bank-IMF Debt Sustainability Framework (DSF) to work towards better planning for long-term debt sustainability.

---

It is important to note that no timetable has been announced for Canada's target of 0.7% of gross national income to be allocated for development assistance, in spite of pressure from other countries that have already announced realizable timeframes.872

Analyst: Catherine Kunz

France: +1

France has complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to debt relief and sustainability. On the MDRI, France has made a commitment to allocate 0.7% of gross national income to development assistance by 2012 and has outlined a clear timetable to achieve this goal.873 France is also the only donor country to make a binding parliamentary 10-year commitment to the MDRI.874 According to Debt, AIDS, Trade, Africa (DATA), France has also pledged 100% of its target contribution to the IDA to cover the costs of MDRI.875 In October 2006, France also worked alongside other G8 countries to broker a Paris Club debt relief package for Malawi that would contribute to restoring the country’s debt sustainability, worth USD$137 million in nominal terms.876 Furthermore, in March 2007, France worked with its G8 partners to broker a debt relief package for Sao Tome and Principe, which became the 22nd country to reach the Heavily Indebted Poor Country (HIPC) completion point.877

On debt sustainability, Former Minister for the Economy, Finance and Industry, Thierry Breton, did however announce, in a statement to the Development Committee of the IMF and the World Bank in September 2006, that "strengthening the debt sustainability analysis framework [of the World Bank-IMF DSF] will be on our common agenda during the coming weeks and months."878

Analyst: Catherine Kunz

Germany: +1

Germany achieved compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment to ensure the implementation of the MDRI and the DSF. Germany reaffirmed its commitment to the MDRI, pledged funds for debt relief through its involvement in the Paris Club, and expressed its support for the IMF and World Bank’s review of the DSF.

So far, according to Debt, AIDS, Trade, Africa (DATA), Germany has pledged 100% of its target contribution to the IDA, which is based on a binding commitment for the period for 2007-2016.879 Germany noted that it in order to finance the MDRI, it will contribute some USD3.9 billion to make up for anticipated losses at the World Bank and AfDB.880 Also, on 9 February 2007, Finance Minister Peer Steinbruck urged fellow G8 member nations to work with the African Development Bank (AfDB) to support African countries through budget reconstruction.881 In terms of bilateral debt relief, in an effort to assist the stabilization of Liberia in the aftermath of civil war, Germany relieved USD230 million owed by the country on 15 February 2007.882 It has also largely participated in

future debt accumulation and will also be of paramount importance in achieving the Millennium Development Goals. Minister Padoa Schioppa also reaffirmed Italy’s support of the Debt Sustainability Framework (DSF), stating that the republic believes that the implementation of the DSF is crucial to successfully avoid future debt accumulation and will also be of paramount importance in achieving the Millennium Goals.

In looking to the Heiligendamm Summit in June Chancellor Merkel reiterated Germany’s support for increasing development assistance. It is reported that Merkel will pledge to provide Africa with USD2 billion over the next four years. A significant amount of the money will be directed towards meeting Germany’s ODA quota.

Finally, Germany has demonstrated its support for the Debt Sustainability Framework. On 17 September 2006, Minister Steinbruck pledged Germany’s future conjoined effort with the IMF and World Bank on the review of the Debt Sustainability Framework.

**Analyst: Charlotte Freeman Shaw and Tatiana Lanshina**

**Italy: 0**

Italy has demonstrated partial compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment on debt relief and sustainability. So far, according to Debt, AIDS, Trade, Africa (DATA), Italy has pledged 100% of its target contribution to the IDA. On 17 September 2006, Italy’s Minister of Economy and Finance Tommaso Padoa-Schioppa confirmed the republic’s decision to support the IMF’s initiatives in low-income countries and the implementation of the sunset-clause in conjunction with the HIPC initiative by the end of 2006. Furthermore, on 19 October 2006 Italy engaged in developing a Paris Club debt relief package for Malawi. Italy is currently working on a multi-annual legislative instrument that will authorize participation in the initiative. At the G8 Development Ministers Meeting in March 2007, Italy reaffirmed its African commitments when its development minister met with fellow G8 development ministers, African organizations, and emerging economies to discuss partnerships on the continent and the fulfillment of foreign aid obligations.

Minister Padoa-Schioppa also reaffirmed Italy’s support of the Debt Sustainability Framework (DSF), stating that the republic believes that the implementation of the DSF is crucial to successfully avoid future debt accumulation and will also be of paramount importance in achieving the Millennium Goals.

---

Development Goals. How Italy will contribute to strengthening this framework beyond its support for its principles is unclear.

**Analyst: Charlotte Freeman Shaw**

**Japan: +1**

Japan has fully complied with its commitment to the MDRI and DSF. In spite of only contributing only 2% of its target contribution to the IDA to cover MDRI costs, it has contributed a significant amount to a number of bilateral debt relief initiatives and thus register full compliance. Beginning on 21 July 2006, Japan provided debt relief to nine countries, which currently qualify for or may potentially qualify for debt relief under MDRI. This bilateral debt relief includes ¥16.65 billion for Ethiopia, ¥100.11 billion for Cameroon, ¥70.88 billion for Mozambique, ¥2.74 billion for Ghana, ¥631.57 billion for Tanzania, ¥70.55 billion for Zambia, ¥88.14 billion for Madagascar, ¥4.99 billion for Central African Republic, ¥227.79 billion for Malawi. In addition, Japan worked alongside other G8 countries to broker a Paris Club debt relief package for Malawi worth USD137 million in nominal terms and provided debt relief for multiple countries through the IMF's implementation of the MDRI.

On 18 September 2006, Hideki Ito, Deputy Director-General of the Economic Affairs Bureau, stated that Japan welcomes the implementation of the MDRI introduced by IMF, IDA and AfDF, and "intends to act on them promptly, staying with them until they are fully carried out." A statement released by Toshihiko Fukui, Governor for the Bank of Japan to the International Monetary and Financial Committee of Board of Governors on 17 September 2006, reaffirmed Japan’s general support for the MDRI. Japan, however, has pledged only 2% of its target contribution to the IDA to cover MDRI costs, and in comparison, has not contributed as much as other G8 countries in canceling bilateral debts.

**Analyst: Adrianna Kardynal**

**Russia: +1**

Russia has taken steps to comply with its St. Petersburg commitment for debt relief and sustainability. According to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "measures are being taken to fulfill the Russian commitments associated with the implementation of the G8 initiative for multilateral debt cancellation to poor countries." It states further that Russia’s contribution will amount to approximately $33 million in 2007-2014.

Russia worked alongside other G8 countries to restore Malawi’s debt sustainability by brokering a Paris Club relief package for the country worth USD137 million in nominal terms. In December 2006, Deputy Finance Minister Sergei Storchak said Russia was writing off USD558.48 million worth of debts to six African nations: $11.75 million owed by Benin, $162.8 million owed by Ethiopia, $20.86 million owed by Tanzania, and $112.2 million owed by Zambia. The six African nations reached the HIPC completion point on

---


Russia may also offer to write off $350 million worth of debts to five other countries, namely Burundi, Republic of Congo, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Sao Tome & Principe, and Chad, Storchak said.  

According to the words of the RF Foreign minister Sergey Lavrov, of the total, Russia has already written off $11.3 billion to African partners, including $2.2 billion in the framework of the HIPC Initiative. This sum will be increased to $500 million.  

According to Stanislav Pokrovskiy, Senior Counsellor of Department of International Organizations of Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Russia takes an active part in the IMF and World Bank initiatives on debt relief for the poorest countries with high level of debt. He also said during round table devoted to the UN Day of fight against poverty that Russia has written off more than $40 billion for the last three years.  

Analyst: Elena Bylina and Adrianna Kardynal

United Kingdom: +1

The United Kingdom has complied with its St. Petersburg commitment on debt relief and sustainability. The UK has reiterated its strong commitment to implementing and financing the MDRI and the World Bank-IMF DSF while remaining active in a wide range of debt-relief related activities instituted prior to the St. Petersburg Summit.

The UK continued with its commitments under the MDRI. According to Debt, AIDS, Trade, Africa (DATA), the UK has pledged 100% of its target contribution to the IDA to cover the cost of MDRI. On 24 January 2007, the UK again worked alongside other G8 countries to broker a Paris Club debt relief package for Sierra Leone, worth USD218 million in nominal terms. Most creditors, the UK included, also committed on a bilateral basis to grant additional debt relief of USD22 million in nominal terms.

On 21 March 2007, Brown delivered the government’s annual budget which stipulated that it will “continue to pay its share of the debt service owed to the World Bank and African Development Bank by other low-income countries that meet criteria for ensuring that the debt service savings are used for poverty reduction.”

The UK also urged other donor countries to agree to debt relief for all low-income countries and made particular mention of the UK’s work in securing the financing of Liberia’s arrears. With respect to this last issue, Brown sought to put fresh impetus behind debt relief for the world’s poorest countries by pressing Britain’s G8 partners to back the write-off of the USD3 billion owed by Liberia to its creditors. However, Brown made no mention of debt relief at the G7 Finance Minister Meeting, a choice that was widely criticized.

The United Kingdom worked alongside other G8 countries to restore Malawi’s debt sustainability by brokering a Paris Club relief package for the country worth USD137 million in nominal terms. British Chancellor of the Exchequer Gordon Brown and Secretary of State for International Development

---


Hilary Benn stated that the UK will continue to work with the World Bank and the IMF in disseminating the DSF to all official creditors, including export credit agencies, to guide their lending decisions.**105  

*Analyst: Erin Fitzgerald*

**United States: +1**

The United States registered full compliance with St. Petersburg’s African Debt Relief commitments. It launched new initiatives involving debt restructuring and relief and reaffirmed previous commitments. The US has pledged 100% of its target contribution to the IDA to cover the costs of the MDRI.**117** On 24 January 2007, the US worked alongside other G8 countries to broker a Paris Club debt relief package for Sierra Leone, worth USD218 million in nominal terms.**118** Similarly, on 13 February 2007, the United States announced it was erasing Liberia’s debt. Speaking at the start of a two-day conference of Liberia’s donors, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice noted the United States holds 391 million dollars in outstanding bilateral loans to Liberia. Rice stated: “We will cancel that debt...We hope that this will help to relieve Liberia’s crippling debt burden, a debt burden that today’s leadership and today’s people of Liberia do not deserve.”**119** The 2008 budget request includes funds to cover the start of this process.**120** Rice also reaffirmed the desire of the United States to “work closely with other donors, such as the World Bank, the African Development Bank, the International Monetary Fund, to resolve...multilateral debt.”**121**

On the issue of debt sustainability, Henry Paulson Jr., Secretary of the Treasury for the United States stated in a September statement to the Boards of Governors of the World Bank and IMF, that while the work done thus far on the DSF is notable, “further improvements are essential to develop a framework that constrains the pace of new borrowing.” Paulson notes that this is an “urgent task that requires [the United States and international financial institutions’] joint attention.”**122**

*Analyst: Erin Fitzgerald*

**European Union: +1**

The European Union has displayed full compliance with the debt relief commitments established at Gineagles and reaffirmed at St. Petersburg.

On 18 October 2006, German chancellor Angela Merkel pledged that Germany would make African debt relief a priority for the year.**123** On 14 November, 2006, World Bank President Paul Wolfowitz met with members of the European parliament (MEPs) where MEP Mauro Zani of Italy called on the World Bank to play a more intense role on debt reduction, while other MEPs asked Wolfowitz whether the World Bank was prepared to forgive “illegitimate debts” amassed from loans to dictatorships and regimes practicing bad governance (such as Liberia and Rwanda).**124** The end of November saw fifty African and EU ministers gather in Tripoli for the first EU-Africa Ministerial Conference on Migration and Development.**125** The Conference paved the way for the joint Africa-EU declaration that

---

**Notes:**


emphasized the commitment of the EU to collectively increase its official development assistance to 0.56% of GNI by 2010 and 0.7% by 2015, with at least 50% of this allocated to Africa. EU debt relief is provided through the European Investment Bank and also through a Heavily Indebted Poor Countries’ (HIPC) trust fund helping multilateral banks provide debt relief. In December 2006, Sierra Leone qualified for debt relief worth $994 million under the HIPC Initiative, and a further $610 million under the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative (MDRI). While the EU has surpassed its goal to contribute 0.39% of GNI by 2006 for official development assistance, it is unclear how much of this includes debt relief. On 1 December 2006, Jarl-Håkan Rosengren, Minister Counsellor of the Permanent Mission of Finland (who held the EU presidency for the second half of 2006) stated that the European Union provided the "lion's share of debt relief to the world's poorest countries".

The EU, most notably by the European Parliament, has criticized the World Bank-IMF DSF. However, it does recognize the importance of the framework in bringing debt sustainability to the centre of the decision-making process of international financial institutions.

On 19 February 2007 at the twenty-fourth France-Africa Summit when she urged European states "to take the Millennium Development Goals (MDG's) seriously" and reminded them of their collective responsibility to meet their Official Development Assistance (ODA) levels. On April 23, 2007, Chancellor Merkel responded to a letter by Pope Benedict urging G8 leaders to cancel the debt of the world's poorest countries by promising that her G8 and EU presidencies will be used to push for "progress in the fight against poverty" and African development.

Analyst: Samreen Beg

---


933 ANSA English Media Service (April 23, 2007), "Pope urges G8 to cancel third world debt."

Commitment

“We maintained our commitment to implement and promote the FATF recommendations, the UN Convention on Transnational Organized Crime, and the UN Convention Against Corruption.”

*Fighting High-Level Corruption*934

Background

Cognizant of the problems that non-transparent governance and corruption presents to economic growth and global stability, the G8 has fought transnational crime by creating specific institutions such as, the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) in 1989 to combat money laundering and terrorist financing, and the Senior Experts’ Lyon Group in 1995 to establish norms and recommendations for the international community. At Evian, the G8 committed to strengthening the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention, concluding the UN Convention Against Corruption and supporting the accelerated ratification of the UN Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime. However, the G8 must move to conclude its collective ratification of the UN Convention Against Corruption as several members including Canada, Germany, Italy, Japan and the European Community have yet to do so. Shortly after the St. Petersburg Summit, Italy became the second to last member to finally ratify the Convention on Transnational Organized Crime; Japan has signed but not ratified the treaty.

The G8 also pledged to encourage partner countries and companies, both in the private and public sectors, to disclose pertinent information to various IFIs such as, the World Bank or the IMF. At the 2004 Sea Island Summit, the G8 reiterated its commitment to fighting corruption and improving transparency and accountability in coordination with other relevant actors, and formed compacts with the governments of Georgia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, and Peru. More recently, the G8 pledged to continue its earlier efforts to “promote transparency in public financial management and accountability, including by following through on our 2004 Sea Island commitment to launch four compacts, and our 2005 Gleneagles commitment to increase support for the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) and countries implementing it.” As the G8 appreciates the connection between good governance and best practices, at St. Petersburg, the G8 committed both to prosecuting acts of corruption and to preventing corrupt politicians from holding office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UN Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime935</th>
<th>UN Convention Against Corruption936</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ratified</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>14 Dec 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>12 Dec 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>12 Dec 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>12 Dec 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>14 Dec 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>12 Dec 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Team Leader: Susan Khazaeli*

---


Assessment

2006 Final Compliance Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada: 0

Canada has taken many of the necessary steps toward registering compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment on transnational crime, specifically in the implementation of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) recommendations, and in the support of the UN Convention Against Transnational Crime. Prior to the summit, former Assistant Deputy Minister of the Financial Sector Policy Branch in Canada’s Department of Finance, Frank Swedlove assumed the presidency of the FATF, and shortly thereafter, from 9 to 13 October 2006, Canada hosted a plenary in Vancouver that saw the release of two reports on improved methods of combating money laundering and terrorist financing.2 In a keynote address at an American and Middle East and North Africa Private Sector Dialogue (US-MENA PSD) conference on the twin problems of anti-money laundering and counter-terrorist financing, on 7 December 2006, Swedlove encouraged the full implementation of the 40 + 9 Recommendations. Recognizing that the mounting problems of transnational crime can only be remedied through close, and concerted international cooperation and through the open exchange of information, he continued that “a truly global network with consistent application of the standards is essential if we are to ensure criminals and terrorists do not have access to the financial resources they need to survive and grow.”

As a state party to the UN Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime, Canada contributes to the global fight against transnational crime. Since the country understands the link from the proceeds of money laundering to terrorism and other crimes, the government has drafted plans for concentrated efforts to eliminate fraudulence and corruption. In March, Finance Minister Jim Flaherty announced the government’s decision to pursue free trade securities alongside its G8 colleagues, which includes “moving towards a principles-based common securities regulator and cracking down on white collar crime and tax havens.”

Prompted by the sponsorship scandal that marred the previous government, the present government promised to deliver the Federal Accountability Act, which would seek to eliminate corruption and bribery among public officials and ‘politically (foreign) exposed persons’ (PEPs). The Act, which passed into law on 12 December 2006, “makes substantive changes to 45 statutes and amends over 100 others, delivers on the Government’s promise to put in place a five year lobbying ban, to eliminate corporate and union donations, and to protect whistleblowers, among other reforms.”

This legislation complies with several FATF recommendations, including proposals for anti-bribery laws, detection, and reporting programs.

While Canada is party to the Convention Against Transnational Crime, it has not agreed to the terms of the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition.\(^\text{941}\) At the same time, Canada has not yet ratified the UN Convention Against Corruption. However, on 22 March 2007, Minister of Justice Rob Nicholson declared that the requisite changes were made to the Criminal Code so as to allow the country to ratify and implement the Convention.\(^\text{942}\) Nicholson reasserted the government’s commitment to fighting crime, saying, “Canada is proud to be taking this step on the road toward full participation in the UN Convention Against Corruption. The Convention is a global instrument that takes preventive measures against corruption, which is a scourge for democratic societies the world over. In calling upon countries to criminalize acts of corruption, the Convention promotes international cooperation in the fight against corruption.”\(^\text{943}\) Canada is thus working toward achieving compliance with its commitment to transnational crime.

**Analyst: Susan Khazaeli**

### France: 0

France has complied with the commitments set out at the St. Petersburg summit. Although France has worked toward promoting the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) and United Nations (UN) Conventions, it has not undertaken any specific steps toward implementing the commitments’ objectives on a more domestic level. Since St. Petersburg, it has yet to create initiatives on anti-corruption or on combating transnational crime domestically, however, France has promoted several anti-corruption initiatives abroad.

France has attended several regional anti-corruption conferences. A French delegation to the Group of States Against Corruption (GRECO) was among those in attendance at the 30th and the 31st plenary sessions, held from the 9 – 13 October and the 4 to 8 December 2006 respectively.\(^\text{944}\) At the latter session, the head of the Legal Studies and Control Division within the department of Legal Affairs of the National Assembly of France presented on political party financing.\(^\text{945}\) As an observer member, France also sent a delegation to the Middle East and North Africa Financial Action Task Force (MENAFATF) meeting in the United Arab Emirates, which was held from the 13 to 15 November 2006.\(^\text{946}\) France continued with its initiatives to support anti-corruption legislation in the Middle East when the Embassy of France in Bahrain co-hosted a regional training program on anti-money laundering techniques on 28 to 29 March 2007.\(^\text{947}\) In addition, France hosted the joint meeting between the FATF and the Council of Europe’s MONEYVAL in Strasbourg from 21 to 23 February 2007.\(^\text{948}\)

In keeping with its commitment to promote the UN Convention Against Corruption, France contributed a legal delegation to helping Indonesia establish anti-corruption laws, specifically concerning the proper application of the Convention.\(^\text{949}\) The following month, from 14 to 15 December, France attended the Fifth Plenary meeting of the Eurasian Group (EAG) to review the levels of cooperation...
between the Group and other regional or international organizations and to discuss the ties between corruption and money laundering. In a daily briefing, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs spokesperson emphasized the importance of the 1st meeting of the states party to the United Nations Convention against Corruption, held in Jordan from 10 to 14 December 2006. This conference reviewed the Convention’s implementation one year after its entry into force. France also attended the ministerial Global Forum V on Fighting Corruption and Safeguarding Integrity, which was held from 2 to 5 April 2007 in Johannesburg, as a follow up to the December meeting in Jordan on implementing the UN Convention Against Corruption.

In regards to the UN Convention on Transnational Organized Crime, at its third session, held in Vienna from 9 to 18 October 2006, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention adopted three decisions regarding the implementation of the Convention.

Analyst: Hilary Peden

**Germany: 0**

Germany has made significant strides toward fulfilling its St. Petersburg commitments through promoting the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) recommendations, the UN Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime, and the UN Convention Against Corruption.

Following the conclusion of the summit, German Chancellor Angela Merkel declared at a press conference on 21 August 2006 that widespread corruption in Africa is greatly contributing to the continent’s development challenges. As the host of the upcoming summit, Germany reaffirmed its intention to fight corruption in Africa. This year’s agenda will focus on “improving systemic stability and transparency of financial markets” and on “the need to develop structures that will encourage private investment... more democracy, less corruption.”

Germany has also made considerable progress with regard to implementing the FATF recommendations. Germany attended the FATF Vancouver Plenary from 9 to 13 October 2006, as well as, encouraged reforms in the Romanian departments of justice and home affairs during a preparatory bilateral meeting, held on 2 November 2006, between Romanian Prime Minister Calin Popescu-Tariceanu and Chancellor Merkel. Foreign Minister Steinmeier made similar recommendations to Bulgaria regarding its entry into the EU along with Romania on 1 January 2007. Through the Financial Intelligence Union at the Federal Criminal Police Office, Germany continued efforts at investigating suspicious financial transactions in cooperation with other federal organizations and countries. Additionally on 29 March 2007, Germany, as president of the EU, engaged in talks with five central Asian republics on corruption, transnational and organized crime within the region.

An informal meeting of the EU Ministers of Justice and Internal Affairs, held in Dresden from 14 to 16 January 2007, highlighted the fight against terrorism and crime as integral to shaping and
empowering European freedoms, including security and justice. In preparation for this meeting, German Federal Minister of Internal Affairs, Dr. Wolfgang Schäuble added that the fight against crime and terrorism “is an area where our citizens expect Europe to provide common solutions.”

Through the communiqué issued by the preparatory meeting of the G8 Finance Ministers held on 9 to 10 February 2007, Germany agreed to work with the FATF to fight money laundering by encouraging the Task Force to continue to work in jurisdictions that have failed to meet international standards.

In recognizing the vulnerability of countries with large extractive industries to corruption, Germany repeated the importance of the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) in ensuring that revenues from the natural resource industries are properly collected and accurately recorded. It further reiterated on 18 December 2006 that the poor distribution of oil revenues to social and economic development programs in African oil-producing countries would become the next target in the fight against corruption.

Nevertheless, Germany’s progress in fighting transnational crime and corruption through the presidency of the EU, support for the EITI and the FATF, and setting the agenda for the Heiligendamm Summit are all off-set by its continued failure to ratify the UN Convention Against Corruption. This failure therefore precludes Germany from achieving full compliance.

**Analyst: Tatyana Lanshina and Alexandra Lapin**

**Italy: 0**

Italy has not taken sufficient measures toward attaining compliance with its St. Petersburg commitments on transnational crime and corruption. Following the summit, on 2 August 2006, Italy ratified the UN Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime and all of its associated protocols. However, Italy has signed but, not yet ratified the UN Convention Against Corruption.

Italy has contributed to the global fight against transnational organized crime. From 9 to 13 October, Italy participated in the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) Vancouver Plenary. It also supplied legal expertise to a Task Force assessment force scrutinizing anti-money laundering practices in Iceland, and ensuring their accordance with the FATF Forty Recommendations plus the Nine Special Recommendations. Still, corruption, extortion, and bribery remain serious problems in the country. According to the 2006 Transparency International’s Corruption Perception Index (CPI) for Western Europe and the European Union, Italy lags behind other G8 members in position 45, with a low score of 4.9. The acquittal of former Prime Minister, Silvio Berlusconi, in a corruption case has raised new concerns about the ability or the willingness of the justice system to effectively prosecute public officials and the elite.

---
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Despite its perceived corruption problems, Italy has implemented the recommendations of the OECD Working Group on Bribery (WGB) in several areas. For instance, Italy has made many improvements in the laws related to false accounting and forged audits. However, it stands to improve methods on the reporting and detection of bribery. A recent OECD report on Italy’s progress, released on 27 March 2007, was critical of the country’s efforts to offer better protection for whistleblowers. With regard to the commitment on transnational crime and money laundering, Italy has acted satisfactorily. Nonetheless, further action is required for full compliance.

**Analyst: Aisha Khan and Susan Khazaeli**

**Japan: 0**

Japan has made steps toward achieving compliance, but has failed to reach full compliance. Most significantly, Japan has still not ratified the United Nations Convention Against Corruption or the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime. However, Japan has demonstrated some regional leadership on the issue and has taken several internal measures to comply with Financial Action Task Force (FATF) recommendations.

In late September, Japan hosted an inter-agency coordination meeting on collaborative interventions to counter trafficking in persons, as a precursor to the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, scheduled the following month in Vienna. During a session of the General Assembly, the Japanese delegation issued a statement on the problems of transnational crime, specifically regarding policy cooperation between governments, non-governmental organizations and the United Nations Office on Crime and Drugs.

Japan, as a member of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), attended the Public-Private Dialogue on Anti-Corruption and Ensuring Transparency in Business Transactions, which was held in Da Nang, Vietnam from the 9 to 10 September. At the APEC Summit on 16 November 2006, Japan, along with other APEC nations, confirmed its commitment to fighting corruption and fostering good governance. There, the APEC leaders agreed to implement the principles of the United Nations Convention Against Corruption and stressed the “importance of adopting preventive measures and market integrity systems to ensure transparency and to boost the groupings anti-corruption war.”

In addition, as a founding member of the Asia Pacific Group on Money Laundering, in November, Japan attended the Special Plenary and Typologies Workshop in Jakarta, Indonesia.

Japan has also maintained its commitment to the FATF. It attended the FATF’s Vancouver Plenary on 13 October, where the interrelated problems of money laundering and terrorist financing were discussed. Shortly thereafter, on 27 December 2006, Japan’s Financial Intelligence Office (JAFIO) entered into a bilateral agreement with the Indonesian Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre, detailing the pooling of information on suspicious transactions in connection with money laundering or...
terrorist financing.\textsuperscript{991} Japan continued its involvement with the FATF by attending the joint meeting between the FATF and the Council of Europe’s MONEYVAL in Strasbourg from 21 to 23 February 2007.\textsuperscript{992}

On 1 April 2007, Japan implemented a domestic money laundering law that expanded the types of businesses required to report suspicious transactions to include also real estate and jewelry dealers. However, this new law is not in full compliance with the guidelines set out by the FATF, which requires accountants, lawyers, and other professionals to report such transactions -- not just dealers.\textsuperscript{993}

Japan moved up on the Corruption Perception Index, compiled by Transparency International, from the 21\textsuperscript{st} position with a score of 7.3 to the 16\textsuperscript{th} with a score of 7.6.\textsuperscript{994} While it seems that Japan has made significant gains in reducing corruption from within, Japan must take further action in complying with FATF recommendations, the UN Convention on Transnational Organized Crime and the UN Convention Against Corruption to achieve full compliance.

\textbf{Analyst: Hilary Peden}

\textbf{Russia: 0}

There are signs that the Russian government is beginning to address the corruption issue, as it is perceived to stifle Russian economic advancement. In 2006 several high-ranking officials were replaced (Vladimir Ustinov, Alexander Zhenikhov, etc.)\textsuperscript{995} In May 2006 Russia ratified United Nations Convention against Corruption\textsuperscript{996}. On the 1\textsuperscript{st} of February 2007 the Russian Federation became the 44\textsuperscript{th} member of the Group of States against Corruption (GRECO)\textsuperscript{997}. President Vladimir Putin signed a decree establishing an interdepartmental working group to draft amendments to Russian laws in conformity with the UN Convention against Corruption of October 31, 2003, and the Council of Europe Criminal Law Convention on Corruption of January 27, 1999\textsuperscript{998}. This working group is to be established by August 1, 2007 and will be accountable to the President.

In October, 2006 at a trilateral meeting of heads of financial intelligence committees (Russia, USA and UK) Russian representatives proposed to create a standing committee consisting of representatives of control and police services of Russia, USA and UK and also member states of Eurasia Group\textsuperscript{999}.

Fighting corruption has been made a major goal in Russia; Russian President has called for a "dictatorship of the law"\textsuperscript{1000}.

But according to International Herald Tribune, many experts say that the problem has worsened at all government levels since 2000. In November 2006 Russia was ranked only 121 out of 163 in Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index\textsuperscript{1001}. According to the Transparency International estimates corruption in Russia has grown 700\% since 2001.

Cooperation with non-governmental organizations in the fight against corruption is carried out through the Public Chamber. In February 2007 the Public Chamber published a report stating that corruption had become a "part of the state machine" and an "inseparable component in its relations with citizens"\textsuperscript{1002}. However, many experts point out that the measures being taken by the Russian


\textsuperscript{996} UN Office on Drugs and Crime, Date of Access: 15 April 2007, http://www.unodc.org/unodc/crime_signatures_corruption.html


\textsuperscript{1003} Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index 2006, 6 November 2006, Date of Access: 15 April 2007

government are both not efficient and not sufficient. Thus despite the compliance with the formal part of the commitment the score for Russia is "0".

Analyst: Yulay Sultanov and Tatiana Lanshina

Analyst: Tatiana Lanshina, Alexandra Lapin, and Yulay Sultanov.

United Kingdom: 0

The United Kingdom has exerted a positive effort in demonstrating its support to the St. Petersburg commitment to fight transnational crime. The government has taken significant measures to support the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) recommendations, and to further its commitment both to the UN Convention Against Transnational Crime and to the Convention Against Corruption.

The United Kingdom has expressed continuous support for the FATF. From 9 to 13 October, the United Kingdom took part in the FATF’s Vancouver Plenary, where the issue of money laundering was discussed. Later that month, on 31 October, it hosted trilateral talks with the financial intelligence heads of the United States and Russia on the twin problems of drug trafficking and terrorist financing.

More recently, on 28 February 2007, the United Kingdom’s HM Treasury published a document entitled, “Financial Challenge to crime and terrorism.” The report seeks to describe "the key priorities for increasing the financial challenge to crime and terrorism in the future." Further complementing the strategy, on 2 April 2007, UK Chancellor and the Treasury’s Representative for Promotion of the City, James Sassoon was appointed to the presidency of the FATF from July 2007 to July 2008. As president, Sassoon intends to advocate anti-money laundering policies and to combat the financing of terrorism.

Despite this progress, the United Kingdom has failed to ratify the Fourth Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking of Firearms. Further action is required if it is to register compliance with its commitment.

Analyst: Anita Li

United States: 0

The United States has partially complied with its St. Petersburg commitment on the issue of transnational crime. The United States has built on previous efforts in supporting both the UN Convention Against Transnational Crime and the UN Convention Against Corruption.

The United States was among those present at the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) Vancouver Plenary this past October, where improved methods of combating the difficult problems of money laundering and terrorist financing were discussed. Later that month, on 31 October 2006, the United States engaged in trilateral talks in London with the financial intelligence heads of the United Kingdom and Russia, where the three G8 member-states focused on tackling drug trafficking and terrorist financing.

More recently, on 1 February 2007, officials of the American Administration and the European Commission met international representatives of industry in Geneva to measure progress in the Euro-American initiative to fight counterfeiting and piracy. This joint strategic action
for the global observance of intellectual property rights (IPR) primarily works toward reinforcing customs cooperation, embarking on “joint action on the ground in the countries in which counterfeiting originates,” and increasing collaboration with the private sector, “which most often falls victim to piracy and counterfeiting.”

The initiative, which was first launched at the EU/United States summit in Vienna in June 2006, will unveil a ‘scoreboard’ of joint strategic action at the EU/United States economic Summit this June.

In addition, the US Department of State’s International Information Programs issued a press release on 12 April 2007, in which US Treasury Under Secretary Timothy Adams urged the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to “boost its surveillance of currency markets.” Adams also stated that the IMF “has a unique and serious responsibility for exchange rate surveillance [and] should play a stronger role in ensuring that countries do not manipulate the values of their currencies.”

Notwithstanding the aforementioned positive efforts, the United States has not yet ratified the final protocol of the UN Convention against Transnational Crime, that is, the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking of Firearms. To achieve full compliance, the United States must also display further evidence of support both for FATF recommendations and for UN initiatives.

**Analyst: Anita Li**

### European Union: 0

The European Union has made some progress in achieving full compliance with its St. Petersburg commitments on transnational crime by implementing the recommendations of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) and by supporting the Conventions of the United Nations.

Shortly following St. Petersburg, on 3 August 2006, the European Commission adopted technical measures in executing the Third Directive on preventing money laundering and terrorist financing. The Third Directive, which is aimed at securing the financial system from money laundering and terrorist financing, details the responsibilities of all goods providers and merchants in reporting on suspicious, particularly large cash transactions.

The European Union has also demonstrated support for the recommendations of the FATF. On 21 February 2007, at a joint meeting between MONEYVAL and the FATF, Council of Europe’s Secretary General Terry Davis discussed the relationship between money laundering and terrorism and stressed the need for concerted effort in securing financial systems against organized crime.

He stated that, “By reinforcing the controls which prevent the use of financial systems by terrorists, we can effectively cut off or restrict their access to funds and thus limit their capacity to strike whenever and wherever they choose.”

The addition of two new members, Bulgaria and Romania, however has reflected poorly on the EU as both countries received low scores on Transparency International Corruption Perception Index. Nonetheless, Romanian Premier Cali Popescu Tariceanu asserted that his country is taking action to improve domestic corruption. He said, "We have formed structures to control the flow of money in..."
strict accordance with the EU Commission. It is in our own interest to make the best use of this money in a fully transparent way that will be monitored by us and the EU Commission." In addition, the European Union has taken collective measures to support the UN Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime. For instance, in efforts to reduce corruption, the European Union announced, in December, its plans to adopt transparent financial rules to administer the disclosure of all Community Funding by member-states. Despite this, the European Commission has not ratified the UN Convention Against Corruption.

Analyst: Aisha Khan and Susan Khazaeli

---

15. Intellectual Property Rights [247]

Commitment

“to create in each G8 country a website providing businesses and individuals with information on mechanisms available and procedures necessary to secure and enforce their intellectual property rights in that country, on threats posed by piracy and counterfeiting to public health, safety and the national interests of countries, consumers and business communities, as well as on measures taken at the national and international levels to combat intellectual property rights violations, and on relevant legislation and law enforcement practices;”

Combating IPR Piracy and Counterfeiting

Background

St. Petersburg represented the second consecutive G8 summit where the issue of intellectual property rights led to the publication of a full communiqué. The website initiative appears to be a unique effort of the St. Petersburg summit to educate national business and individuals on a broad range of issues relating to intellectual property rights, although the G8 states already agreed in Gleneagles to “raise awareness among government officials and the public of the health risks, economic damage and growth of organized crime groups resulting from counterfeiting and piracy”

At its core, this commitment promises “in each G8 country a website providing business and individuals with information on...”

a) “...mechanisms available...to secure and enforce their intellectual property rights in that country
b) “...procedures necessary to secure and enforce their intellectual property rights in that country
c) “...threats posed by piracy and counterfeiting to public health…”
d) “...threats posed by piracy and counterfeiting to...safety…”
e) “...threats posed by piracy and counterfeiting to...the national interests of countries…”
f) “...threats posed by piracy and counterfeiting to...consumers…”
g) “...threats posed by piracy and counterfeiting to...business communities…”
h) “...measures taken at the national...level to combat intellectual property rights violations…”
i) “...measures taken at...the international level to combat intellectual property rights violations…”
j) “...relevant legislation…”
k) “...relevant...law enforcement practices…”

These eleven points constitute distinct components of information agreed to in the commitment. This information is to be supplied in “a website”, suggesting the need for a single centralized, online access point. The following table summarizes content available as of 31 December 2006.

---


### Summary of IPR Content on Primary Government Websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>CAN</th>
<th>FRA</th>
<th>GER</th>
<th>ITA</th>
<th>JAP</th>
<th>RUS</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Mechanisms</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Procedures</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Threats – Health</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Threats – Safety</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Threats – Interest</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Threats – Consumers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Threats – Business</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Measures – National</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Measures – International</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Legislation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Enforcement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available (11 Max)</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessment

#### Interim Compliance Score

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

**Overall: 0.13**

#### Canada: 0

While all the information referenced by the G8 commitment is available on websites maintained by the Canadian Government, updated information on only 5 of the 11 points is maintained on the government’s central intellectual property rights website. To achieve full compliance, the Canadian Government needs to integrate all the information described in the commitment into a single website.

The Canadian Government’s primary website relating to intellectual property rights is the Canadian Intellectual Property Office, available online at: [strategis.ic.gc.ca/sc_mrksv/](strategis.ic.gc.ca/sc_mrksv/)

---

Commitment components A, B and J are fulfilled by providing information and copies of the Patent Act\(^\text{1026}\), the Trade-mark Act\(^\text{1028}\), the Copyright Act\(^\text{1029}\), the Industrial Design Act\(^\text{1030}\), the Consolidated Statutes of Canada and other relevant legislation and procedures available for protecting intellectual property. Furthermore, an 'intellectual property toolkit' fulfills components A and B in full.\(^\text{1031}\)

CIPO maintains an archive of press releases and news bulletins relating to domestic and international intellectual property right protection, fulfilling components H and I.\(^\text{1032}\) The website also contains contact information for government agencies, notably the Intellectual Property Policy Directorate, professional groups, and the Intellectual Property Institute of Canada. These agencies and groups can provide information to users relating to the other criteria outlined in the G8 commitment. However, despite providing contact information for inquiries relating to components C through G and K, the website itself does not host this information. While the CIPO website has added a new "client service" section, which CIPO claims "pulls all CIPO information together", the site still lacks information on the components of the commitment which were absent at the publication of the interim report.

Elsewhere, the Canadian government provides the information described in commitment components C, D, F and G at the website of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.\(^\text{1033}\) While this may benefit consumers and entrepreneurs seeking general information, it does not provide substantial detail. Indeed, the warnings about threats posed by IPR violations and counterfeit products are highly general. To facilitate specific inquiries, the RCMP website also provides contact information for officers handling intellectual property matters.\(^\text{1034}\)

**Analyst: Jeremy Weiss**

**France: 0**

France has only partially complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to provide online information about intellectual property rights. At present, only 6 of the 11 points referenced by the commitment are maintained at a sufficient quality on the government's central intellectual property rights website. To achieve full compliance, the French government needs to expand the quality and scope of the information it provides. In particular, it needs to explicitly address the threats posed by piracy and counterfeiting.

The French government’s primary website relating to intellectual property rights is that of the Institut National de la Propriété Industrielle (INPI), available online at: www.inpi.fr.\(^\text{1035}\) INPI is a "publicly-owned establishment, financially self-sufficient and placed under the supervision of the Ministry for the economy, finances and industry and the Ministry delegated to industry."\(^\text{1036}\)

The INPI website provides access to legislative information\(^\text{1037}\), and explains the significance of French patent\(^\text{1038}\), trademark\(^\text{1039}\) and registered models and designs\(^\text{1040}\) to protecting one's innovation. Together,

---


this website content fulfills commitment components A, B and J. The INPI website also offers information on relevant law enforcement practices\textsuperscript{1043}, fulfilling component K. Finally, the website provides information on how to register innovations so as to protect IP rights and on the principal actors of IP rights on both the national\textsuperscript{1042} and international\textsuperscript{1043} level that combat intellectual property rights violations. This fulfills commitment components H and I.

The INPI has allied with a French anti-counterfeiting committee to launch a national anti-counterfeiting campaign entitled “Contrefaçon: non merci!”\textsuperscript{1044}. On March 4, 2007, the Ministries of Economy, Industry and Finance relaunched their anti-counterfeiting campaign in collaboration with the INPI and the Comité national anti-contrefaçon (Cnac) to alert the public of threats posed by IP rights violations\textsuperscript{1045}. The INPI website encourages visitors to support the campaign by providing statistics\textsuperscript{1046} and a link to the affiliated anti-counterfeit campaign website: www.contrefacon-danger.com.\textsuperscript{1047} This campaign website emphasizes the threats posed by piracy and counterfeiting but does not adequately elaborate on their implications for "public health, safety and the national interests of countries, consumers and business communities", information described in components C through G of the St. Petersburg commitment on intellectual property rights.

**Analyst: Sahar Kazranian**

**Germany: 0**

Germany has only partially complied with the St. Petersburg Summit commitment to disseminate information to both businesses and individuals regarding intellectual property rights in that country. At present, the German Government’s primary intellectual property rights website only adequately treats 2 of the 11 points described in the St. Petersburg commitment. To achieve compliance, Germany must work significantly at creating a more comprehensive and centralized online access point for intellectual property rights information.

The German Government’s primary website relating to intellectual property rights is that of the Deutsches Patent und Markenamt (DPMA), available online at: www.dpma.de/index.htm.\textsuperscript{1048}

Mechanisms and procedures available in Germany to secure intellectual property rights are clearly detailed, fulfilling commitment components A and B.

While very thorough and functional for both businesses and individuals, this site appears to focus primarily on providing information regarding industrial patents. The DPMA website covers the technical rights of the patent holder but does not mention the consequences, legal or otherwise, of their violation, thus failing to meet commitment components J and K. The DPMA does provide links to other websites containing relevant copyright laws and legislations as well as to patent justice courts however, the DPMA itself does not post legislation and law enforcement measures undertaken at the national or international levels to protect intellectual property rights.\textsuperscript{1049}

\textsuperscript{1043} La marque, un capital à protéger, INPI, (Paris), Last Date of Access by G8RG Analyst: 1 May 2007, Last Update: 17 April 2007. www.inpi.fr/front/content/ART_68_62.php?archive=0&StartRow=0&order=1
\textsuperscript{1046} Les principaux acteurs de la P.I/ Propriété Industrielle, INPI, (Paris), Last Date of Access by G8RG Analyst: 1 May 2007, Last Update: 17 April 2007. www.inpi.fr/front/content/ART_68_62.php?archive=0&StartRow=0&order=1
\textsuperscript{1047} Protéger sa marque à l'international, INPI, (Paris), Last Date of Access by G8RG Analyst: 17 April 2007, Last Update: 1 May 2007. www.inpi.fr/front/content/ART_186_115.php?archive=0&StartRow=0&order=1
\textsuperscript{1049} Mobilisation nationale contre la contrefaçon
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Moreover, while the DPMA website does briefly address the effects of product piracy on the German economy in a press release,\textsuperscript{1050} the website fails to provide information about the threats posed by piracy to public health, safety, national interests, businesses and consumers.

Within the German Federal Ministry of Justice website, there is a webpage for the Federal Ministry of Copyright, the agency that enacts relevant intellectual property rights legislations.\textsuperscript{1051} This site does contain some of the information that comprises commitment components J and K. This information, however, is still not consolidated on a single intellectual property right website in Germany.

Germany therefore fails to completely fulfill the commitment to publish key information regarding intellectual property rights legislations and the threats of piracy and counterfeiting to the nation’s health and economic well-being.

Germany moreover has not established a single, central website for all intellectual rights information and therefore fails short of the St. Petersburg commitment.

\textit{Analyst: Kayla Pries}

**Italy: 0**

Italy has only partially complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to provide online information about intellectual property rights. At present, only 6 of the 11 points described in the commitment are maintained at a sufficient quality on the government’s central intellectual property rights website. To achieve full compliance, the Italian Government needs to particularly expand the quality and scope of the information provided about piracy and counterfeiting and make the website easier to navigate so as to find relevant information.

The primary online resource relating to intellectual property rights of the Italian Government is that of the Italian Patent and Trademark Office available at: www.infobrevetti.camcom.it/welcome.html.\textsuperscript{1052}

This website has clear information fulfilling commitment components A and B. For instance, information regarding the legal protection of software programs is provided\textsuperscript{1053}. Separate sections include information on relevant legislation and law enforcement practices,\textsuperscript{1054} fulfilling commitment components J and K.

Moreover, the website provides links to international bodies involved in the protection of IP rights\textsuperscript{1055}, such as the World Intellectual Property Organization. It also provides links to national and regional patent and trademark offices and to number of sites dedicated to the protection of IP rights\textsuperscript{1056}. Together these sections of the website fulfill commitment components H and I.

While general information on combating piracy and counterfeiting is present in some of the online guides\textsuperscript{1057}, the information is not centralized and does not explicitly address of the "threats posed by piracy and counterfeiting to public health, safety and the national interests of countries, consumers and business communities.”

\textit{Analyst: Sahar Kazranian}

**Japan: 0**

Japan has only partially complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to provide online information about intellectual property rights. At present, only 4 of the 11 points described in the commitment

\textsuperscript{1050} Productpiraterie gefährdet den Wirtschaftssandort Deutschland, Deutsches Patent- und Markenamt, 7 October 2006, (Berlin)
www.dpma.de/infos/pressedienst/pm060710.html

www.bmj.bund.de/enid/5a615f4510d49b939b6d61bc3d3f812f,c7c6d5305f7472636964092d0933363038/Trade_and_Economic_Policy_Activities_within_the_FMJ_s_Remit/Intellectual_property_18j.html

\textsuperscript{1052} Infobrevetti – Informazione su brevetti e marchi, Infobrevetti, (Rome), Last Date of Access by G8RG Analyst: 1 May 2007, Last Update: 22 January 2007. www.infobrevetti.camcom.it/welcome.html

\textsuperscript{1053} I Diritti Sul Software. Infobrevetti, (Rome), Last Date of Access by G8RG Analyst: 1 May 2007.
http://www.infobrevetti.camcom.it/disc_software.php

\textsuperscript{1054} La Disciplina, Infobrevetti, (Rome), Last Date of Access by G8RG Analyst: 1 May 2007, Last Update: 17 April 2007.
www.infobrevetti.camcom.it/disc_legislazione.php


\textsuperscript{1056} Information on Patents and Trademarks, Infobrevetti. (Rome), Last Date of Access by G8RG Analyst:1 May 2007.
www.infobrevetti.camcom.it/link_en.php

www.infobrevetti.camcom.it/disc_contraf.php
appear on the government’s primary intellectual property rights website. To achieve full compliance, the Japanese government needs to expand the range and quality of online information it provides about intellectual property rights.

The primary online resource regarding intellectual property rights maintained by the Japanese Government, is the website for the Japanese Patent Office (JPO), available online at: www.jpo.go.jp/1058. The JPO website clearly outlines both the mechanisms and procedures available to enforce and protect intellectual property rights in Japan. Some relevant law enforcement practices are also detailed on this website. It definitively fulfills commitment components A, B, J and K. However the website fails to detail the threats posed by piracy and counterfeiting to public health, safety, national interests, businesses and consumers. National and international measures taken to combat these piracy threats are also not specified. The JPO website does have links to other, mostly non-governmental sites which do attempt to address piracy threats to the public and economic interests.1059 This information though is still not located at one central governmental site as the commitment mandate would infer.

The Japanese Copyright Office (JCO) is an arm of the Agency of Cultural Affairs within the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT).1060 While JCO oversees new initiatives, programs and legislation protecting intellectual property rights in Japan, the JCO does not have a website to detail them. However, the JCO is reportedly building a virtual copyright help desk that might become a major new primary source of online intellectual property right information published by the Japanese government.1061 Japan therefore fails full compliance to the St. Petersburg commitment because it lacks a single, central, governmentally-run website that disseminates all information regarding intellectual property rights in Japan.

Analyst: Kayla Pries

Russia: 0

Russia has only partially complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to provide online information about intellectual property rights, having made no progress towards fulfilling this commitment since the publication of the interim report. At present, only 6 of the 11 points described in the commitment are maintained at a sufficient quality on the government’s central intellectual property rights website. To achieve full compliance, the Russian government needs to enhance the quality and expand the scope of the information provided about piracy and counterfeiting.

The primary online resource for intellectual property rights (IPR) maintained by the Russian Government is at: www.copyright.ru.1062 This website provides information on securing copyrights, thus fulfilling commitment component A. In the news section of the website, there is information on national and international measures to combat intellectual property right violations, thus fulfilling components G, H and I. There is information on relevant legislation, fulfilling component J. There is also information on law enforcement practices, fulfilling component K. There is no information on counterfeiting and piracy as described in items from B to F. Thus, Russia gets a score of 0 for work in progress.

Analyst: Elena Bylina and Jeremy Weiss

Analyst

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has achieved full compliance with St. Petersburg commitment to provide online information about intellectual property rights. At present, the UK government has all 11 information points referenced by the commitment available on the 'UK Intellectual Property Office' website, available at: http://www.patent.gov.uk.

Detailed information for business and individuals on mechanisms available and procedures necessary to secure and enforce intellectual property rights in London are addressed within the "Get IP Protection" and "Managing your IP" sections of the website. The "IP Crime" section of the website provides a link to the United Kingdom’s "National IP Crime Strategy". This comprehensive document defines and discusses the threats posed by intellectual property crimes to public health, safety, national interests, consumers and business communities. This fulfills commitment components C, D, E, F and G.

As the mandate of the "National IP Crime Strategy" document is to provide both a national counteroffensive strategy to intellectual property crime at home and abroad, components H, I and K are also fulfilled. The website also provides published annual intellectual property enforcement reports. The purpose of these reports are to provide information on the progress of the United Kingdom’s government fight against intellectual property crimes, as well as to set targets for future enforcement. These "Patent Office Annual Report and Accounts" documents further reinforce commitments H and I.

Lastly, the United Kingdom Patent Office website provides a copy of the "Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988", which is the United Kingdom’s principal legislation on copyright. This information combined with information on the primary legislations that have amended the act, such as “The Copyright, etc. and Trade Marks (Offences and Enforcement) Act 2002” fulfills commitment component J.

The United Kingdom Patent Office website provides a copy of the principal legislation on copyright, the “Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988,” as well as the primary legislations that have amended the act, such as “The Copyright, etc. and Trade Marks (Offences and Enforcement) Act 2002.” The availability and information about these documents fulfills commitment component J and K.

*Analyst: Mariann Lau*

**United States: 0**

The United States has not complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to provide online information about intellectual property rights into one single website. The primary governmental online resource dedicated to intellectual property rights is that of the “United States Patent and Trademark Office” available at: http://www.uspto.gov. This website provides information on 6 of the 11 points referenced by the commitment. Another website, run by the U.S. Department of State, references the remainder of the commitments that were not included in the US government’s central website for intellectual property rights. This information is available at: http://usinfo.state.gov/products/pubs/intelprp/homepage.htm. All together, the information is available, but to achieve a full compliance with the commitment, all the information must be available on one centralized website. Moreover, regular updates of information is needed.

The “United States Patent and Trademark Office” website clearly fulfills commitment components A, B, J and K as it provides links to relevant legislations and regulations relating to patents, as well as patent procedures. Information on US Patent Laws is provided, including relevant enforcement mechanisms.

---


practices regarding the protection of patents, and a number of links regarding international cooperation on intellectual property rights. This content collectively fulfills commitment components H and I.

Information regarding to the threats posed by piracy and counterfeiting to public health, safety, national interests, consumers and businesses, can be found at the U.S. Department of State’s website for international programs. Here, commitment components C through G are fulfillled.

Analyst: Mariann Lau

European Union: N/A

The European Union maintains “The European Union On-Line” website, available at: http://europa.eu/. The "Activities" section of this website provides a link to activities within the European Union’s “Internal Market”, which then provides links to information on intellectual property rights. The “Introduction” of this website provides information on the harmonization efforts of the European countries on national laws and for stronger protection of intellectual property rights at the community level as well as the international level.

The main purpose of this website is to provide user-friendly fact sheets that summarize European Union legislation. Legislation includes the European Parliament and Council Directive Acts pertaining to different areas of intellectual property rights, such as copyright and related rights, Biotechnological inventions, trademark laws, and counterfeit goods and piracy.

Lastly, the website provides information on international treaties that the European Union has signed onto, such as the Agreement on Intellectual Property Rights Relating to Trade and Pharmaceutical Patents, as well as the World Intellectual Property Organization: The Copyright treaty and the Performances and Phonograms treaty.

The website does not provide very detailed information on the dangers of intellectual property violations. Some information is provided at: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/copyright/index_en.htm. However it does not seem to be the purpose of this website, as this website primarily aims to provide information on the harmonization efforts of the European Union in regards to intellectual property rights.

Note that since the commitment speaks explicitly to "national governments", a compliance score for the EU is not assessed in this report.

Analyst: Mariann Lau
16. Trade: Export Subsidies and Agriculture [257]

“In agriculture, we are equally committed to substantially reducing trade-distorting domestic support and to the parallel elimination by the end of 2013 of all forms of export subsidies, as well as the establishment of effective disciplines on all export measures with equivalent effect, as agreed in Hong Kong.”

Background

At the Doha Ministerial Conference held in November 2001, participants implemented the Doha Declaration, launching a new trade round to establish a fair and market-oriented trading system by preventing restrictions and distortions in world agricultural markets. The Fifth WTO Ministerial Conference was held in September 2003 in Cancun, Mexico. The Ministerial ultimately collapsed after the QUAD countries (US, EU, Japan and Canada) failed to reach an agreement with the G-20 bloc of developing countries (including Brazil, India and China). Nevertheless, the leaders of the G8 countries understood the importance of assisting less developed countries in their trade capabilities in order to promote economic growth and alleviate poverty.

On 1 August 2004, the WTO General Council adopted the ‘July Package’ setting out a detailed work programme, which established a framework for placing the Doha Development Agenda (DDA) back on track for completion by 2006. Under the July Package, industrialized countries agreed to major concessions that they had previously resisted in Cancun. Wealthy states, in particular the EU, agreed to place all trade distorting agricultural subsidies on the table for discussion and committed to making “substantial” cuts; wealthy countries agreed to a ‘down payment’ on this deal in the form of an immediate 20% reduction in total current trade distorting agricultural subsidies beginning with the implementation period of a new WTO agreement; LDCs (including approximately 25 African states) received an agreement in principle to receive increased market access while maintaining the right to shelter their domestic industries; and three of the several Singapore Issues were dropped (foreign investment, competition policy, and government procurement) from the DDA with the fourth (trade facilitation) kept on in the understanding that it would only result in a “carifying and improving” of current agreements in addition to the . In exchange, developing countries agreed to further open their markets to manufactured imports and agreed to continue negotiations on a deal regarding trade in services.

The WTO Hong Kong Ministerial Conference (2005) set out to renew the resolve to complete the Doha Work Programme after a failure in previous efforts to achieve a viable consensus on reductions to export subsidies and domestic supports in agriculture tabled at the Doha (2001) and Cancun (2003) Ministerial conferences.

The conclusion of the Hong Kong Conference made progress in establishing a credible commitment to an end date of 2013 for the elimination of export subsidies (no timeline was established for the elimination of trade-distorting domestic support). Members of the G8 recently reaffirmed this commitment at the St. Petersburg Summit (2006), in terms of specific projected results and rule-making to correct and prevent restrictions and distortions in world agricultural markets. This is to be achieved by reductions, and the ultimate elimination, of all forms of export subsidies by the date set

---


out in the Hong Kong Ministerial, and, without any particular deadline, substantial reductions in trade-

Team Leader: James Meers

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada: 0

Although Canada has said that it has an interest in working towards the fulfillment of its St. Petersburg Trade commitments and has moved to break the monopoly of the Canada Wheat Board, it has introduced a major USD1 billion new agriculture subsidy program. In spite of the fact that Canada remains a highly competitive producer of agricultural commodities and is below average in terms of trade-distorting supports by comparison with other OECD members, Canada cannot receive a score better than 0 because of its new subsidies since St. Petersburg.\footnote{WTO nations not able to reach deal on trade, Guardian, (Charlottetown), 29 January 2007. Date of Access: 16 April 2007. http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1209320151&Fmt=3&clientId=12520&RQT=309&VName=PQD.}

On 26 January 2007, the WTO hosted an informal Ministerial Meeting following the suspension of Doha Round talks in July 2006 to restart the stalled trade negotiations. Although the meeting failed to achieve any significant breakthrough to resolve conflicts that arose during Doha,\footnote{WTO nations not able to reach deal on trade, Guardian, (Charlottetown), 29 January 2007. Date of Access: 16 April 2007. http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1209320151&Fmt=3&clientId=12520&RQT=309&VName=PQD.} Canada reiterated its commitment “to more liberalized trade, to the rules-based multilateral trading system and to the objectives of the Doha Round.”\footnote{WTO: Canada Welcomes Further Efforts to Advance the Doha Round, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, (Ottawa), 27 January 2007. Date of Access: 16 April 2007. http://w01.international.gc.ca/minpub/Publication.aspx?isRedirect=True&publication_id=384793&Language=E&docnumber=16.} Canada’s Agriculture and Agri-Food Minister Chuck Strahl issued the following statement at the meeting: “Canada has a fundamental interest in further strengthening the international rules governing agricultural trade... We are committed to work constructively within the WTO to achieve progress in these negotiations for our entire agriculture sector.”\footnote{WTO: Canada Welcomes Further Efforts to Advance the Doha Round, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, (Ottawa), 27 January 2007. Date of Access: 16 April 2007. http://w01.international.gc.ca/minpub/Publication.aspx?isRedirect=True&publication_id=384793&Language=E&docnumber=16.} In spite of this statement, Strahl also said that Canada will, during subsequent trade negotiations, “seek the elimination of all forms of export subsidies, the substantial reduction of trade-distorting domestic support, and real and significant market access improvements while continuing to defend our supply-managed sectors” (emphasis added).\footnote{WTO: Canada Welcomes Further Efforts to Advance the Doha Round, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, (Ottawa), 27 January 2007. Date of Access: 16 April 2007. http://w01.international.gc.ca/minpub/Publication.aspx?isRedirect=True&publication_id=384793&Language=E&docnumber=16.} In fact, Canada has recently introduced some significant protectionist policies in its domestic agricultural sector.
On 9 March 2007, Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper pledged USD1 billion in federal subsidies to assist Canadian farmers with rising production costs and damage sustained from natural disasters. Farmers will receive USD400 million directly, while the other USD600 million will be invested in a producer saving accounts which has been justified by Harper as a step towards “replacing the Canadian Agricultural Income Stabilization Program with programming that is more predictable, bankable and better enables farmers to better respond to rising costs.” On 21 March 2007, the WTO published a report expressing concern over Canada’s mildly aggressive protection of its supply management industries, and also indicated that Canada’s “significant trade barriers still protect certain agricultural activities.”

Canada, however, has had some measurable success in reducing trade-distortions of agricultural products through efforts to dismantle the Canadian Wheat Board’s (CWB) monopoly over the sale of Canadian wheat and barley. The CWB is the largest grain marketer in the world, accruing an annual revenue of USD4 billion and controlling 20% of the international wheat market. The results of a plebiscite on barley was announced on 4 April 2007, with 38% of farmers voting to keep the monopoly and another 48% voting to keep the Board while having the option to sell to other buyers; 14% voted to eliminate the Board completely. Based on the results of the plebiscite, the government intends to introduce regulation changes that will allow farmers to market their own grain beginning 1 August 2007.

Analyst: Loretta Yau

France: -1

France has not complied with its G8 commitment undertaken at St. Petersburg to reduce domestic agricultural support measures and simultaneously eliminate export subsidies. On 11 January 2007, French Prime Minister Dominique de Villepin met with European Commissioner for Trade Peter Mandelson and reaffirmed France’s stance of maintaining its protective polices toward its agricultural sector.

Former President Jacques Chirac echoed this position in 2006, supporting the 2003 reforms of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) to which France is a major beneficiary. Describing the agricultural sector as “Europe’s vocation,” Chirac endorsed the conversion of large tracts of farm land to production of vegetable-based fuels and chemicals which serve to enhance the viability of the sector. Government inducements are provided for farmers to convert crops as well as research and development in expanding a non-food agricultural industry.

In August 2006, in an endeavour to continue trade talks after the failed Doha Round in Hong Kong (2005), French Agriculture Minister Dominique Bussereau visited non-subsidized farms in Australia. Australian Federal Agriculture Minister Peter McGauren offered advice drawn upon his country’s successful experience in eliminating agricultural support measures. In response, Bussereau defended

France’s domestic subsidies insisting that its agricultural sector is part of a regional social framework and ultimately contributes to French culture.1104 In 2006 and 2007 France has demonstrated no intention nor implemented any policy initiatives aimed at reducing trade-distorting supports and export subsidies. In view of these factors, France receives a score of -1 for non-compliance.

**Analyst: Kathryn Kotris**

**Germany: +1**

In 2006 and 2007, Germany has taken significant steps to reduce export subsidies and trade-distorting domestic supports and thus earns a +1 for full compliance. In September 2006, Germany agreed to full transparency of expenditures in its agricultural sector under the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP).1105 The EUR43 billion support-market related expenditure and direct payments in 2007 “will be disclosed only after the review of the EU-budget and the CAP Health Check” for transparency.1106 The movement facilitates a shift on the part of Germany and some other nations, toward greater overall transparency of EU support systems and subsidization in agricultural products: “Transparency has become even more important now that subsidies have been decoupled from production.”1107

Germany’s pro-active stance to reduce agricultural subsidization in Europe was recently summarized in a statement published by Germany’s Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture, and Consumer Protection: “Member States will be obliged to cut direct payments beginning in 2005 (2005: 3%, 2006: 4%, as from 2007: 5%) in favour of the development of rural areas.”1108 Germany recently announced that it will be introducing a phased period for drastic reductions in federal funding for agricultural development and subsidization.1109 In the 2007 Annual Budget, the maximum investment sums planned will be reduced from EUR387.6 million in 2007 to EUR1 million by 2013.1110 Further, the BMLEV Federal Organic Farming Scheme intends to also reduce governmental supports for organic farming in the next three years: “The BMELV budget earmarked around EUR20 million for 2005. Another EUR20 million has also been earmarked for the 2006 federal budget. The scheme is to be continued until 2010 with EUR16 million in 2007 and with EUR10 million per year from 2008 to 2010.”1111

In assuming Presidency of both the EU and G8 in 2007, Germany has reaffirmed its intention to conclude Doha Round negotiations in discussions in Heiligendamm. On 24 January 2007, Dr. Joachim Wuermeling, State Secretary in the Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology, outlined Germany’s Trade Policy under Germany’s Council Presidency during its EU Presidency: “As the holders of the Presidency, we will do our best to ensure that tangible results on Doha are on the table by the end of March.”1112

**Analyst: Mila Khodskaya and Igor Churkin**


Italy: -1

Italy has not complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to reduce trade-distorting domestic support and export subsidies. As a member of the European Union, Italy is a party to all trade negotiations undertaken by the EU. Yet, despite the efforts of EU negotiators to find an acceptable framework for the reduction of subsidies, Italy has sought ways to continue to protect key commodities and sectors of the economy.

Since April 2006, the new majority of the coalition government led by Prime Minister Romano Prodi has largely excluded reductions in domestic supports and export tariffs on agricultural products from its large-scale reform agenda. During a visit to Brazil, Italy’s current trade position was articulated by Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs Massimo D’Alema, defending the current Italian and EU trade policies: “We’ve been supporting trade agreements favouring the elimination of protectionist barriers for some time now. These agreements are made difficult today partly as a result of the protectionist agricultural policies of richer countries. I believe that, at the moment, the main obstacle is constituted by United States’ subsidy policies than by the European Union’s.” Since St. Petersburg, Italy has demonstrated little intention of actually drastically reducing its trade-distorting domestic subsidies or its export subsidies.

Analyst: Kathryn Kotris

Japan: +1

Japan has worked hard to revive trade talks and has implemented important initiatives to dismantle some domestic trade-distorting mechanisms since the St. Petersburg G8 Summit. Thus Japan receives a score of +1 for full compliance with its commitment to substantially reduce trade-distorting domestic support and eliminating export subsidies. The Japanese government has exerted a strong effort to revive stalled Doha negotiations, focused mainly on pressuring the United States and the European Union to compromise on a subsidy reduction agreement. Japan’s attempts to restart Doha trade talks has most recently been demonstrated in a meeting between Japanese Agriculture Minister, Toshikatsu Matsuoka and WTO Director General, Pascal Lamy in November 2006.

In April 2007, Japan's Ministry of Agriculture announced it intends to implement a new system for pricing wheat which will link import costs to market prices two to three times a year, in lieu of the current practice of annual price fixing. The new system marks Japan’s first change major change in pricing policy in 59 years. The move to more closely link wheat prices to market movements will change the status of grain to that of an "ordinary commodity," such as rice.

In November 2006, Japan agreed to eliminate billions of dollars in farm subsidies, in part to stimulate suspended talks on trade by setting an example for other regions to follow. In what would be highly beneficial for Australian farmers in particular, the Asia-Pacific bloc, including the US, China and Japan, are strongly in favour of reopening trade talks by making "deeper reductions in trade-distorting farm support" in their own respective countries. However, Japan's new Prime Minister, Shinzo Abe, has demonstrated little political will to deliver an Australia-Japan FTA that contains substantial concessions on agriculture. In a recent trade review report conducted by the World Trade Organization (WTO) in March 2007, Japan's agricultural sector was described as "relatively protected from foreign competition" with high subsidies for farmers.”

---

1114 Communications: Minister Massimo D’Alema receives Comunita to speak about the Lula government and the foreign vote and to express the desire to overcome the economic obstacles between Brazil and Italy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, (Rome), 31 January 2007. Date of Access: 16 April 2007.
subsidies were above the average for Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development member states, and urged Japan to further liberalize its agricultural market further.\textsuperscript{1121}

**Analyst: Ryan Fang**

**Russia: 0**

Russia registers a score of 0, indicating partial compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment to reduce trade export subsidies and improve agricultural market access. A thorough and comprehensive amount of press releases, speeches, and news coverage indicate that Russia has put a significant emphasis on agriculture issues. Russia has demonstrated an active involvement and commitment to global talks. However, Russia is the only G8 member excluded from global trade negotiations, which includes the Doha Round, since it is not a member of the WTO.

According to GKS.ru (official site of the Federal State Statistics Service) there were 7,381 thousand of people employed in agricultural industry in Russia in 2005\textsuperscript{1122}. Average agricultural budget accounts for $3 billion according to Aleksei Gordeev, the Minister of agriculture. Rough calculations give figure of USD474 per farmer of subsidies in agriculture in Russia is far behind of those in Western countries\textsuperscript{1123}. For example, in 2005 subsidies per a USA farmer accounted for USD 62 thousand=USD 23 billion of total subsidies in the USA\textsuperscript{1124} for 369.3 thousand of farmers in the USA\textsuperscript{1125}. This fact let us conclude, that Russian agricultural subsidies way below those of the US and in no way trade distorting.

Russia has indicated that upon accession to the WTO, as scheduled on 1 January 2008, it intends to further reduce tariffs in accordance with Doha agreements: “The weighted average rate of Russian duties on agricultural products will decrease by about 3 percentage points. Similar reductions will be made on the import tariffs of manufactured goods.”\textsuperscript{1126} At present, Russia is continuing to engage in bilateral and multilateral talks and completing trade protocols with partners, as required for entry into the WTO. On 24 January 2007, Russia signed bilateral protocols with El Salvador and Costa Rica. Russia expects multilateral negotiations to be completed by the middle of 2007 with only 20 remaining issues that need to be resolved.\textsuperscript{1127}

One of the contentious issues is agricultural subsidies, which Russia intends to increase from USD 3.5 billion to USD 9.5 billion, and efforts to bring national legislation in compliance with international standards.\textsuperscript{1128} However, it is important to emphasize, that the increase will only lead to a level of agricultural support in Russia amounting to less than USD 1300 per farmer, which is significantly lower than ones in the USA and in Europe. Russia has stated that import tariffs on agricultural products are to be cut from 21.5\% to 18.9\%, but no cuts will be made for any farm produce that is grown or produced in Russia in quantities sufficient for the saturation of the domestic market.\textsuperscript{1129}

Russia’s accession to WTO, which is scheduled to take place on 1 January 2008, the significant agreements that it has achieved, and its efforts to join the global trading community earn Russia a score of 0. Although Russia has taken significant steps to comply with its St. Petersburg commitment, a number of key issues regarding agricultural supports will remain to be resolved in 2007.

**Analyst: Elena Bylina and Mila Khodskaya**


\textsuperscript{1122} Average number of employees by economic activity, GKS, (Moscow). Date of Access: 17 May 2007. 
http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/2006/b06_13/05-06.htm

\textsuperscript{1123} Alexey Portanskiy, Russia’s agriculture to get more opportunities for goods export after WTO Accession", 24 November 2006. 


http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/naics2_11.htm

\textsuperscript{1126} Russian Export’s Potential, Ministry of Economic Development and Trade of the Russian Federation, (Ottawa), 20 November 2006. 

\textsuperscript{1127} Russian WTO Negotiator Upbeat about Geneva Talks, Russian News and Information Agency, (Moscow), 2 March 2007. 

\textsuperscript{1128} Russia in No Hurry to Join WTO, , Russian News and Information Agency, (Moscow), 2 March 2007. 

http://en.rian.ru/analysis/20061027/55180786.html
**United Kingdom: +1**

Although there have been no immediate reductions in trade distortions and domestic supports in agriculture since the St. Petersburg Summit, the UK’s announcement of eliminating all agricultural subsidies by 2020 and their efforts to advocate greater trade liberalization with other nations, particularly the EU, are indicative of cooperation and compliance with its commitments. The UK thus receives a score of +1.

Between January and May 2007, the United Kingdom has continued to support efforts to reduce trade-distorting domestic supports in agricultural products. In the closing speech of the World Economic Forum in Davos in January 2007, British Prime Minister Tony Blair urged G8 participants to honor commitments made at previous G8 Summits. In February 2007, Chancellor of the Exchequer Gordon Brown pledged a USD750 million Aid-For-Trade package in the hopes that it would encourage a new trade deal. The UK reinforced this position on 13 April 2007, announcing a plan to offer USD75 million over five years to help poor countries boost their exports.

In his speech on January 2007, the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs David Miliband announced the UK’s long-term plans for agriculture indicating that the future: "role of government is to create opportunities and contracts, not protectionism and subsidies...I see an inevitable process of trade liberalization, with huge pressure to cut subsidies and end restraints on trade." In his speech, Miliband declared that all state subsidies to farmers for food production would end by 2020, and that farmers that use greener practices that protect the environment may be eligible for government assistance: "The reforms of 2003 to 2005 were substantial, but the CAP remains unsustainable in the long term. It must evolve into a framework which gives you freedom to farm and to support yourselves from the market, while being rewarded by the taxpayer only for achieving specific environmental and landscape benefits."

The UK has also demonstrated a strong political will in advocating cuts to agricultural subsidization in Europe. Following the suspension of Doha negotiations in July 2006, the UK has placed noticeable pressure on the EU to establish a timeline for reform to its Common Agricultural Policy (CAP): "Despite the useful progress made since 2003, the CAP still retains many aspects which pull down farm competitiveness and which stifle innovation and efficiency...We should address these issues in 2008." The UK has also worked hard with other countries to revive trade negotiations on agriculture. On 28 November 2006, Chancellor Brown met with US Treasury Secretary Hank Paulson, renewing commitments to address the growth of international protectionism.

**Analyst: Loretta Yau**

**United States: 0**

Although the United States has continued to show optimism and political will in working with other trade partners and the WTO to revive discussions on agriculture, the U.S. has yet to make any significant reductions in domestic trade supports and agricultural export subsidies thus warranting a score of 0 for partial compliance.

The United States recently held talks with trade representatives from Brazil, the European Union, and Japan since the collapse of Doha in July 2006, but there are no indications that the U.S. intends to carry out dramatic reductions in its trade-distorting domestic supports and subsidies in the foreseeable

---


future. In a recent meeting with WTO Director-General Pascal Lamy, U.S. Trade Representative Susan Schwab expressed future expectations for a trade deal to be met as negligible: "Are we near a breakthrough? No. We’ve got a long way to go for a breakthrough.\(^\text{1138}\) The probability of establishing a major agreement that would include the United States before the summer appears bleak unless it is conceded to the existing U.S. trade negotiating authority before it expires in July 2007.\(^\text{1139}\)

In negotiations, the United States has offered to reduce its current USD23 billion farm subsidies down to USD19 billion per annum but has faced opposition from the G20 and EU which demand a much lower subsidy cut within a range of USD12 billion and USD15 billion per annum, respectively.\(^\text{1140}\) The United States has demonstrated reluctance to adhere to such concessions unless other members, particularly the EU, reciprocate by reconciling issues of agricultural protectionism.\(^\text{1141}\) The 2007 Farm Bill proposal unveiled by Agriculture Secretary Mike Johanns in February 2007, would reconfigure the USD25 billion a year the US currently pays in farm subsidies by shifting money from price supports to subsidies not tied to production, thereby reducing total subsidies allocated to farmers by 5 per cent.\(^\text{1142}\) However, the Bush administration decided against cutting subsidies for the American dairy industry.\(^\text{1143}\)

At the Cairns meeting in September 2006, U.S. Agriculture Secretary Mike Johanns stated: "We’re willing to be at the table and negotiate our way through this…We’re willing to cut our subsidies, but the EU has to be more flexible."\(^\text{1144}\) The U.S. rigidity on their position of reciprocal negotiations was further echoed by Schwab: "We are disappointed but we will not be deterred. Last October, the United States took a risk that’s associated with leadership by putting on the table a major agricultural offer, expecting that it would be reciprocated by similarly bold moves by others. That has not happened yet."\(^\text{1145}\)

**Analyst: Ryan Fang**

**European Union: 0**

Since the suspension of Doha negotiations in July 2006, efforts to resolve trade differences between the EU and other WTO members have proven unsuccessful. In previous multilateral meetings of trade ministers in Australia and Brazil, the EU advanced proposals to open its agricultural markets, which European Trade Commissioner Peter Mandelson says would lead to significant access to its agricultural markets.\(^\text{1146}\) During the G8 Compliance period between July 2006 and May 2007, the EU has continued to demonstrate reluctance in making such trade concessions without the reciprocation by other partners, particularly the United States, in reconciling issues of market protectionism for agricultural and industrial goods and services. During her recent visit to India in March 2007, Mariann Fischer Boel, European Commissioner for Agriculture and Rural Development, echoed the EU’s position on this point: "In respect of market access, we have signalled our readiness to make deep cuts, halving our average agricultural import tariff from 23 to 12 per cent. On domestic support: we have already made a huge effort. We now expect our trade partners to do the same. The US in particular must tame its

---


Despite its rigidity on the issue of reciprocation, the EU has demonstrated more optimism in moving toward greater reductions in agricultural subsidies. In a recent speech, Boel articulated the EU’s mandate for trade in agricultural products for 2007 and beyond: "The European Union’s commitment to the Doha Round remains at 100 per cent...In terms of domestic support, we have been able to offer a huge cut of 70 per cent to our ceiling on trade-distorting support...With regard to export competition, we have been far out in front of everyone else: we have offered to abolish our export refunds – 100 per cent of them!"

Although the EU’s rhetoric and effort to revive trade negotiations have gained momentum in the latter part of 2006 and the beginning of 2007, the EU has yet to introduced any real cuts nor legislation to drastically reduce trade-distorting domestic supports of agricultural products. In October 2006, the EU did make some progress in addressing its St. Petersburg commitment following the EC’s approval of increasing transparency in CAP farm subsidy payments with the introduction of a central database of all individual recipients of EU agricultural, regional and cohesion funds beginning in 2008. Despite the EU’s recent efforts at negotiation and a shift toward greater transparency however, there are major indications that existing fault lines between pro-liberal and protectionist factions of EU members will result in an inability to achieve consensus on substantial reform of agricultural policy in 2006-2007.

In a statement issued on 29 September 2006, Finnish Minister of Agriculture and Forestry Juha Korkeoja succinctly summarized this fracture: "We are on the same line and same direction but we differ on speed...The northern European EU-15 group is in favour of more speedy liberalisation than the southern group..." The EC’s announcement in September 2006 at the European Agriculture Minister's meeting that radical reform to CAP is not likely to occur until the next budget period expires in 2013, only exacerbates hopes for immediate reform.

Although the EU has exerted some effort to cooperate with other WTO members to establish new agreements in 2006, unless significant reductions in domestic trade supports and agricultural export subsidies are eliminated, the EU receives a score of 0 for partial compliance.

*Analyst: James Meers*


17. Counterterrorism: Energy [263]

Commitment

“We announce a plan of action to secure global critical energy infrastructure, including defining and ranking vulnerabilities of critical energy infrastructure sites, assessing emerging and potential risks of terrorist attacks, and developing best practices for effective security across all energy sectors within our countries.”

G8 Summit Declaration on Counter-Terrorism

Background

The commitment to secure global energy infrastructure was made by the member states of the Group of Eight (G8) on 16 July 2006 at the 2006 G8 St. Petersburg Summit. Although this commitment deals with energy, it must not be confused with energy security, but must be viewed within the framework of counter-terrorist measures and the physical security of energy infrastructure.

In 2006 a number of international conferences addressing the issue of counter terrorism were held in which a substantial proportion of G8 members participated. On 11 October 2006 Russia hosted the G8 Seminar on Specific Proposals on Strengthening Partnerships between Governments and Businesses to Counter Terrorism. Subsequently, a Global Forum for Partnerships between States and Businesses to Counter Terrorism was held on 28-30 November 2006 in Moscow attended by all G8 members. On 30-31 October 2006 G8 members participated in the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism in Rabat, Morocco. NATO members of the G8 also took part in the NATO Riga Summit on 30-31 October 2006.

Team Leader: Julia Muravska

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 Final Compliance Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of Compliance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada: +1

Canada has registered a score of +1 indicating full compliance with its commitment to secure its energy infrastructure against terrorist attack. Canada’s compliance has been in the areas of the development of best practices and in the definition and ranking of the vulnerabilities of its critical energy infrastructure.

On 30-31 October 2006 Canada was a signatory of a “Statement of Principles” at the inaugural meeting of the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism in Rabat, Morocco. Canada and twelve other signatory nations pledged to: “improve accounting of and security on radioactive and nuclear materials; enhance security at civilian nuclear facilities; [...] improve capabilities to search and

---

confiscate unlawfully held nuclear or radioactive substances or devices using them; leverage response, mitigation, and investigation capabilities in case of a terrorist attack; develop technical means to identify nuclear or other radioactive materials and substances that are or may be involved in a terrorist incident; [...] and promote greater information sharing pertaining to acts of nuclear terrorism.\textsuperscript{1154}

On 7 September 2006, Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission spokesman Aurele Gervais stated that Canadian nuclear infrastructure will be given increased security in light of increased terrorist threats since the September 11 attacks. Gervais’ statements were made following the August 2006 amendments to Canada’s Nuclear Security Regulations. These amendments also call for increased measures for identifying local threats to nuclear facilities and ensuring uninterrupted power supply during an attack.\textsuperscript{1155}

Canada is also working alongside the United States to help coordinate security practices in the event of a terrorist attack targeting infrastructure. Speaking at the Woodrow Wilson School of International Affairs, Dave Mackenzie, Canada’s parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, stated that Canada is working with the American Department of Homeland Security and Energy to assess the impact on its energy infrastructure in the case of a terrorist attack. Canada has stated its commitment to continue working with public regulators and Canada’s private energy industry to develop best practices\textsuperscript{1156}.

On the issue of offshore energy infrastructure the Director of Natural Resources Canada’s critical energy infrastructure protection division, stated that amendments will be made to Canadian regulations pertaining to offshore oil and gas rigs to provide better protection of infrastructure against potential terrorist attacks.\textsuperscript{1157}

Canada also recently participated in the G8 Seminar on Specific Proposals on Strengthening Partnerships between Governments and Businesses to Counter Terrorism on 11 October 2006, and the Global Forum for Partnerships between States and Businesses to Counter Terrorism on 28–30 November 2006, both held in Moscow. The G8 Seminar featured eight proposals for government-business partnerships aimed at protecting the various aspects of critical energy infrastructure. Results of the G8 Seminar were subsequently presented at the Global Forum. They pledged to promote the establishment of "informal international government-business working groups on counter-terrorism partnerships in key sectors."\textsuperscript{1158} Participants of the Forum commissioned working groups with the task implementation of various counterterrorism proposals with public and private sector partners. The Forum also called for cooperative initiatives from businesses and governments to establish measures protecting critical energy. The Forum and Seminar were successful in developing best practices for the security of the energy sector through endorsements of various government-business partnerships.

On 29 October 2006 Canada also participated in the NATO Riga Summit. At the Summit, participant NATO countries rubber-stamped a policy paper identifying the most imminent risks of global terrorism of the next decade, most notably the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and threats to energy infrastructure.\textsuperscript{1159}

On 28 March 2007, the Canadian Ambassador to the United States Michael Wilson presented a paper entitled "Energy Security: A North American Concern" to the Canadian Electricity Association (CEA). The paper focuses on American-Canadian energy issues, as well as best practices for critical


\textsuperscript{1158} Global Forum for Partnerships between States and Businesses to Counter Terrorism, Official Site of Russia’s G8 Presidency in 2006, (St. Petersburg), 30 November 2006. Date of Access: 11 January 2006. en.g8russia.ru/page_work/32.html.

infrastructure protection. The paper describes American and Canadian cooperation in safeguarding the North American bulk electric power system. On 8 February 2007, in response to an alleged Al Qaeda website calling for terror strikes against Canadian oil and gas infrastructure, Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada and the Royal Canadian Mountain Police provided public warnings, in an effort to prepare Canadians against such an attack. All facilities that were believed to be at risk were immediately notified. According to Public Safety Minister Stockwell Day: "... Canada is not immune to threats. We take this threat very seriously."

Canada’s Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) has drafted a report stating that any newly built nuclear reactors must be able to withstand severe explosions, including the impact of a major jetliner. Experts believe that Canada’s current Candu reactors could not withstand the impact of any such explosion. The report further states that the CNSC will not license the construction of any further Candu reactors unless they are retrofitted with technology that would protect them from such a terrorist attack.

A recent report by the Canadian Department of National Defence states that Canadian oil refineries could be targets of terrorist attacks. For this reason, Canadian Forces are planning an exercise in the Northwest Territories between 16-27 April 2007 to simulate possible energy infrastructure attacks, and plan their responses to it.

The Canadian government has announced a call to several public agencies for proposals to increase Canadian safety against a nuclear terrorist attacks. The Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada, Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd and the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission will have the opportunity to apply for a share of the $28 million grant. If awarded to the aforementioned agencies, grants would likely be used to research securing nuclear facilities against possible terror attacks.

A 27 February 2007 Joint Statement by the leaders of the United States, Canada, and Mexico described the creation of the Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America (SPP). The program is designed in part to focus on coordination between the three nations in the face of a terrorist attack on critical energy infrastructure.

**Analyst: Rasta Daei**

**France: +1**

France has registered a score of +1 indicating full compliance with its commitment to secure critical energy infrastructure. France has been effective at developing best practices, defining and ranking the vulnerabilities of its critical infrastructure, and in promoting international cooperation on the issue.

In light of France’s proposal to build several new nuclear reactors, the European Union (EU) issued approval for construction of a nuclear power plant in northern France which will employ new technologies to increase safety from terror attacks.

On 30-31 October 2006 France was a signatory of a “Statement of Principles” at the inaugural meeting of the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism in Rabat, Morocco. France and twelve other signatory nations conceded to: "improve accounting of and security on radioactive and nuclear materials; enhance security at civilian nuclear facilities; [...] improve capabilities to search and confiscate unlawfully held nuclear or radioactive substances or devices using them; leverage response, mitigation, and investigation capabilities in case of a terrorist attack; develop technical means to identify nuclear or other radioactive materials and substances that are or may be involved in a..."

---


1167 France’s nuclear safety commission to be in place by end of this month, Inside N.R.C., 4 September 2006. Date of Access: Dec 20, 2006. web.lexis-nexis.com.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/universe/doclist?_m=1e05b4f4328627f7f5b824a837458b92&wchp=dGLbVtz-z5kVA&md5=bc94865027c8873e1b67b60366b9b4.
terrorist incident; [...] and promote greater information sharing pertaining to acts of nuclear terrorism.\textsuperscript{1168}

France also recently participated in the G8 Seminar on Specific Proposals on Strengthening Partnerships between Governments and Businesses to Counter Terrorism on 11 October 2006 in Moscow, and the Global Forum for Partnerships between States and Businesses to Counter Terrorism on 28-30 November 2006 in Moscow. The G8 Seminar featured eight proposals for government-business partnerships aimed at protecting the various aspects of critical energy infrastructure. Results of the G8 Seminar were subsequently presented at the Global Forum. They pledged to promote the establishment of "informal international government-business working groups on counter-terrorism partnerships in key sectors."\textsuperscript{1169} Participants of the Forum commissioned working groups with the task of implementing various counterterrorism proposals with public and private sector partners. The Forum also called for cooperative initiatives from businesses and governments to establish measures protecting critical energy. The Forum and Seminar were successful in developing best practices for the security of the energy sector through endorsements of various government-business partnerships.

On 29 October 2006 France also participated in the NATO Riga Summit. At the Summit, participant NATO countries rubber-stamped a policy paper identifying the most imminent risks of global terrorism of the next decade, most notably the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and threats to energy infrastructure.\textsuperscript{1170}

On 26 October 2006, the European Union committed an extra EUR9 million in order to develop anti-terrorism safety programs in Europe. The funds will be used in part to protect the continent’s critical energy infrastructure. The European Union’s commitments for 2007 so far total EUR20 million. According to EU Commissioner for Justice and Security Franco Frattini, the wide-reaching project would: “cover everything from prevention and protection to response, pursuit and prosecution.”\textsuperscript{1171} Discussions included differentiating between European critical infrastructure and national critical infrastructure, a ranking system for the level of risk of an attack. Among other countries, France attended the session, suggesting sharing of liquid explosive intelligence among EU countries.

France has also taken significant steps in international cooperation in the sphere of nuclear terrorism prevention. It participated in the second meeting on the Global Initiative to combat nuclear terrorism in Ankara,\textsuperscript{1172} which aimed to promote cooperation among the key nuclear states in the area of securing nuclear facilities from potential attacks.

In Köln, Germany, the European Commission, of which France is a member, hosted a meeting on 1 February for Information and Communications Technologies and explained specific methods for researchers in related industries to respond to proposals made under the 2007/2008 work programme. The meeting included an objective titled “critical infrastructure protection” detailing desired outcomes and impacts for protection, as well assigning EUR20 million to the objective.\textsuperscript{1173} The Council of the EU has also reiterated its support for further development of CIWIN and EPCIP, \textsuperscript{1174} and reaffirmed the importance of infrastructure protection identified originally in the EU’s 2005 Counter Terrorism Strategy which clearly states that creating a programme for protection of critical infrastructure is among its “key priorities”\textsuperscript{1175} and that “Reducing the vulnerability across Europe of critical infrastructure to physical and electronic attack is essential.”\textsuperscript{1176}


\textsuperscript{1172} http://www.turkishweekly.net/news.php?id=42630 http://www.sgpproject.org/Personal%20Use%20only/070222nuketism.htm


France also participated in the European Conference on Security Research, held in Berlin from 26-27 March, which focused on the study of security, including that of infrastructure was promoted. Franco Frattini, Justice and Security Commissioner stated, "We need better protection for critical infrastructures in Europe. The majority... [are] private undertakings and we need to work in close partnership," echoing ideas put forth during the Global Forum for Partnerships between States and Businesses to Counter Terrorism conducted earlier in the year. He also emphasized the importance of Member State co-operation, the problem of solely bi-lateral solutions and the need to, "analyze the threats and costs and then decide which infrastructures should have priority."  

Analyst: Rasta Daei

Germany: 0

Germany has registered a score of 0 indicating partial compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment to increase the security of its energy infrastructure against terrorist attack, insofar as it has begun to assess emerging potential risks of terrorist attacks. However, not much progress has been made in either defining and ranking vulnerabilities of critical energy infrastructure sites, or developing best practices for effective security across all energy sectors within its boundaries. In addition, much of the German compliance was carried out in concert with other nations, and through participation in international conferences.

Germany was a signatory of a "statement of principles" at the inaugural meeting of the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism which took place on 30-31 October 2006 in Rabat, Morocco. Germany agreed, along with twelve other nations to: "improve accounting of and security on radioactive and nuclear materials; enhance security at civilian nuclear facilities; [...] improve capabilities to search and confiscate unlawfully held nuclear or radioactive substances or devices using them; leverage response, mitigation, and investigation capabilities in case of a terrorist attack; develop technical means to identify nuclear or other radioactive materials and substances that are or may be involved in a terrorist incident; [...] and promote greater information sharing pertaining to acts of nuclear terrorism."

In addition, Germany has participated in the G8-initiated Seminar on specific Proposals on Strengthening Partnerships between Governments and Businesses to Counter Terrorism, held on 11 October 2006 in Moscow, and the subsequent Global Forum for Partnerships between States and Businesses to Counter Terrorism, held on 28-30 November in Moscow. The Seminar featured eight proposals for government-business partnerships aimed at protecting the various aspects of critical energy infrastructure. The results of the Seminar were presented at the Global Forum, which pledged to promote the establishment of "informal international government-business working groups on counter-terrorism partnerships in key sectors." The Forum charged the working groups with working towards the implementation of the proposals and projects of cooperation between the government and businesses. Furthermore, the Forum called for the protection of all critical energy infrastructure and for intensive government-business cooperation toward that end. However, even though the Forum discussions stated that the energy sector is vulnerable to terrorist attack, the results of the Forum and the Seminar lack specificity and concrete data in ranking and defining the vulnerabilities of energy infrastructure, as well as assessing potential risks of terrorist attack. The Forum and Seminar did, nevertheless, develop best practices for security of the energy sector—by endorsing an array of government-business partnerships.

As a member of the European Union, Germany has been involved in the European Programme for Critical Infrastructure Protection. (EPCIP). First proposed in 2005, EPCIP has developed over the past two years as important legislation protecting critical infrastructure. EPCIP ranks energy infrastructure first in its definition of European critical infrastructure needing protection. lists specific

vulnerabilities and suggests best practices, that could be adapted after all concerned parties are consulted (member states, businesses, industry associations etc.).1182 Partially implemented in 2006, the European Commission laid out specific “principles, processes and instruments” to operate EPCIP in the future in December 2006.1183 The EPCIP programme grants money to businesses, member states and others responsible for critical infrastructure.1184 Funding for the trial programme has been incorporated into the general EU budget, and financial planning for EPCIP has been extended for 2007-2013 in the EU programme, Prevention, Preparedness and Consequence Management of Terrorism and other Security Related Risks.1185 The EU has already allotted EUR137.4 million for the 2007-2013 periods.1186

Germany was also present at NATO’s Riga Summit, which took place on 29 October 2006, where the member countries rubber-stamped a new policy paper identifying global terrorism, the spread of weapons of mass destruction and threats to energy infrastructure as among the main risks the alliance must address over the next decade.1187

Germany has also taken significant steps in international cooperation in the sphere of nuclear terrorism prevention. It participated in the second meeting on the Global Initiative to combat nuclear terrorism in Ankara,1188 which aimed to promote cooperation among the key nuclear states in the area of securing nuclear facilities from potential attacks.

In the CORDIS Seventh Research Framework Programme, the EU has stated it will be funding research with emphasis on “protection against crime and terrorism,” as well as specifically “increasing the security of infrastructures and utilities,” further naming energy as one of them. The Programme has reserved EUR1.4 billion for this purpose.1189

Speaking for the federal Ministry of Education and Research, Minister Anette Schavan reiterated that “security and liberty go hand in hand” at the European Conference on Security Research in Berlin. The conference was held as part of Germany’s EU presidency. They focused on our society’s “dense infrastructure networks for... energy” and the vital importance of keeping them going.1190

In Köln, Germany, the European Commission, of which Germany is a member, hosted a meeting on 1 February for Information and Communications Technologies and explained specific methods for researchers in related industries to respond to proposals made under the 2007/2008 work programme. The meeting included an objective titled “critical infrastructure protection” detailing desired outcomes and impacts for protection, as well assigning funds (20 million €).1191 The Council of the EU has also reiterated its support for further development of CIWIN and EPCIP,1192 and reaffirmed the importance of infrastructure protection identified originally in the EU’s 2005 Counter Terrorism Strategy which clearly states that creating a programme for protection of critical infrastructure is

Germany also participated in the European Conference on Security Research, held in Berlin from 26-27 March, which focused on the study of security, including that of infrastructure was promoted.^{1195} Franco Frattini, Justice and Security Commissioner stated, "We need better protection for critical infrastructures in Europe. The majority... [are]...private undertakings and we need to work in close partnership," echoing ideas put forth during the Global Forum for Partnerships between States and Businesses to Counter Terrorism conducted earlier in the year.^{1196} He also emphasized the importance of Member State co-operation, the problem of solely bi-lateral solutions and the need to, "analyze the threats and costs and then decide which infrastructures should have priority."^{1197}

**Analyst: Daniela Scur and Arina Shadrikova**

**Italy: 0**

Italy has registered a score of 0 indicating partial compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment to secure its energy infrastructure against terrorist attack. Italy’s activities have been centred primarily on participation in international initiatives. On 31 October 2006, Italy was a signatory to a "Statement of Principles" at the inaugural meeting of the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism in Rabat, Morocco. Italy agreed, along with twelve other nations to: "...improve accounting of and security on radioactive and nuclear materials; enhance security at civilian nuclear facilities; [...] improve capabilities to search and confiscate unlawfully held nuclear or radioactive substances or devices using them; leverage response, mitigation, and investigation capabilities in case of a terrorist attack; develop technical means to identify nuclear or other radioactive materials and substances that are or may be involved in a terrorist incident; [...] and promote greater information sharing pertaining to acts of nuclear terrorism."^{1198}

In addition, Italy has participated in the G8-initiated Seminar on specific Proposals on Strengthening Partnerships between Governments and Businesses to Counter Terrorism, held on 11 October 2006 in Moscow, and the subsequent Global Forum for Partnerships between States and Businesses to Counter Terrorism, held on 28-30 November in Moscow. The Seminar featured eight proposals for government-business partnerships aimed at protecting the various aspects of critical energy infrastructure. The results of the Seminar were presented at the Global Forum, which pledged to promote the establishment of "informal international government-business working groups on counter-terrorism partnerships in key sectors." The Forum charged the working groups with working towards the implementation of the proposals an projects of cooperation between the government and businesses. Furthermore, the Forum called for a protection of all critical energy infrastructure and for intensive government-business cooperation to that end. However, even though the Forum discussions stated that the energy sector is vulnerable to terrorist attack, the results of the Forum and the Seminar lack specificity and concrete data in ranking and defining the vulnerabilities of energy infrastructure, as well as assessing potential risks of terrorist attack. The Forum and Seminar did, nevertheless, develop best practices for security of the energy sector by endorsing an array of government-business partnerships.

As a member of the European Union, Italy has been involved in the European Programme for Critical Infrastructure Protection. (EPCIP). First proposed in 2005, EPCIP has developed over the past two years as important legislation protecting critical infrastructure. EPCIP ranks energy infrastructure first.

---

in its definition of European critical infrastructure needing protection, lists specific vulnerabilities and suggests best practices, that could be adapted after all concerned parties are consulted (member states, businesses, industry associations etc.) Partially implemented in 2006, the European Commission laid out specific “principles, processes and instruments” to operate EPCIP in the future in December 2006. The EPCIP programme grants money to businesses, member states and others responsible for critical infrastructure. Funding for the trial programme has been incorporated into the general EU budget, and financial planning for EPCIP has been extended for 2007-2013 in the EU programme, Prevention, Preparedness and Consequence Management of Terrorism and other Security Related Risks. The EU has already allotted €137.4 million for the 2007-2013 periods. Italy was also present at NATO’s Riga Summit, which took place on 29 October 2006, where the member countries rubber-stamped a new policy paper identifying global terrorism, the spread of weapons of mass destruction and threats to energy infrastructure as among the main risks the alliance must address over the next decade. As a member of the EU, Italy has allocated funds for energy security research. In the CORDIS Seventh Research Framework Programme, the EU has stated that it will be funding research with emphasis on “protection against crime and terrorism,” as well as specifically “increasing the security of infrastructures and utilities,” further naming energy as one of them. They have reserved EUR1.4 billion for this purpose. Furthermore, Italy has identified key vulnerabilities for potential terrorist attacks. The European Commissioner for Justice Freedom and Security, Italian Franco Frattini, reiterated during the two day European Security Research Conference in March 2007 the “borderless nature” of terrorism, and the need for cooperation. Here he defined as key vulnerabilities the need for “joint surveillance capability for maritime and coastal authorities” and information sharing. During this same conference, Frattini observed that a large portion of the critical infrastructure in Europe is privately owned, and that governments need to work in close partnership with them. Italy has also taken significant steps in international cooperation in the sphere of nuclear terrorism prevention. It participated in the second meeting on the Global Initiative to combat nuclear terrorism in Ankara, which aimed to promote cooperation among the key nuclear states in the area of securing nuclear facilities from potential attacks. In Köln, Germany, the European Commission, of which Italy is a member, hosted a meeting on 1 February for Information and Communications Technologies and explained specific methods for researchers in related industries to respond to proposals made under the 2007/2008 work programme. The meeting included an objective titled “critical infrastructure protection” detailing desired outcomes and impacts for protection, as well assigning funds (20 million €). The Council of

---

http://www.isn.ethz.ch/news/sw/detials.cfm?id=17425
the EU has also reiterated its support for further development of CIWIN and EPCIP,\textsuperscript{1211} and reaffirmed the importance of infrastructure protection identified originally in the EU’s 2005 Counter Terrorism Strategy which clearly states that creating a programme for protection of critical infrastructure is among its “key priorities”\textsuperscript{1212}, and that “Reducing the vulnerability across Europe of critical infrastructure to physical and electronic attack is essential.”\textsuperscript{1213}

**Analyst: Daniela Scur**

**Japan: 0**

Japan has registered a score of 0 indicating partial compliance with its commitment to develop a plan of action for securing global critical energy infrastructure. The score is based on Japan’s participation in international counterterrorism conferences and recent efforts to assess emerging potential risks of terrorist attacks. However, not much progress has been made in either defining and ranking vulnerabilities of critical energy infrastructure sites, or developing best practices for effective security across all energy sectors within its boundaries.

On 8-9 November 2006, the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs in partnership with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) organised and chaired the Seminar on Strengthening Nuclear Security in Asian Countries. The conference recognised the usefulness of the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism in ensuring nuclear security.\textsuperscript{1214}

Japan also took part as a signatory of the “Statement of Principles” at the inaugural meeting of the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism in Rabat, Morocco on 30–31 October 2006. Japan and twelve other signatory nations committed to: “improve accounting of and security on radioactive and nuclear materials; enhance security at civilian nuclear facilities; […] improve capabilities to search and confiscate unlawfully held nuclear or radioactive substances or devices using them; leverage response, mitigation, and investigation capabilities in case of a terrorist attack; develop technical means to identify nuclear or other radioactive materials and substances that are or may be involved in a terrorist incident; […] and promote greater information sharing pertaining to acts of nuclear terrorism.”\textsuperscript{1215}

Japan, as a member of Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), was party to the Ha Noi Declaration, the result of the 14\textsuperscript{th} APEC Economic Leaders’ Meeting in Hanoi, Vietnam on 18-19 November 2006. This declaration urges members “to enhance emergency preparedness and to better protect critical energy infrastructure.”\textsuperscript{1216}

Japan participated in the G8 Seminar on Specific Proposals on Strengthening Partnerships between Governments and Businesses to Counter Terrorism on 11 October 2006 in Moscow, and the Global Forum for Partnerships between States and Businesses to Counter Terrorism on 28-30 November 2006 in Moscow. The G8 Seminar featured eight proposals for government-business partnerships aimed at protecting the various aspects of critical energy infrastructure. Results of the G8 Seminar were subsequently presented at the Global Forum. They pledged to promote the establishment of “informal international government-business working groups on counter-terrorism partnerships in key sectors.”\textsuperscript{1217} Participants of the Forum commissioned working groups with the task implementation of various counterterrorism proposals with public and private sector partners. The Forum also called for cooperative initiatives from businesses and governments to establish measures protecting critical energy. The Forum and Seminar were successful in developing best practices for the security of the energy sector through endorsements of various government-business partnerships.


\textsuperscript{1217} Global Forum for Partnerships between States and Businesses to Counter Terrorism, Official Site of Russia’s G8 Presidency in 2006, (St. Petersburg), 30 November 2006. Date of Access: 11 January 2006. en.g8russia.ru/page_work/32.html.
On 29 November 2006, Japan’s Ambassador in charge of International Counter-Terrorism Cooperation, H.E. Mr. Akio Suda, remarked on the importance of public/private sector co-operation at the Global Forum for Partnerships between Government and Businesses to Counter Terrorism. He emphasised the necessity of “information sharing on crimes and terrorism” and “operational coordination” in the event of an “emergency situation.” Mr. Suda also noted the strides being made by the private sector in securing “critical infrastructure, such as nuclear and other power plants, electricity, gas, and oil related facilities.”

A 16 December 2006 meeting of Energy Ministers from China, India, the Republic of Korea, the United States, and Japan, issued a joint statement to “enhance global energy security” through “safeguarding critical energy infrastructure and sea route security for transportation of oil and gas.”

Finally, from 12-13 February 2007, the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism, of which Japan is part, met for a second time in Ankara, Turkey. The Initiative seeks to “deprive terrorists of the ability to attack nuclear facilities” and encourages “broader engagement of the private sector.” The Initiative released a statement that included a commitment to “strengthen material accounting, control, and physical protection” and to “enhance civilian nuclear facility security.” The Initiative is scheduled to meet again in June 2007 in Kazakhstan.

Analyst: Gabe De Roche

Russia: 0

Russia demonstrated partial compliance with its commitment to protect the security of critical energy infrastructure by participating in international counter-terrorism conferences and assessing the security vulnerabilities of nuclear industry. However, limited progress was made on assessing the emerging and potential risks of terrorist attacks and developing best practices for effective security across all energy sectors within its boundaries.

In September, 2006 Russian Federation ratified the Council of Europe’s Convention on preventing terrorism and protocol on amendments to the European Charter on preventing terrorism.

According to the minister of foreign affairs of the Russian Federation Sergey Lavrov statement, “the agenda of energy security is the priority in dialogue on energy that we conduct with EU and other bilateral and multilateral partners.”

Russia has been one of the driving forces behind the international Seminar on Specific Proposals on Strengthening Partnerships between Governments and Businesses to Counter Terrorism, which was conceived at the G8 Summit and took place on 11 October 2006 in Moscow. This seminar was specifically a G8 initiative, intended to bring about business-government cooperation between and within the member states. Eight of the twenty presented proposals by business and scientific community leaders were concerned with the security of energy infrastructure.

The results of the Seminar were presented at the Global Forum for Partnerships between States and Businesses to Counter Terrorism hosted in Moscow on 28-30 November 2006. The Forum, with significant Russian governmental participation and leadership, pledged to promote the establishment of “informal international government-business working groups on counter-terrorism partnerships in key sectors.” Participants of the Forum commissioned working groups with the task of implementing various counterterrorism proposals with public and private sector partners. The Forum also called for

---

cooperative initiatives from businesses and governments that establish measures protecting critical energy. The Forum and Seminar were successful in developing best practices for the security of the energy sector through endorsements of various government-business partnerships.

On 30-31 October 2006 Russia became a signatory of the “Statement of Principles” at the inaugural meeting of the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism in Rabat, Morocco. Russia and twelve other signatory nations pledged to: “improve accounting of and security on radioactive and nuclear materials; enhance security at civilian nuclear facilities; [...] improve capabilities to search and confiscate unlawfully held nuclear or radioactive substances or devices using them; leverage response, mitigation, and investigation capabilities in case of a terrorist attack; develop technical means to identify nuclear or other radioactive materials and substances that are or may be involved in a terrorist incident; [...] and promote greater information sharing pertaining to acts of nuclear terrorism.”

On 12 January 2007 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Secretary Samuel Bodman and Russian Federal Atomic Energy Agency Director Sergey Kiriyenko have submitted to Presidents Bush and Putin the fourth report of the Senior Interagency Working Group on implementation of the February 2005 Bratislava Checklist. The report contains data pertaining to the US-Russian cooperation in the sphere of security of nuclear energy sector, in particular the physical security of fissile material.

On 9-11 February 2007 Russia participated in the 43rd Security Conference in Munich the central topics of which were terrorism and energy security.

On 12-13 February 2007 Russia took part in the second meeting on the Global Initiative to combat nuclear terrorism in Ankara. The aim of the meeting was to adopt a plan to implement the statement of principles agreed upon by these nations at an October 2006 meeting in Rabat. Participants agreed to meet again in Kazakhstan in June 2007 to review the progress of Global Initiative activities, take specific steps to address gaps in implementation and agreed on the 2007-2008 Action Plan.

As for the promotion of international conventions on counter-terrorism, Russia as the G8 presiding country “vigorously calls on other countries for signing international documents on fighting the terrorism, especially actual UN International Convention on Combating Nuclear Terrorists’ Acts”, as Russian State Duma Speaker Mr. Gryzlov said.

Analysts: Yulay Sultanov and Sarah Koerner

United Kingdom: +1

The United Kingdom (UK) has registered a score of +1 indicating full compliance with its commitment to develop a plan of action to secure energy infrastructure. This score resulted, in part, from the UK's formation of a separate institution, the Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure (CPNI) to deal specifically with securing energy infrastructure from potential terrorist attack. In addition, this score stems from the UK's participation in several international conferences on the subject.

The Security Office of the United Kingdom has long assessed the domestic energy sector as one of the targets for international terrorism, placing it within the context of Osama bin Laden's threat to attack economic interests.

Since 1 August 2006, the Security Service and the Home Office have made the government's counter-terrorism strategy as well as the system of national threat levels—which assess the level of the current threat from terrorist attack—available to the public. The levels “are a tool for security practitioners...”

---

working across different sectors of "Critical National Infrastructure (CNI), which includes the energy sector. This availability of information about the threat to CNI demonstrates the UK government’s assessment and definition of potential threat to the energy sector from terrorist attack.\(^{1232}\)

As a member of the European Commission, the UK has been a party to the adoption of the Communication on a European Programme for Critical Infrastructure Protection (EPCIP), as well as a proposal for a Directive on the identification and designation of European Critical Infrastructure on 12 December 2006.\(^{1233}\) This constitutes the protection of the European critical infrastructure, including the energy sector, from terrorism and other disruptions, and is defined as "critical infrastructure that, if disrupted or destroyed, would significantly affect two or more Member States or a single Member State if the critical infrastructure is located in another Member State"\(^{1234}\) and the UK has expressed its readiness to contribute "fully" to the initiative where community involvement is justified.\(^{1235}\)

In addition, the UK has participated in the G8-initiated Seminar on specific Proposals on Strengthening Partnerships between Governments and Businesses to Counter Terrorism, held on 11 October 2006 in Moscow, and the subsequent Global Forum for Partnerships between States and Businesses to Counter Terrorism, held on 28-30 November in Moscow. The Seminar featured eight proposals for government-business partnerships aimed at protecting the various aspects of critical energy infrastructure. The results of the Seminar were presented at the Global Forum, which pledged to promote the establishment of "informal international government-business working groups on counter-terrorism partnerships in key sectors." The Forum charged the working groups with working towards the implementation of the proposals and projects of cooperation between the government and businesses. Furthermore, the Forum called for a protection of all critical energy infrastructure and for intensive government-business cooperation to that end. However, even though the Forum discussions stated that the energy sector is vulnerable to terrorist attack, the results of the Forum and the Seminar lack specificity and concrete data in ranking and defining the vulnerabilities of energy infrastructure, as well as assessing potential risks of terrorist attack. The Forum and Seminar did, nevertheless, develop best practices for security of the energy sector— by endorsing an array of government-business partnerships.

The UK was a signatory of a "statement of principles" at the inaugural meeting of the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism which took place on 30-31 October 2006 in Rabat, Morocco. Germany agreed, along with twelve other nations to: "improve accounting of and security on radioactive and nuclear materials; enhance security at civilian nuclear facilities; [...] improve capabilities to search and confiscate unlawfully held nuclear or radioactive substances or devices using them; leverage response, mitigation, and investigation capabilities in case of a terrorist attack; develop technical means to identify nuclear or other radioactive materials and substances that are or may be involved in a terrorist incident; [...] and promote greater information sharing pertaining to acts of nuclear terrorism."\(^{1236}\)

In addition, the UK participated in the second meeting on the Global Initiative to combat nuclear terrorism in Ankara,\(^{1237}\) which aimed to promote cooperation among the key nuclear states in the area of securing nuclear facilities from potential attacks.

The UK was also present at NATO’s Riga Summit, which took place on 29 October 2006, where the member countries rubber-stamped a new policy paper identifying global terrorism, the spread of weapons of mass destruction and threats to energy infrastructure as among the main risks the alliance must address over the next decade.\(^{1238}\)


In Köln, Germany, the European Commission, of which the UK is a member, hosted a meeting on 1 February for Information and Communications Technologies and explained specific methods for researchers in related industries to respond to proposals made under the 2007/2008 work programme. The meeting included an objective titled “critical infrastructure protection” detailing desired outcomes and impacts for protection, as well assigning funds (20 million €). The Council of the EU has also reiterated its support for further development of CIWIN and EPCIP, and reaffirmed the importance of infrastructure protection identified originally in the EU’s 2005 Counter Terrorism Strategy which clearly states that creating a programme for protection of critical infrastructure is among the “key priorities” for the component of protect, and that “Reducing the vulnerability across Europe of critical infrastructure to physical and electronic attack is essential.”

Notably, the UK government set up the Centre for Protection of National Infrastructure (CPNI) in the beginning of February 2007. CPNI was the result of merging the National Security Advice Centre (NSAC) and the National Infrastructure Security Co-ordination Centre (NISCC). The sole task of CPNI is providing advice to relevant businesses and organizations on how to protect their assets—which comprise the UK’s national infrastructure and include energy infrastructure—from potential terrorist attack.

The UK participated in the European Conference on Security Research, held in Berlin from 26-27 March, where study of security, including that of infrastructure was promoted. Franco Frattini, Justice and Security Commissioner stated, “We need better protection for critical infrastructures in Europe. The majority... [are]...private undertakings and we need to work in close partnership,” echoing ideas put forth during the Global Forum for Partnerships between States and Businesses to Counter Terrorism conducted earlier in the year. He also emphasized the importance of Member State cooperation, the problem of solely bi-lateral solutions and the need to, “analyze the threats and costs and then decide which infrastructures should have priority.”

Analyst: Julia Muravska

United States: +1

The United States has registered a score of +1, indicating full compliance with its commitment to develop a plan of action to secure global energy infrastructure from terrorism. The United States achieved this primarily through its organisation of or participation in various international conferences and declarations on the subject of the protection of critical energy infrastructure from terrorist attacks. Furthermore, the United States has made strides in developing a system of best practices to be applied across all sectors (including the promotion of public/private partnerships).

In an 18 July 2006 speech immediately following the 2006 St. Petersburg Summit, Under-Secretary for Arms Control and International Security Robert G. Joseph elaborated on the newly created Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism, of which the U.S. is a co-sponsor. He specifically mentioned “protecting [nuclear] materials at the source,” addressing and identifying the particular vulnerability of nuclear energy facilities. Furthermore, the U.S. co-sponsored the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism on 30-31 October 2006 in Rabat, Morocco, to “provide guidelines for keeping track

of nuclear substances, ensuring the safety of nuclear facilities, and combating trafficking that could deliver nuclear materials into the hands of terrorists.” The initiative is concerned with developing best practices for the protection of the nuclear energy sector, but not other energy sectors. Additionally, by 27 October 2006, the United States had helped Russia secure fifty of its naval nuclear sites from the threat of terrorist attack. Although this was done in the context of preventing nuclear proliferation, the result of the undertaking was to protect nuclear energy infrastructure.

The United States also recently participated in the G8 Seminar on Specific Proposals on Strengthening Partnerships between Governments and Businesses to Counter Terrorism on 11 October 2006 in Moscow, and the Global Forum for Partnerships between States and Businesses to Counter Terrorism on 28-30 November 2006 in Moscow. The G8 Seminar featured eight proposals for government-business partnerships aimed at protecting the various aspects of critical energy infrastructure. Results of the G8 Seminar were subsequently presented at the Global Forum. They pledged to promote the establishment of “informal international government-business working groups on counter-terrorism partnerships in key sectors.” Participants of the Forum commissioned working groups with the task implementation of various counterterrorism proposals with public and private sector partners. The Forum also called for cooperative initiatives from businesses and governments to establish measures protecting critical energy. The Forum and Seminar were successful in developing best practices for security of the energy sector through endorsements of various government-business partnerships.

On 29 October 2006 the United States also took part in the NATO Riga Summit. At the Summit, participant NATO countries produced a policy paper identifying the most imminent risks of global terrorism of the next decade, most notably the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and threats to energy infrastructure.

The U.S., as a member of Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), was also party to the Ha Noi Declaration, which resulted from the 14th APEC Economic Leaders’ Meeting in Hanoi on 18-19 November 2006. This declaration urges members “to enhance emergency preparedness and to better protect critical energy infrastructure,” using language that closely resembles the G8 commitment.

At a meeting of Energy Ministers on 16 December 2006 including the United States, China, India, Japan, and the Republic of Korea, delegates called on “all countries of the international community to enhance global energy security” through “safeguarding critical energy infrastructure and sea route security for transportation of oil and gas.” On 23 January 2007, Andrew Grant, the Deputy Director of the Office of Weapons of Mass Destruction Terrorism, delivered an address in Crystal City, Virginia, in which he emphasized the importance of developing Best Practices and Information Sharing between the public and private sectors in order to secure the “maritime supply chain” against terrorist attack.

Also on 23 January 2007, President Bush announced plans to “double the current capacity of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to 1.5 billion barrels by 2027” as an “insurance policy” in the event of a “terrorist attack on the energy supply chain.” In a 7 February 2007 appearance before the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Homeland Security, Committee on Appropriations, US Secretary of

Homeland Security Michael Chertoff named his department’s five priorities, of which the third was the protection of critical infrastructure, including “energy (electrical, nuclear, gas and oil, dams).” From 12-13 February 2007, the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism, of which the United States is part, met for a second time in Ankara, Turkey. The Initiative seeks to “deprive terrorists of the ability to attack nuclear facilities” and encourages “broader engagement of the private sector.” The Initiative released a statement that included a commitment to “strengthen material accounting, control, and physical protection” and to “enhance civilian nuclear facility security.” The Initiative is scheduled to meet again in June 2007 in Kazakhstan.

On 23 April 2007, US Secretary of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff reiterated the protection of critical infrastructure as one of five priorities of his department. He emphasised public/private partnerships and remarked that as regards critical infrastructure, emergency preparedness means “acquiring the right tools, planning what you would do to deal with an exigency, and then training and exercising against it.” He also mentioned a system of best practices that includes “background checks on truck drivers who carry hazardous material, [and] new credentialing requirements for workers with access to sensitive transportation facilities.”

Analyst: Gabe DeRoche

The European Union: +1

The EU has registered a score of +1 indicating full compliance with its commitment to protect global energy infrastructure from terrorist attack. A 2005 Green Paper titled the European Programme for the Protection of Critical Infrastructure Protection (EPCIP) recently developed into important legislation protecting critical infrastructure. EPCIP ranks energy infrastructure first in its definition of critical infrastructure requiring protection, lists specific vulnerabilities, and suggests best practices to be adapted once all concerned parties are consulted (member states, businesses, industry associations, etc.). While partially implemented in 2006, the European Commission laid out specific “principles, processes and instruments” in December 2006 for future EPCIP operation. The EPCIP programme grants money to businesses, member states and others responsible for critical infrastructure. Funding for the work programme is included in the general EU budget, and financial planning for EPCIP has been extended for 2007-2013 in the EU programme: Prevention, Preparedness and Consequence Management of Terrorism and other Security Related Risks. The EU has already allocated EUR137.4 million for the 2007-2013 period.

In November 2005 the EU also issued a Green Paper on the Critical Infrastructure Warning Information Network (CIWIN), which engages specialists from different member states in assessing EU-wide threats and risks. Both the ECPIP and the CIWIN are further codified by a 12 December

---


2006 communication from the EC specifying "the principles, processes and instruments proposed to implement EPCIP," and including the precise role that CIWIN will play along with EPCIP.

The EC also participated in the G8 Seminar on Specific Proposals on Strengthening Partnerships between Governments and Businesses to Counter Terrorism on 11 October 2006 in Moscow, and the Global Forum for Partnerships between States and Businesses to Counter Terrorism on 28-30 November 2006 in Moscow. The G8 Seminar featured eight proposals for government business partnerships aimed at protecting the various aspects of critical energy infrastructure. Results of the G8 Seminar were subsequently presented at the Global Forum. They pledged to promote the establishment of "informal international government-business working groups on counter-terrorism partnerships in key sectors." Participants in the Forum commissioned working groups with the task of implementing the various counterterrorism proposals with public and private sector partners. The Forum also called for cooperative initiatives from businesses and governments to establish measures protecting critical energy. The Forum and Seminar were successful in developing best practices for security of the energy sector through endorsements of various government-business partnerships. Since appropriating funds in December 2006, the EU has maintained an active role in promoting and improving protection of critical infrastructure.

In Köln, Germany, the European Commission hosted a meeting on 1 February for Information and Communications Technologies and explained specific methods for researchers in related industries to respond to proposals made under the 2007/2008 work programme. The meeting included an objective titled "critical infrastructure protection" detailing desired outcomes and impacts for protection, as well assigning EUR20 million to the objective. The Council of the EU has also reiterated its support for further development of CIWIN and EPCIP, and reaffirmed the importance of infrastructure protection identified originally in the EU's 2005 Counter Terrorism Strategy which clearly states that creating a programme for protection of critical infrastructure is among its "key priorities," and that "[r]educing the vulnerability across Europe of critical infrastructure to physical and electronic attack is essential." At the European Conference on Security Research, held in Berlin from 26-27 March, study of security, including that of infrastructure was promoted. Franco Frattini, Justice and Security Commissioner stated, "We need better protection for critical infrastructures in Europe. The majority... [are]...private undertakings and we need to work in close partnership," echoing ideas put forth during the Global Forum for Partnerships between States and Businesses to Counter Terrorism conducted earlier in the year. He also emphasized the importance of Member State co-operation, the problem of solely bilateral solutions and the need to, "analyze the threats and costs and then decide which infrastructures should have priority."

Analyst: Sarah Koerner
18. Stabilization and Reconstruction [288]

Commitment

"In order to facilitate the UN’s rapid and efficient response to crises, G8 states commit to pursuing reforms in the United Nations to ensure that resources are available in advance to the UN as it works to establish new peacekeeping and peace support operations pre-positioning equipment in Brindisi, an increase in pre-authorization funds to support DPKO's planning, and the authority to identify personnel in advance of a UNSC resolution mandating a new PKO;”

G8 Declaration on Cooperation and Future Action in Stabilization and Reconstruction

Background

At the Sea Island Summit of 2004, G8 Leaders adopted an Action Plan on Expanding Global Capability for Peace Support Operations that committed the G8 to various deliverables including training and equipping 75,000 troops by 2010 to increase global capacity to conduct peace support operations with a focus on Africa, and developing a transportation and logistics support arrangement to help provide transportation for deploying peacekeepers and logistics support to sustain units in the field. The commitment made at the St. Petersburg summit is an extension of the commitment made at Sea Island.

The purpose of the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) is to assist Member States and the Secretary-General in their efforts to maintain international peace and security. The Department prepares, directs and manages UN peacekeeping operations in order to effectively fulfill their mandate under the Security Council, General Assembly and Secretary-General. In implementing Security Council mandates, DPKO maintains contact with the Security Council, troop and financial contributors, and parties to the conflict.

In 1994, the UN set up a supply and logistics base in Brindisi, Italy, in order to facilitate the storage and maintenance of reusable assets from closing missions. According to the UN, this arrangement has resulted in increased efficiency and considerable savings, and has led to the redistribution of equipment and lowering of costs to newly-created missions. The Brindisi Logistics Base also provides a satellite communications relay system supporting operations at United Nations Headquarters, peacekeeping missions and a number of other field offices.

General financial issues related to peacekeeping are addressed by the General Assembly. The budgets of individual missions are considered separately, while the Secretary-General submits a report to the General Assembly on financial issues regarding peacekeeping missions.

Team Leader: Samreen Beg
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Assessment

2006 Final Compliance Score

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

Canada: 0

The Canadian government has registered partial compliance with its commitment to ensure that equipment and resources are made available in advance to the UN as it pursues new peacekeeping and peace support operations.

The Canadian government has offered verbal support for several UN reforms. On 20 October 2006, Colonel Jacques Morneau, Military Advisor of Canada, made a statement to the Fourth Committee of the 61st session of the General Assembly on behalf of Canada, as well as Australia and New Zealand (CANZ), reinforcing a "strong commitment to support DPKO in its reform of peace operations and to the Department itself." From 20 October 2006, Colonel Jacques Morneau, Military Advisor of Canada, made a statement to the Fourth Committee of the 61st session of the General Assembly on behalf of Canada, as well as Australia and New Zealand (CANZ), reinforcing a "strong commitment to support DPKO in its reform of peace operations and to the Department itself." He also expressed concern over the strain on DPKO resources, in particular the Military and Police Divisions and offered to work with the DPKO on doctrine development. Similarly, on 13 December 2006, Olivier Poulin, Representative of Canada, made a statement to the Fifth Committee of the 61st Session of the General Assembly on behalf of CANZ stating that due to the recent surge in peacekeeping operations, "we must reinforce DPKO to ensure proper management of all the operations".

Canada’s assessed financial contribution to UN peacekeeping operations amounted to US$133.6 million for the period from 1 July 2006 to 30 June 2007, approximately 2.8% of the UN peacekeeping budget. From July 2006 to March 2007, Canada contributed on average 133 military observers, police, and troops to UN peacekeeping missions. However, Canada’s ranking in the world for military and police contributions fell from 51 to 61 over the same period.

Canada continues to lend verbal and financial support to several projects including the Mission Startup & Management Project, and the Electronic Learning for African Peacekeepers (ELAP) Project, which demonstrates a commitment to both strengthening the DPKO’s capacity and bolstering regional

---

organizations, but it has not publicly called for reforms that would see the establishment of pre-positioned peace support equipment in Brindisi.

**Analyst: Kirby Dier**

### France: 0

France has not yet fulfilled its G8 commitment to pursue UN reforms that will ensure resources are made available to the organization as it works to establish new peace support operations.

France has been a supporter of the establishment and operation of the UN Peacebuilding Commission, of which it is now a member, whose goals are broadly congruent with the reforms called for at St. Petersburg. However, France has yet to commit funds to the newly established United Nations Peacebuilding Fund, a mechanism that would support post-conflict stabilization initiatives.1287

With regards to peacekeeping support, France remains a great contributor of troops. It has deployed 14,300 troops in various UN missions including: MINUK in Kosovo, UNIFIL in Lebanon, ONUCI in Cote D’Ivoire, MINUSTAH in Haiti and MONUC in the Democratic Republic of Congo.1288 Many of France’s efforts since the St. Petersburg Summit have been focused on its response to the conflict in Lebanon. France is the second greatest contributor of troops to the UNIFIL mission in Lebanon with around 1,650 soldiers. When interviewed, the French leader of the blue helmets, General Alain Pellegrini said that the UNIFIL mission has been partially accomplished.1289 Furthermore, on 24 March 2007, French forces completed their first mission above Afghanistan, greatly increasing the air-ground capabilities of the PAMIR and NATO missions there.1290

In February and March 2007, France participated in two sessions of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, which discussed the “Peace Operations 2010” proposal to reform UN peacekeeping.1291 It is uncertain, however, whether France actively pursued reforms in these forums. There is also no evidence that France has worked to establish new peacekeeping and peace support operations equipment pre-positioning in Brindisi. Moreover, it has not publicly stated its support for reforms that would increase pre-authorized funds to help the DPKO’s planning, nor has it supported the augmentation of the UN’s authority to identify personnel in advance of a UNSC resolution mandating a new peacekeeping operation.

**Analyst: Aziza Mohammed**

### Germany: 0

Germany has partially complied with its St. Petersburg commitment regarding UN reforms that would see enhanced funds and pre-positioned resources for UN peace support operations.

Germany has articulated its support for enhancing the UN’s capacity to provide stabilization and reconstruction assistance through UN peace support operations. The 2006 White Book on German Security Policy by the Federal Ministry of Defence states that Germany is lobbying to equip the UN with the resources necessary for the “fulfilment of its tasks.”1292 The paper also expresses the need for shared operational norms in peace operations. The training of UN staff and troops by German military thus contributes to creating capacities for UN peace operations.1293

Germany is also a large contributor to EU and UN peacekeeping operations.1294 For instance, Germany pledged over a third of the total sum contributed by the EU (€400 million), to assist in the diffusion of

---


the conflict in Lebanon.\textsuperscript{1296} The German armed forces are currently providing 850 troops and eight vessels.\textsuperscript{1296}

Furthermore, Germany has been an active participant of the UN Peacebuilding Commission, which is poised to ease the provision of funds for new UN operations.\textsuperscript{1297} Germany has pledged to actively contribute its expertise to this body.\textsuperscript{1298} Furthermore, Germany is taking part in European efforts to support the work and functioning of this body.\textsuperscript{1299}

Germany has not, however, taken specific steps to ensure an increase in advance resources available to the UN and in particular the DPKO, to enable better identification of personnel in advance, or to strengthen the UN logistics base in Brindisi. Moreover, pursuing reforms at the UN with regards to the objectives contained in the commitment has not been articulated as a priority for the federal government.\textsuperscript{1300}

Analysts: Viktor Brech, Arina Shadrikova, and Tatiana Lanshina

Italy: 0

Italy has a strong record of involvement with various UN missions.\textsuperscript{1301} Former Italian Foreign Minister Gianfranco Fini said in late 2005 that Italy was bound by an "unwavering adherence" to "the principles and values of multilateralism, beginning with peace and security."\textsuperscript{1302}

It\'s involvement with the United Nations\' peacekeeping operations was recognized with the UN\'s decision to position its Logistics Base (UNLB) in the Southern Italian city of Brindisi. On 3 November 2006 the Italian Republic was pleased to announce that, "As a result of our growing role in peacekeeping operations, one of Italy\'s priorities will be to foster the reinforcement and expansion of the Brindisi base, which performs a function essential to the preparation and logistical management of all the UN\'s peacekeeping operations."\textsuperscript{1303}

In the same press release the government announced that it supported the establishment of a Standing Police Capacity at Brindisi, which is to be "employed in the reorganisation of the forces of law and order of countries facing post-conflict difficulties."\textsuperscript{1304} Italy promises to make an "active contribution" to this new force.

In a speech to the International Labour Organization Italian President Giorgio Napolitano made it clear that his nation was proud of the work that Italy has been doing with the DPKO and drew particular attention to the Brindisi Logistics Base. This is an indication that the Italian republic sees the improvement of the Brindisi base as a national priority.\textsuperscript{1305} In February of 2007 the head of the UN

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\end{thebibliography}
General Assembly, Sheika Haya Rashed Al Khalifa, visited the Brindisi base and thanked Italy for its “strong contribution in terms of infrastructure and personnel” to the Brindisi base and for Rome’s July 2006 decision to finance the base with €2.4 million.  

Italy has also been elected to a seat at the UN Peacebuilding Commission. However, it is unclear whether Italy has actively pursued reforms that would see an increase in pre-authorization funds to support DPKO’s planning, or would enable the UN to identify personnel in advance of the UNSC resolution mandating a new peace support operations.

**Analyst: John Ashbourne**

**Japan: 0**

Japan has partially complied with its commitment with regards to stabilization and reconstruction through UN reform.

On 26 February 2007, Mr. Takahiro Shinyo, Deputy Permanent Representative of Japan to the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations issued a statement at the 61st session of the General Assembly in which he expresses Japan’s support for the Secretary-General’s proposed restructuring of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations.  

Japan has also demonstrated its support for peacebuilding. Japan confirmed its contribution of $20 million to the new UN Peacebuilding Fund. Furthermore, a mechanism that would support post-conflict stabilization initiatives. Furthermore, in a March 2007 publication, its ministry of foreign affairs has also declared that “Japan on its part, will continue to be active in the area of peacebuilding by providing seamless and comprehensive support, strengthening its contributions of personnel and making further intellectual contribution.” It continued with the admission that “Japan needs to employ greater initiative to make use of Asian experience in order to provide insights to peacebuilding activities, amidst the global rise in the needs for peacebuilding, particularly in Africa.”

Its support for various DPKO missions also remains high. Since February 2007, Japanese civilian police officers have been deployed in Timor-Leste to help in peacebuilding efforts. In March 2007, Japan held a symposium regarding Timor-Leste for the future activities of the United Nations Peacebuilding Commission. In a statement by Kenzo Oshima, the permanent representative of Japan at the public meeting of the Security Council, Japan supported extension of the UNMIT mandate for one year.  

Further to its activities in Timor-Leste Japan has deployed 8184 Self-Defense Forces personnel under the Special Measures Law for Humanitarian and Reconstruction Assistance in Iraq. In a statement by Ken Mukai, counsellor of Permanent Mission of Japan on financing UNIFIL, Japan supported strengthening the capacity of the Security Council in peacekeeping operations. It however undermined this by threatening to cut funding to the mission if it did not receive better breakdowns of expenditures.

Despite its support for various DPKO missions, Japan has failed to address the establishment of pre-positioning equipment in Brindisi or the identification of personnel in advance of a UNSC-mandated PKO.

**Analyst: Aziza Mohammed**

---


Russia: 0

Russia has partially complied with its St. Petersburg stabilization and reconstruction commitment. On 20 September 2006, Russia’s Foreign Minister, Sergey Lavrov, issued a statement to a UN Security Council (UNSC) Meeting in which he remarked: "It is necessary to build up the positive cooperation experience of the UNSC with its regional and subregional partners in Africa, including the African Union, ECOWAS, SADC, and IGAD.” He noted further that "the most important area of the [UN]’s cooperation with regional organizations is peacekeeping."1315

In a 2 October 2006 statement to a plenary session of the UN General Assembly, Russia’s ambassador to the UN, Vitaly Churkin, "welcomed the establishment of the UN Commission on Peacebuilding, and expressed the intention of his country to participate actively in the work of that body.”1316 In the framework of Russia’s chairmanship of the UNSC, debates were held on the effective work of the Peacebuilding Commission. The main issue that was discussed during this period was global peace and security.1317

In January 2007, under Russia’s chairmanship of the UNSC, three resolutions were approved, and several key commitments were made, including the situation in Nepal, Cote-d’ivoire, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Chad, Central African Republic, Congo, Haiti and Sudan.1318

On 29 March 2007, the Prime Minister of Russia Michail Fradkov signed the Government resolution 384-p that approved the Proposal of the Russian Ministry for Foreign Affairs to contribute annually US$2,000,000 on voluntary basis to the UN Peacebuilding Fund.1319

However, it is unclear whether Russia has pursued reforms in the UN to ensure that the UN has authority to identify personnel in advance for peacekeeping operations, or to establish pre-positioning equipment in Brindisi.

Analysts: Yulay Sultanov, Arina Shadrikova, Katya Gorbunova, and Viktor Brech

United Kingdom: 0

The United Kingdom has partially fulfilled its commitment to pursue reforms in the UN to ensure that resources are available to the UN as it mandates new peace support operations.

The UK’s Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) notes the UK’s commitment to work to "...strengthen the capacity of the United Nations [in order to] improve the UN system’s early action to prevent conflict through lead[ing] and manag[ing] peace operations, drawing on effective and well trained military forces and civilian personnel..."1320 It also indicates that the British government wishes to "improve the quality” of UN peacekeeping by deploying "More, better trained personnel (military, police and civilian) with clearer operational guidelines."1321

The UK is a major contributor to the United Nations, and increased its contribution by a further £200 million in March of 2006.1322 However, there is no specific evidence of a British move to increase pre-authorization funding to support DPKO planning.

---

The UK has been for several years a strong supporter of reform at the DPKO. It has supported the creation of the Peacebuilding Commission (of which it is now a member) and the use of that organization to suggest reforms to the current state of affairs at the DPKO.

The UK has also been a supporter for several years of the UN’s Standing Police Capacity. Speaking in 2005, Adam Thomson, the Deputy Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom’s mission to the United Nations Special Political and Decolonisation Committee said that the Standing Police Capacity will, "provide both a start-up capability for the policing component of peacekeeping missions." Such a reform would give the DPKO the authority to identify personnel in advance of a UNSC mandate, as they would be permanently ‘on call’.

While this support is in line with the United Kingdom’s commitment at St. Petersburg, it is the continuation of an existent policy, which was formed by the European Union several years ago. Currently, it is also unclear whether the United Kingdom is actively supporting the establishment of pre-positioning of operational equipment at Brindisi.

**Analyst: John Ashbourne**

### United States: 0

The American government has not yet fully complied with the St. Petersburg stabilization and reconstruction commitment.

On 20 June 2006, the House of Representatives, in the State Department Appropriations Act, 2007 (H.R. 5672) provided US$1,135,327,000 to pay U.N. peacekeeping operations for the fiscal year 2007, as requested by President George Bush on 6 February 2006.

From July 2006 to March 2007, the United States contributed on average 324 military observers, police and troops to UN peacekeeping missions. However, the United States’ ranking in the world for military and police contributions fell from 33 to 43 over the same period.

In the 2008 Budget request, President Bush requested an additional $200 million for “Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities” to fund unforeseen United Nations expenses, including $184 million in 2007 to support the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) and $16 million for the UN mission if East Timor. In addition, President Bush approved the drawdown of approximately US$3,000,000 in commodities and services from the Department of Defense to provide for the transportation of Indonesian troops for the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon on 2 October 2006.

The United States has made contributions to peacekeeping outside the UN mechanism. US Peacekeeping Operations (PKO) funds multilateral peacekeeping and regional stability operations not funded by the United Nations. According to the Department of State, these funds also help to “build capabilities in countries seeking to participate in international peace support missions”.

---

1323 By 2007-08, improved effectiveness of UK and international support for conflict prevention, through addressing long-term structural causes of conflict, managing regional and national tension and violence, and supporting post-conflict reconstruction, where the UK can make a significant contribution, in particular Africa, Asia, the Balkans and the Middle East, Foreign and Commonwealth Office (London), 30 September 2005, Date of Access: 3 January 2007.
requested budget for US PKO for the fiscal year 2007 is US$200,500,000. In addition, according to the Department of State, the U.S. has worked with NATO and other partners to strengthen the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) during the transition to a UN force. In addition to financial contributions, the U.S. has provided the maintenance of vehicles, communications equipment, pre-deployment training, and airlifts for 34 AMIS camps.

Beyond its regular assessed contributions to UN peacekeeping operations, and its support for regional security organizations, the United States has not taken any significant actions to establish new peacekeeping and peace support operations pre-positioning equipment in Brindisi, nor increase pre-authorization funds to support DPKO’s planning as was established at St. Petersburg.

**European Union: 0**

The European Union has partially complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to United Nations peacekeeping reforms.

Speaking on behalf of the European Union on 22 September, 2006, Minister of Foreign Affairs for Finland Erkki Tuomioja (Finland held the presidency of the European Union in the second half of 2006) stated that the EU and UN should continue to work through the Steering Committee created in 2003 by the “Joint Declaration on EU-UN Cooperation in Crisis Management” in order to enhance coordination between the UN’s Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) and Department of Political Affairs. He also asserted that the EU was committed to exploring how to create better mechanisms to address conflict prevention, collect early warning of conflicts and garner the political will necessary to respond to evolving crises. Finally, he stated that the EU wanted regional organizations to have increased responsibility and ownership of efforts to solve regional conflicts, but that this must be done within a UN framework and with the support of the Security Council.

On 13 December, 2006, Mikael Raivio, First Secretary of the Permanent Mission of Finland to the UN, stated that the European Union was committed to continuing to grant all necessary financial means to the Secretary-General to implement the Security Council’s call of 11 August 2006 for an increase in the strength of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) to a maximum of 15,000 troops. The EU has also been active in stabilization efforts in Southeast Asia this past year. In December 2006, two hundred EU-led peace monitors ended their year-long mission in Indonesia’s Aceh province on the northern tip of Sumatra, where they oversaw a deal that ended thirty years of fighting between government troops and separatists.

Most recently, in 19 February 2007, Mr. Thomas Matussek, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Germany to the UN issued a statement on behalf of the EU welcoming the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the latest recommendations of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations to reform the DPKO. According to Ambassador Matussek, the DPKO’s Military Division is experiencing severe capacity shortfalls, and what is needed is a more integrated approach to UN peace support operations.

Despite the EU’s strong support of UN missions and its willingness to pursue reforms to make peacekeeping missions more effective, it has not taken any significant action to establish new peacekeeping and peace support operations pre-positioning equipment in Brindisi, nor to increase pre-authorization funds to support DPKO’s planning as was established at St. Petersburg.

---


Analysts: Samreen Beg and Janet Chow
19. Global Partnership: Non-Proliferation [306]

Commitment

"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."

St. Petersburg Statement on Non-Proliferation

Background

Introduced at the 2002 Kananaskis Summit, the Global Partnership against the Proliferation of WMD is aimed at assisting Russia and former member states of the USSR in decommissioning excess nuclear, biological and chemical weapon stocks. This initiative was spearheaded by the United States under the auspices of threat reduction measures intended to minimize the potential of rogue states and terrorist organizations to acquire access to large, often poorly guarded, stocks of weapons of mass destruction, or the materials needed to develop such weapons.

Given that these weapons stocks are improperly or insufficiently secured primarily due to prohibitive disarmament costs, G8 member states pledged to collectively raise USD20 billion over ten years to fund Global Partnership program initiatives. At the Gleneagles summit and again at St. Petersburg the G8 member states renewed their commitment to their 2002 pledge. The pledges made at Kananaskis to the Global Partnership are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member State</th>
<th>Original Currency</th>
<th>2002 US Dollars*</th>
<th>2006 US Dollars†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>CAD1 billion</td>
<td>$637 million</td>
<td>$882 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>€1 billion</td>
<td>$941 million</td>
<td>$1.24 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>€1.5 billion</td>
<td>$1.4 billion</td>
<td>$1.86 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>€1 billion</td>
<td>$941 million</td>
<td>$1.2 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>USD200 million</td>
<td>$200 million</td>
<td>$200 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>USD2 billion</td>
<td>$2 billion</td>
<td>$2 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>€750 million</td>
<td>$706 million</td>
<td>$932 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>USD10 billion</td>
<td>$10 billion</td>
<td>$10 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>€1 billion</td>
<td>$941 million</td>
<td>$1.2 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Using the IMF’s average market exchange rate for 2002

† Using the IMF’s average market exchange rate for Q1 through Q3 2006

Team Leader: Cliff Vanderlinden

---

Assessment

Interim Compliance Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada: +1

Canada registers full compliance with its 2002 commitment made in Kananaskis to engage in nuclear non-proliferation activities.

Canada has prioritized the safe disposal of nuclear materials as part of its non-proliferation strategy, following through with consistent allocation of funds. On 17 July 2006, Canada announced a planned contribution of CAD100 million toward the construction of chemical weapons destruction facilities in Russia.\(^{1342}\) The announcement included a pledge of CAD24 million to defuel and dismantle three nuclear submarines in northwestern Russia, bringing the total number of submarines dismantled with Canada’s cooperation to nine.\(^{1343}\) It also included CAD4.3 million for 15 new research projects at research institutes in Russia and other countries of the former Soviet Union aimed at providing “peaceful, sustainable employment opportunities for former weapons scientists.”\(^{1344}\)

On 23 November 2006 Foreign Affairs Minister Peter Mackay tabled in Parliament the annual report of the Global Partnership Program. The report outlined the contributions made by Canada to the Global Partnership Program thus far and also set an agenda for future Canadian priorities with respect to the Global Partnership. The report states that Canada will continue its commitment to the construction of the Shchuch’ye Chemical Weapons Construction Facility, which is set to be completed by 2008, and may spearhead the development of a similar facility in Kizner beginning in 2007.\(^{1345}\)

Among the other commitments outlined in the report was the continued investment in the decommissioning of 12 nuclear submarines in the Russian Arctic Fleet, a project which is expected to be completed by 2010.\(^{1346}\) The Canadian government has earmarked CAD100 million to the project and, in early November 2006, the Zvezdochka shipyard in Severodvinsk in Russia began disposal of a B-244 Viktor III class multipurpose nuclear submarine with Canadian funding.\(^{1347}\) On 29 March 2007, it was reported that the decommissioning of the seventh nuclear submarine had begun at Zvezdochka.\(^{1348}\)

---


\(^{1348}\) Russian nuclear sub being decommissioned for Canadian cash, ITAR-TASS, (Moscow),
On 7 May 2007 the Canadian government announced that it would contribute CAD5 million towards the upgrade of security systems at airports and other border crossings in Ukraine to prevent nuclear terrorism.\textsuperscript{1349}

Analyst: Cliff Vanderlinden

France: +1

Although France reiterated its commitment to fulfilling its 2002 pledge made in Kananaskis to support non-proliferation initiatives, it has not made any significant new financial commitments to the Global Partnership Program since the St. Petersburg Summit.

On 30 December 2006 Russian President Vladimir Putin signed a federal law ratifying the Russian-French intergovernmental agreement on cooperation in the disposal of chemical weapons in Russia, which was signed in Moscow on 14 February 2006.\textsuperscript{1350} The agreement outlines the "practical use of a free financial and technical aid by France in order to implement the Russian prioritized programmes of destroying the Russian chemical weapons stock, creation and maintenance of facilities for the disposal of these weapons, and to solve accompanying ecological problems."\textsuperscript{1351} During the implementation of the agreement France will take part in the launching of an ecological monitoring project at the chemical weapons disposal plant in Shchuch'ye, a project to which France will make an initial commitment of EUR6 million.\textsuperscript{1352} France has also committed itself to the refitting of the nuclear waste incinerator in the Zvezdochka shipyard located in Russia, a project which it will fund up to EUR7 million going into 2008.\textsuperscript{1353}

Analyst: Hana Dhanji

Germany: +1

Germany registers full compliance with its St. Petersburg commitment to continue supporting the Global Partnership Program.

On the 2 August 2006, the first stage of a EUR125 million storage facility for nuclear submarine reactors in Saida Bay in the Murmansk region was completed. The project was financed by Germany.\textsuperscript{1354} This paved the decision to continue the project until 2008; the complex is a shore-based long-term storage facility for the storage of 120 reactor bocks, including all necessary infrastructure and is expected to be fully operational by December 2008.\textsuperscript{1355}

Furthermore, German officials worked together with the United States and Russia in a secret operation to transfer almost 600 pounds of abandoned, Soviet-made nuclear material from a former East German research lab to a secure site in Russia on 22 December 2006.\textsuperscript{1356} This operation was carried out under the Global Threat Reduction Initiative, a Bush administration program launched in 2004 to combine and speed-up efforts to lock down nuclear materials and weapons around the world.\textsuperscript{1357}

On 18 January 2007 the Strengthening the Global Partnership Project and the Europe Program – both of which are initiatives of the Centre for Strategic and International Studies – co-hosted a luncheon...
roundtable discussion with Mr. Hellmut Hoffman, Germany’s Director for Nuclear Arms Control and Nonproliferation in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Director Hoffman remarked on Germany’s nonproliferation priorities during its 2007 G8 and EU presidencies.\footnote{1358}

The German 2007 national budget includes an allocation of EUR57 million towards supporting Russia in the framework of the Global Partnership.\footnote{1359}

**Analyst: Sandro Gianella and Igor Churkin**

**Italy: 0**

The government of Italy has continued to support its Global Partnership commitments reiterated at the 2006 G8 Summit in St. Petersburg, although there were no new financial commitments registered by the Italian government since the summit. However, the decommissioning of the Kirov-class nuclear-powered battle cruiser Admiral Ushakov – a project funded by Italy – is expected to begin in 2007.

On 9 October 2006, talks between an Italian delegation and the Zvyozdochka project in Severodvinski were held. The talks concerned the unloading of spent nuclear fuel from the decommissioned cruiser.\footnote{1360} In November 2004 Italy had expressed its readiness to allot EUR60 million for the dismantlement of the Admiral Ushakov.\footnote{1361} On 25 January 2005 Italian sources reported that SOGIN (Società Gestione Impianti Nucleari or the Society for the Management of Nuclear Systems) had come to a preliminary agreement with the Russian Atomic Energy Agency to commit EUR66 million to fund dismantlement of three Victor-class submarines and the Admiral Ushakov.\footnote{1362} The Italian parliament was expected to take about two years to approve the project and commit the pledged funds.\footnote{1363}

According to a Zvyozdochka project spokesman, the unloading of spent nuclear fuel from the Admiral Ushakov is expected to begin in 2007.\footnote{1364}

**Analyst: Joseph Tabago**

**Japan: +1**

The government of Japan has registered full compliance in meeting the Global Partnership commitments reiterated at the 2006 G8 Summit in St. Petersburg.

On 12 September 2006, Deputy Foreign Minister Shintaro Ito announced at a press conference in Vladivostok that Japan had allocated JPY20 billion in a joint project with Russia to dismantle five Victor-class nuclear submarines by 2010.\footnote{1365} The project will be conducted under the Star of Hope program, which was adopted during Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi’s visit to Russia on 11 January 2003. The first Victor class submarine will be decommissioned in Zvezda Shipyard in the upcoming months and will take approximately 10 months to complete.\footnote{1366}

On 30 August 2006, the chief of Russia’s Federal Atomic Agency (Rosatom) Sergei Kiriyenko and Japan’s Katsutoshi Kaneda discussed cooperation in the area of nuclear-powered submarine recycling. As part of an agreement, Japan agreed to finance the construction of a floating complex worth USD35 million to process liquid radioactive waste.\footnote{1367}

---


\footnote{1360} Italian delegation to discuss nuclear cruiser scrapping prospects in Severodvinski, Strengthening the Global Partnership, (Washington D.C.), 9 October 2006. Date of Access: 27 December 2006. \(\text{www.sgpproject.org/Personal\%20Use\%20Only/101206italycruiser.htm}\).


\footnote{1364} Italian delegation to discuss nuclear cruiser scrapping prospects in Severodvinski, Strengthening the Global Partnership, (Washington D.C.), 9 October 2006. Date of Access: 27 December 2006. \(\text{www.sgpproject.org/Personal\%20Use\%20Only/101206italycruiser.htm}\).

\footnote{1365} Japan to begin dismantling 5 subs under a Moscow-Tokyo deal, Bellona, (Moscow), 12 September 2006. Date Access: 27 December 2006. \(\text{www.bellona.org/news/japan\_victordis}\).

\footnote{1366} Russia and Japan discuss nuclear submarine recycling, Strengthening the Global Partnership, (Washington D.C.), 30 August 2006. Date of Access: 27 December 2006. \(\text{www.sgpproject.org/Personal\%20Use\%20Only/RusJapanSub8.30.06.htm}\).
Japan has also continued to demonstrate its strong support for international agreements concerning nuclear non-proliferation. On 20 September 2006, Shintaro Ito reiterated Japan’s commitment to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, noting that “Japan is taking every diplomatic opportunity to facilitate the entry into force of the Treaty.”

Russia: +1

Russia complied with the commitment to persevere in the implementation of the pledge made in Kananaskis.

Russia has dismantled 148 out of 197 decommissioned Soviet-era nuclear submarines, a Russian Federal Nuclear Power Agency official said 26 December 2006. In the end of February Russia’s Nerpa shipyard scrapped one more submarine.

By the end of 2006, Russia scrapped 75% of the nuclear submarines discarded from the Navy or 148 of the 197 submarines. At present, Russia scrap approximately 18 nuclear submarines a year. By now, 120 nuclear submarines were discarded from the Northern Fleet and 77 nuclear submarines were discarded from the Pacific Fleet, 97 submarines were scrapped in the North and 51 submarines were scrapped in the Far East. Among those, there are 23 nuclear submarines at the stage of scrapping (10 in the North and 13 submarines in the Far East) and 23 submarines are awaiting scrapping (12 in the North and 11 in the Far East).

The scrapping of all nuclear submarines is expected to be completed in 2010. The scrapping of one submarine costs approximately $7 million on average.

The program of scrapping Russian nuclear submarines is partially financed with other countries’ assistance. Costs of scrapping 39 submarines (which constitutes 26 per cent of all scrapped submarines) were born by foreign countries. For instance, Canada is prepared to start financing the scrapping of Russian nuclear submarines in the Far East.

The first of four unique pontoons, designed to ensure safe transportation of decommissioned nuclear submarines, has been built at the Snezhnogorsk shipyard Nerpa (Murmansk Region).

At the Murmansk seminar on the problems of decommissioning of nuclear service vessels on 7 February 2007 it was declared that the joint Russian-German nuclear decommissioning project is in progress at Saida Bay on Russia’s Kola Peninsula, with the objective of creation of a shore-based long-term storage facility for the storage of 120 reactor blocks, including all necessary infrastructure. The project is aimed at improving and maintaining the safety of the environment and arranging for the

---


material and technical development of the Russian sites involved in nuclear submarine decommissioning for the smooth and dynamic course of the decommissioning process.\(^{1376}\) In case of chemical weapons, at the end of last year, 15 percent of all the stockpiled chemical weapons in Russia had already been destroyed, Viktor Kholtov, the deputy chief of the RF Federal Industry Agency, reported in an exclusive ITAR-TASS interview, after attending the December session of the Conference of States Party to the Chemical Weapons Convention in The Hague\(^{1377}\).

By now (14 March 2007) Russia destroyed more than 17.5 percent of all the stockpiled chemical weapons, i.e. 7 007 tons of the weapons\(^ {1378}\). The Chemical Weapons Convention set terms for Russian second stage of destruction of chemical weapons of first category as 29 April 2007. By that time Russia is expected to destroy 20 percent of all the stockpiled chemical weapons, i.e. 8,553.4 tons of the weapons\(^ {1379}\).

The last 28 kilograms of lewisite were destroyed at a facility in Kambarka, Udmurtia, on 20 April 2007, which wound up the second phase of the national program to eliminate chemical weapons. Also, on 20 April 2007, the Maradykovo facility, Kirov region, completed the detoxication process of the last aircraft bomb. Russia therefore delivered on its promise to destroy 8,000 tonnes of toxic agents by April 29, 2007\(^ {1380}\).

The Russian budget allocated $718 million, or 18.3 billion rubles, for the work on the chemical weapons destruction program in 2006. Budget allocations in 2007 will be close to $980 million, or more than 26 billion rubles\(^ {1381}\).

**Analysts: Elena Bylina and Ekaterina Mamontova**

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom has registered a high level of compliance with regards to its commitments made at the G8 Summit in St. Petersburg. In 2006 the UK made substantial progress on dismantling Russian nuclear submarines, redirecting former nuclear weapons scientists, increasing the security of nuclear materials, and establishing of a co-operative programme for the transportation and storage of spent nuclear fuel from the Aktau reactor.\(^ {1382}\) According to the Fourth Annual Global Partnership report, the British government remains fully committed to continuing threat reduction work under the Global Partnership banner and Ministers agreed to improve the framework within which the UK delivers its threat reduction work in establishing new governance arrangements for the programme, which will provide a more flexible and effective structure for the work over the next few years. The new arrangements, since April 2007, created a single budget, subsuming the funds previously held by DTI and MOD.\(^ {1383}\) The programme has a ring-fenced budget of GBP 32.5 million for the period 2005-06 and 2007-08.\(^ {1384}\)

The United Kingdom is also working with the Nuclear Safety Programme (NSP) with the aim of promoting the adoption of internationally recognized nuclear safety and regulatory standards within the civil nuclear industry in the Former Soviet Union and Central and Eastern Europe in order to minimize the potential for nuclear mismanagement.\(^ {1385}\) The Department of Trade and Industry,\

---

together with British Nuclear Group as project managers, are working closely with beneficiary organizations to develop project proposals that address their nuclear safety priorities.\textsuperscript{1386}

On 18 July 2006 the Ministry of Defense announced that it will continue to play a significant role in the international effort to destroy chemical weapons in Russia by helping to build a second destruction facility in Kizner, which, like the facility in Shchuch’ye, will be a key Russian facility for the destruction of lethal nerve agents.\textsuperscript{1387} The Minister of State for the Armed Forces stated, that “together, working with Russia and other international donors, we are making a real difference, helping to make the world safer by eliminating these terrible weapons.”\textsuperscript{1388} In total, the Ministry of Defence has placed contracts worth some GBP44 million to date at Shchuch’ye.\textsuperscript{1389} According to the Ministry of Defense, up to USD100 million of the United Kingdom’s EUR750 million Global Partnership pledge will be made available to Russia for the destruction of its chemical weapons stockpile.\textsuperscript{1390}

The Department of Trade and Industry announced on 29 September 2006 that, with the help of GBP21 million in British funds, a new facility to safely store nuclear fuel was built at the Amaflot site in Murmansk.\textsuperscript{1391} This is the largest completed project to date under the United Kingdom’s Global Partnership commitments. The facility provides safe storage for 3,500 spent fuel rods in 50 storage cases.\textsuperscript{1392}

In addition, Great Britain implemented a portfolio of projects which should secure over 1000 sustainable jobs for former weapons scientists and completed a major engineering study to direct international collaborative effort to ensure the timely removal from Andreeva Bay of some 30 tonnes of spent nuclear fuel.\textsuperscript{1393} Furthermore, under the auspices of the Arctic Military Environmental Co-operation (AMEC) programme, Royal Navy salvage experts assisted Norway in the safe transport of the last nuclear submarine from the Arctic submarine base at Gremikha; it is set to be dismantled in 2007, using UK and Norwegian funds.\textsuperscript{1394} On 6 April 2007, it was announced that the first of four pontoons designed to ensure safe transportation of decommissioned nuclear submarines had been built at the Snehzhnogorsky shipyard Nerpa in the Murmansk region.\textsuperscript{1395} The pontoons are being constructed using UK funds and are expected to be completed by June 2007.\textsuperscript{1396}

The United Kingdom also had its Global Partnership programme evaluated by Chatham House, which found that the UK programme has been well-planned and organized, appropriately funded, efficient and above all effective.\textsuperscript{1397} The report further states that the UK sets an example for other donors and potential donors to follow by demonstrating that with careful management, pledges to the Global Partnership can and should be converted into real and productive expenditure.\textsuperscript{1398}


United States: 0

The United States has registered a sufficient level of compliance with the Strategic Global Partnership initiative.

New legislation had been introduced to remove restrictions on the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program. The congressionally-imposed conditions on Nunn-Lugar have inhibited the amount of work that can be done to eliminate and safeguard weapons of mass destruction in the former Soviet Union. Each year, a six-month, thirteen step certification and waiver process must be completed before appropriated funds can be obligated to eliminate weapons of mass destruction. Temporary waiver of the restrictions has created a lot of paperwork that distracts from the program’s mission of destroying nuclear, biological and chemical weapons.  

On 31 January 2007 the US House of Representatives passed a fiscal 2007 spending bill that increases funding for two nuclear nonproliferation programs by more than USD$60 million. A number of defense nuclear nonproliferation programs receive the same funding they did in fiscal 2006 under the long-term continuing resolution, but two received sizable boosts. The International Nuclear Material Protection and Cooperation program received a USD$50 million injection, rising from USD$422.7 million to USD$472.7 million under the House resolution. Much of funding is to be directed toward monitoring systems at transit points on the Russian border and ports to prevent nuclear smuggling. The Global Threat Reduction Initiative also received additional support. Funded at USD$97 million in the 2006 fiscal year budget, it received USD$115.5 million in the House spending plan. The program seeks to repatriate U.S. and Russian spent reactor fuel being used in other nations, and to convert research reactors from using highly enriched uranium to more proliferation-resistant low-enriched fuel.

On 1 November 2006, US Cooperative Threat Reduction officials met with their Russian counterparts in Moscow to discuss a new strategy to resume work on the unfinished chemical weapon destruction plant at Shchuch’ye, one of seven planned chemical weapons destruction facilities in Russia aimed at eliminating Russia’s chemical weapon stockpiles. The facility was originally scheduled for completion by 2005, but the timeframe was pushed back to 2008. The US made the most significant pledge towards the facility of all G8 member states and hopes to retain oversight over the project and release funds only as work is completed to satisfaction. Both the US and Russia aim to reduce their respective chemical weapons stockpiles by 20 percent by April 2007, 45 percent by the end of 2009, and the entire stock of chemical weapons eradicated by April 2012.  

However, the Shchuch’ye project has stalled. The White House has eliminated funding allocated to the Shchuch’ye plant in the 2008 and 2009 fiscal budgets. Furthermore, USD$270 million in CTR funds from 2005, 2006 and 2007 remains unspent due to disputes over whether the money should continue to be managed by the Denver-based Parsons firm, or whether control should be transferred to Russian federal agencies. A key reason for this move away is the continuing difficulties in working cooperatively with the Russian government and its official entities.

The Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) budget proposed for fiscal year 2008 is approximately USD$348 million, which is approximately USD$100 million less than traditional funding allocations towards CTR since Kananaskis. Three important trends appear to be emerging within the CTR program: a declining overall budget overall, a significant shift of funding away from chemical and nuclear weapons to biological threat reduction, and the declining centrality of WMD security and
elimination efforts in Russia as compared to other former Soviet states. The CTR program’s 2008 budget also demonstrates a refocusing of its priorities and resources to nonproliferation opportunities in the non-Russian former Soviet states.\textsuperscript{1407}

On 29 September 2006, the US Department of Energy and the Nuclear Threat Initiative (NTI) reached an important agreement-in-principle with the Government of Kazakhstan to move forward with the down-blending of highly enriched uranium (HEU) currently stored at Kazakhstan’s Institute of Nuclear Physics.\textsuperscript{1408} The project will be administered through the Department of Energy’s National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). NNSA’s Global Threat Reduction Initiative (GTRI) will work with Kazakhstan and will contribute at least USD4 million to the threat reduction initiative.\textsuperscript{1409} The mission of GTRI is to identify, secure, recover and facilitate the final disposal of high-risk vulnerable nuclear and radiological materials around the world as quickly as possible.\textsuperscript{1410}

\textit{Analyst: Ekaterina Mamontova}

**European Union: 0**

The European Union has registered a respectable level of compliance with its EUR1 billion pledge to the Global Partnership. The EU pledge is concentrated in several key areas, including EUR125 million for ISTC/STCU former weapons scientist assistance and EUR550 million for nuclear safety assistance, which includes EUR50 million for nuclear submarine dismantlement and EUR23 million for fissile material safeguards.\textsuperscript{1411} The pledge is managed by the European Council’s Joint Action program and the European Commission’s TACIS program, which provides grant-financed technical assistance to Eastern Europe and Central Asia.\textsuperscript{1412}

TACIS is currently funding the USD30 million dismantlement of the Lepse, a retired service vessel for the nuclear-powered ice-breaker fleet operated by Murmansk Shipping Company. The Lepse contains 640 spent nuclear fuel assemblies which are assumed to be in poor condition. Protected by concrete to reduce radiation, the radioactivity within the hull of the Lepse has been estimated as high as 28,000 TBq (750,000 Ci).\textsuperscript{1413}

On 31 January 2007 talks in Kiev between the head of the Federal Service for Environmental, Technological and Nuclear Supervision, Konstantin Pulikovsky, and the head of Ukraine’s State Committee for Nuclear Regulation, Yelena Mikolaiuchuk revealed significant difficulties surrounding the EU-financed construction of a storage facility for spent nuclear fuel in the Chernobyl exclusion zone.\textsuperscript{1414} The facility should have gone into operation in 2003, then its opening was postponed to 2005, and it has not yet gone into operation. Both Mr. Pulikovsky and Ms. Mikolaiuchuk expressed disappointment and frustration over the management of the project and recommended that similar ventures not be undertaken in either Ukraine or Russia. Mr. Pulikovsky stated that the project was “another example showing that not everything foreign companies offer should be taken at face value ... both Russia and Ukraine have technologies and highly qualified specialists to implement such projects on their own.”\textsuperscript{1415}


\textsuperscript{1412} The EU’s relations with Eastern Europe & Central Asia, External Relations, (Brussels), DATE Date of Access: 12 January 2007. ec.europa.eu/comm/external_relations/ceeca/tacis/.


The EU budget cycle ended in 2006. New allocations are slated to be made in 2007 and consultations around new concepts and regulations for the TACIS program are currently underway.\textsuperscript{1416} The proposed EU budget for the 2007 fiscal year includes mention of a EUR6.7 billion investment in external relation actions, which includes “a new instrument to ... address trans-border challenges including nuclear safety and non-proliferation, the fight against trafficking, organised crime and terrorism.”\textsuperscript{1417}

*Analyst: Cliff Vanderlinden*

---

\textsuperscript{1416} The EU’s relations with Eastern Europe & Central Asia, External Relations, European Commission, (Brussels). Date of Access: 12 January 2007. ec.europa.eu/comm/external_relations/ceeca/tacis/.

20. Middle East: Lebanon [307]

Commitment

"We will support the economic and humanitarian needs of the Lebanese people, including the convening at the right time of a donors conference."

Statement by Group of Eight Leaders at the St. Petersburg Summit

Background

Three days prior to the commencement of the 2006 G8 Summit at St. Petersburg, Hezbollah guerrillas kidnapped two Israeli soldiers and killed three others in a cross-border raid. In response to the attack, the Israeli government sanctioned a full-scale military operation against Lebanon, including air and artillery strikes, incursions by ground troops and a naval blockade. The Lebanese Higher Relief Council estimates that the Israeli offensive resulted in the nearly 1,200 casualties and the Lebanese government estimated the cost of damage to its infrastructure and economy at USD3.6 billion.

On 16 July 2006, at the St. Petersburg Summit, the G8 leaders issued a joint statement in which they expressed their "deepening concern about the situation in the Middle East, in particular the rising civilian casualties on all sides and the damage to infrastructure." In that same statement the G8 leaders made the commitment to attend a donors conference and extend financial support to Lebanon for its reconstruction and humanitarian relief efforts.

The International Donor Conference for Lebanon was held on 31 August 2006 in Stockholm, Sweden. Close to 60 governments and organizations were invited to attend. Conference organizers aimed to raise approximately USD500 million, but in total more than USD940 million in new funds were pledged at the conference. At the time of the conference this brought the total pledges raised to help with the rebuilding of Lebanon to USD1.2 billion. On 27 January 2007 a second donors conference was held in Paris. The International Conference for Support to Lebanon, or Paris III, was the third in a series of international conferences hosted by the French government and designed to provide economic aid for Lebanon. The conference was attended by 38 states and institutions and included representatives from all the G8 member states. Approximately USD7.6 billion was pledged at the conference towards the reconstruction of Lebanon.

According to the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) Financial Tracking Service (FTS), the total commitments to Lebanon by the G8 member states in response to the 2006 crisis amounted to approximately USD261 million, with an additional USD177 million in uncommitted pledges. The contributions by G8 member states equal approximately 51 percent of the total pledge amounts recorded by the OCHA FTS. The FTS, however, only recorded pledges made in association with the 2006 Lebanon Crisis until the end of 2006, and does not earmark pledges made in 2007 (such as those made at Paris III) as being tied to the 2006 Lebanon Crisis.

---

The OCHA FTS reports that the total individual contributions of G8 each member state in relation to the 2006 Lebanon Crisis are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>USD Committed</th>
<th>USD Pledged</th>
<th>USD Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>$11,127,284</td>
<td>$7,013,857</td>
<td>$18,141,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>$22,337,032</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$22,337,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>$6,065,188</td>
<td>$3,709,382</td>
<td>$9,774,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>$33,152,043</td>
<td>$7,908,728</td>
<td>$41,060,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>$3,992,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3,992,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>$19,371,276</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$19,371,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>$106,432,575</td>
<td>$121,663,757</td>
<td>$228,096,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>$57,647,038</td>
<td>$37,688,442</td>
<td>$95,335,480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs Financial Tracking Service

According to the Lebanese Ministry of Finance, the pledges made by G8 member states at the Paris III conference, which in most cases include previous commitments, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>USD Committed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>$650,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>$134,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>$156,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>$115,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>$890,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>$486,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Republic of Lebanon Ministry of Finance

Team Leader: Cliff Vanderlinden

---


Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interim Compliance Score</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>+1.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada: +1

The Government of Canada has demonstrated a high level of compliance with the St. Petersburg G8 Summit’s commitment to the Lebanon crisis by attending the Stockholm International Donors Conference on 31 August 2006 and by offering both financial and humanitarian aid. On 20 July 2006, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) announced an initial pledge of CAD1 million towards humanitarian assistance efforts in Lebanon. Of this pledge, CAD500,000 was immediately allocated to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). On 16 August 2006, Prime Minister Stephen Harper announced the creation of a Lebanon Relief Fund comprised of CAD25 million to be allocated over two years to assist various UN initiatives, the Red Cross and other multilateral organizations and non-governmental organizations. More specifically, a pledge of CAD2 million from this fund is allocated to the United Nations Development Programme’s (UNDP) Early Recovery Initiative for Lebanon. The funds were earmarked to assist in efforts to contain and decontaminate an oil spill near the Lebanese coast. A Canadian environmental expert and a Canadian helicopter were assigned to survey the damage from the spill. CIDA also assisted the United Nations Mine Action (UNMAS) Voluntary Trust Fund, the World Food Programme, UNICEF and the WHO, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and the Lebanese Landmine Resource Centre by way of contributions of CAD1.25 million, CAD1.75 million, CAD1.5 million, CAD1 million and CAD209,340 respectively.

Parliamentary secretary Ted Menzies headed the Canadian delegation at the International Donors Conference in Stockholm on behalf of Josée Verner, Canada’s Minister of International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Official Languages and La Francophonie. Canada pledged a total of CAD34 million in both financial and humanitarian aid at the conference. On 25 January 2007, Josée Verner, Minister of International Cooperation and Minister for La Francophonie and Official Languages

---

attended the International Conference on Support to Lebanon, or Paris III, in Paris, France. Canada added a grant of CAD20 million at the conference to help the Government of Lebanon get out of deficit and debt problems. As of 25 April 2007, the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) reports that Canada has committed a total of USD18,141,141 in response to the Israel-Lebanon Conflict of 2006. Of this funding, USD7,013,857 is allocated through the Lebanon Relief Fund and USD442,478 to establish a UN Joint Logistics Centre. The rest of the funds are distributed among initiatives with other governmental organizations and international non-governmental organizations such as the Canadian Embassy in Beirut, the Lebanese Red Cross Society, Save the Children and World Vision.

**Analyst: Farah Saleem**

**France: +1**

France has demonstrated full compliance with its commitment to Lebanon. France attended the Stockholm conference for Lebanon’s Early Recovery, with European Affairs Minister Delegate Catherine Colonna leading the French delegation. At the conference, France pledged USD25.5 million, of which USD16.6 million was in loans. To date, France has committed USD22,337,032 to humanitarian and economic relief in Lebanon, including aid for internally displaced persons, equipment for landmine clearance, 15 bridges, foodstuffs and medical supplies. This aid was distributed through both the French-Lebanese bilateral relationship and in partnership with several non-governmental organizations and international organizations, including UNICEF, the World Food Program, and UNHCR.

On 25 January 2007, France hosted a conference of international donors on Lebanese reconstruction. The conference was both a follow-up to the Stockholm Donor Conference for Lebanon’s reconstruction as well as part of a long-term effort to address Lebanon’s debt and the status of its economy. Dubbed Paris III, the conference marked the third time the French have hosted a meeting to help Lebanon since 2001, when the Paris I conference raised USD659 million. President Chirac pledged a USD650 million concessionary loan on behalf of France at the conference. The loan is intended to stabilize Lebanon’s economy in the face of its overwhelming debt. France also pledged over USD8 million in the form of grants to the Lebanese government as well as NGOs and UN agencies working in Lebanon, which will be channeled towards security, education and defense. Projects include new public libraries and increased security for the Lebanese coast.

---

France has also committed over 2,000 troops to the UN Peace Mission in Lebanon, and will lead the mission until February 2007. The French contingent consists of 400 troops participating in UNIFIL, and an additional 1,700 air and naval troops situated off the coast of Lebanon that are now dedicated to the UNIFIL mission. French army divisions were also sent to rebuild bridges in Beirut.

France has also been a vociferous supporter of the implementation of UN Resolution 1701, which was passed to end the conflict between Israel and Lebanon. In April 2007, the French Foreign Ministry issued a presidential statement, indicating a support for an independent mission to monitor compliance with aspects of the resolution and calling for a final solution to questions surrounding the Shebäa Farms and Lebanese-Israeli border.

France has already fully committed its pledge of USD22,337,032, the bulk of which has been allocated to food aid and humanitarian assistance.

**Analyst: Farnam Bидgoli**

**Germany: +1**

Germany registered an acceptable level of compliance with regard to its St. Petersburg commitment to provide economic and humanitarian support to the Lebanese people. Despite calls for the German government to act as a mediator in the Middle East, Chancellor Angela Merkel's spokesman stated that Germany's role would not go beyond the context of the G8 and the EU. This includes strong support for UN Security Council Resolution 1701, stressing the importance of rapid implementation. Germany has repeatedly shown support for both Lebanon and Israel and hopes to revitalize the Middle East Quartet in order to continue peace talks within the region.

On 21 July 2006, the Federal Development Ministry provided Lebanon with EUR2 million in emergency aid, of which EUR500,000 was sent directly to the International Red Cross. Furthermore, on 4 August 2006, the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development increased emergency aid by EUR2 million. At the Stockholm Donors Conference on 31 August 2006, the German government pledged EUR22 million. Speaking at the conference, Federal Development Minister Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul stressed the importance of moving away from immediate relief to sustainable reconstruction in Lebanon.

---

1455 The French contingent consists of 400 troops participating in UNIFIL, and an additional 1,700 air and naval troops situated off the coast of Lebanon that are now dedicated to the UNIFIL mission.
1456 French army divisions were also sent to rebuild bridges in Beirut.
1457 France has also been a vociferous supporter of the implementation of UN Resolution 1701, which was passed to end the conflict between Israel and Lebanon.
1458 France has already fully committed its pledge of USD22,337,032, the bulk of which has been allocated to food aid and humanitarian assistance.
1459 Germany registered an acceptable level of compliance with regard to its St. Petersburg commitment to provide economic and humanitarian support to the Lebanese people. Despite calls for the German government to act as a mediator in the Middle East, Chancellor Angela Merkel's spokesman stated that Germany's role would not go beyond the context of the G8 and the EU.
1460 This includes strong support for UN Security Council Resolution 1701, stressing the importance of rapid implementation.
1461 Germany has repeatedly shown support for both Lebanon and Israel and hopes to revitalize the Middle East Quartet in order to continue peace talks within the region.
1462 On 21 July 2006, the Federal Development Ministry provided Lebanon with EUR2 million in emergency aid, of which EUR500,000 was sent directly to the International Red Cross. Furthermore, on 4 August 2006, the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development increased emergency aid by EUR2 million.
1463 At the Stockholm Donors Conference on 31 August 2006, the German government pledged EUR22 million. Speaking at the conference, Federal Development Minister Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul stressed the importance of moving away from immediate relief to sustainable reconstruction in Lebanon.
In order to protect Lebanon’s coastal border, Germany announced its plans to send a maritime task force, rather than ground troops, to Lebanon – a decision applauded by the international community in regards to its sensitivity towards Israel.\textsuperscript{1463} On 15 October 2006, German naval units became fully operational with the deployment of 2,400 naval troops, the second largest contingent of the EU countries.\textsuperscript{1464}

On 25 January 2007 at the Paris III conference, Germany pledged a total of EUR103 million to humanitarian aid and reconstruction in Lebanon.\textsuperscript{1465} This pledge was intended to represent Germany’s total contribution, including its commitments made prior to Paris III. "We want to help the people in an extensive and effective way and stabilize the political situation in Lebanon," stated German Development Minister Wieczorek-Zeul.\textsuperscript{1466} Of the amount pledged, the Development Ministry has earmarked EUR63 million towards vocational training, water supply and sanitation.\textsuperscript{1467} Thus far, 32 damaged vocational schools have been repaired, with 10,000 students back in school.\textsuperscript{1468} Construction plans for two damaged schools are expected to begin shortly.\textsuperscript{1469} Programs regarding water supply and sanitation are in progress.\textsuperscript{1470}

In addition to naval security, Germany has also made contributions towards strengthening border control with EUR40 million.\textsuperscript{1471} Funds will be allocated specifically for the use of freight scanners designed to scan items moving across the Lebanon-Syria border.\textsuperscript{1472} Deputy Interior Minister, August Hanning, declared that, "[t]his project will be very developed and modern and is aimed at showing the Lebanese how to monitor the border in a good way".\textsuperscript{1473} In addition, Germany has provided technical support to the Lebanese customs department at Beirut International Airport, protecting its ports and borders in order to provide the highest level of security.\textsuperscript{1474}

Germany has also promised to revive the Middle East Quartet in order to promote peace talks within the region upon assuming the EU presidency.\textsuperscript{1475} The Middle East Quartet met in Washington on 2 February 2007, discussions focused on the Israel-Palestine conflict in order to ensure regional stability.\textsuperscript{1476}

According to the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, Germany has pledged a total of USD9,774,570 to Lebanon in response to the 2006 crisis, of which more than USD6 million has already been committed.\textsuperscript{1477} According to the Progress Report published by the Lebanese


\textsuperscript{1472} Wieczorek-Zeul: We will continue to support Lebanon! Germany pledges over 100 million euros, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, (Bonn), 25 January 2007. Date of Access: 1 April 2007. http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,2144,2232709,00.html


\textsuperscript{1475} EU Summit Closes With Focus on Middle East, Deutsche Welle, (Berlin), 15 December 2006. Date of Access: 29 December 2006. http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,2144,2232709,00.html


Ministry of Finance, Germany has pledged USD134 million, of which USD43 million has been confirmed.1478

Analyst: Tatyana Zeljkovic and Arina Shadrikova

Italy: +1

The Italian government registered an acceptable level of compliance with regard to its St. Petersburg commitment to provide economic and humanitarian support to the Lebanese people. In addition, Italy has also stated its willingness to provide military support within the context of the United Nations. On 18 July 2006, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Massimo D’Alema, announced to the Chamber of Deputies on Recent Developments that Italy has "urged regional actors to act responsibly, and been ready even to bear a military burden, in addition to the political and economic ones foreseen by the G8 declaration."1479 The Italian government has consistently promised to deploy 2,000-3,000 troops, as well as offering to lead the force in order to decrease fighting.1480 The ground troops are promised to arrive in two groups, collectively creating the largest national contingent of UNIFIL forces. The first group arrived on 3 September 2006.1481

On 25 July 2006, Minister of Foreign Affairs D’Alema approved an emergency aid plan to be sent to the citizens of Lebanon.1482 The Italian government then made a financial pledge of USD39 million at the Stockholm Donors Conference.1483 Deputy Minister Patrizia Sentinelli, who led the Italian delegation to the conference, stated the funds would go towards healthcare, education, reconstruction, and the creation of a civil peace corps.1484 In addition, USD6.5 million was pledged towards the reconstruction of a vital bridge on the Beirut-Damascus highway.1485 According to the Presidency of Council of Ministers report, the Lebanese government has already received the funds promised.1486

Italy has also shown an interest in encouraging bilateral-economic trade relations.1487 On 27 October 2006, the first Italian economic mission in Lebanon returned.1488 The purpose of the mission was to reopen economic ties with the Lebanese government and local entrepreneurs in sectors such as building, infrastructure, agriculture and the environment.1489

On 25 January 2007 at the International Conference for Support to Lebanon, Italy’s total amount pledged was EUR120 million, with EUR65 million in low interest rate credits and a gift of EUR55 million.1490 In addition, Italy has also offered to suspend Lebanon’s commercial debt repayments to

---

1479 Address by Minister D’Alema before the Chamber of Deputies on Recent Developments in the Middle East, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, (Rome), 18 June 2007. Date of Access: 3 January 2007.
1485 Italy gives Lebanon €30 million (US$39 million) for reconstruction from Israeli war, recovery updates posted on Rebuild Lebanon, (Beirut), 20 November 2006. Date of Access: 25 November 2006.
1488 First Italian economic mission in Lebanon returned, recovery updates posted on Office of the Prime Minister, (Beirut), 27 October 2006. Date of Access: 4 January 2007.
1489 First Italian economic mission in Lebanon returned, recovery updates posted on Office of the Prime Minister, (Beirut), 27 October 2006. Date of Access: 4 January 2007.
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), and
On 10 November 2006 Japan extended emergency grant aid consisting of USD3 million to
financially support the activities of Japanese NGOs in implementing emergency humanitarian
landmines and unexploded ordnance in southern Lebanon to be implemented by the United Nations
through the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security to a project aimed at removing threats of
clearance of landmines is an essential step for that goal. Japan, therefore,
Southern Lebanon is of paramount importance for the stability of the entirety of Lebanon and that the
Mr. Kaneda stated that Japan is in accordance with the view that the stability and the development of
Southern Lebanon is of paramount importance for the stability of the entirety of Lebanon and that the
clearance of landmines is an essential step for that goal. Japan, therefore, also extended USD2 million
through the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security to a project aimed at removing threats of
landmines and unexploded ordnance in southern Lebanon to be implemented by the United Nations
Mine Action Service (UNMAS). Mr. Kaneda stressed the government of Japan’s commitment to
financially support the activities of Japanese NGOs in implementing emergency humanitarian
assistance for displaced persons.

On 10 November 2006 Japan extended emergency grant aid consisting of USD3 million through the
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), and

Analyst: Tatyana Zeljkovic

Japan: +1

Japan has complied with the St. Petersburg commitment concerning the Middle East. On 27 July 2006
Japan pledged assistance totaling USD2 million through the World Health Organization (WHO), the
World Food Programme (WFP) and the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in
the form of food, medical supplies, and shelter.

On 31 August 2006 Japan was represented at the International Donors Conference in Stockholm,
Sweden by then-Senior Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, Mr. Katsutoshi Kaneda, who
announced that Japan was ready to provide USD3 million in aid after examining the details of the early
recovery plan announced at the conference.

Mr. Kaneda stated that Japan is in accordance with the view that the stability and the development of
Southern Lebanon is of paramount importance for the stability of the entirety of Lebanon and that the
clearance of landmines is an essential step for that goal. Japan, therefore, also extended USD2 million
through the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security to a project aimed at removing threats of
landmines and unexploded ordnance in southern Lebanon to be implemented by the United Nations
Mine Action Service (UNMAS). Mr. Kaneda stressed the government of Japan’s commitment to
financially support the activities of Japanese NGOs in implementing emergency humanitarian
assistance for displaced persons.

On 10 November 2006 Japan extended emergency grant aid consisting of USD3 million through the
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), and

http://www.reuters.com/article/latestCrisis/idUSN29175581

Lebanon Crisis July 2006 Table A, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs Financial Tracking Service
ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R10_E15146__07010421.pdf.
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Remarks by Mr. Katsutoshi Kaneda Senior Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan on the Occasion of the International
Recovery Conference for Lebanon’s Early Recovery, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, (Tokyo), 31 August 2006. Date of Access:
through the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). This aid fulfilled Japan’s pledge made at the Stockholm Donors Conference.

On 25 January 2007, at the International Conference for Support to Lebanon held in Paris, Masatoshi Wakabayashi, Special Envoy of the Japanese Prime Minister stressed the importance of Lebanese stability as a means to achieve peace in the Middle East. Mr. Wakabayashi reiterated Japan’s commitment towards stability in the in the fields of water provision and the environment.

To date, Japan has contributed a total of USD3,992,100 toward the humanitarian and economic needs of the people of Lebanon. The Japanese financial commitments have included USD1 million allocated to the World Health Organization, USD1,992,100 towards the United Nations Mine Action Service, USD500,000 to the United Nations High Commission for Refugees, and USD500,000 to the World Food Programme.

**Russia: +1**

Russia has fully complied with its St. Petersburg commitment to provide economic and humanitarian support to the Lebanese people by continuing to provide financial and humanitarian aid to Lebanon. Russian Deputy Foreign minister Alexander Saltanov represented Russia at the International Donors Conference in Stockholm in August 31, 2007. During the Conference several bilateral contributions have been made.

The main contribution of Russia to postwar reconstruction is direct (based on bilateral Russian-Lebanese agreement) participation of Russian military engineers in rebuilding transport infrastructure. Since August Russian government had sent 4 hospital aircrafts with humanitarian aid on board and carried out a humanitarian relief operation for Lebanon worth a total of about 1.75 million dollars, by OCHA estimation.

According to the Periodic Report published by the Presidency of the Council of Ministers in Lebanon, Russia has provided to Lebanon donations in kind (food, medicine, etc.), estimated at 123 tons.

As a response to the request of Lebanese prime minister Fuad Siniora Russia proposed to Lebanese government help – sending engineering and sapper units of Russian army that would rebuild some ruined bridges, “which separated Lebanon so urgently needs” – said minister of defense Ivanov. Russian field engineer battalion (307 soldiers) was sent to Lebanon at the beginning of October to render assistance in postwar reconstruction according to the decision of Russian Parliament. Russian soldiers built nine bridges (instead of planned six) with a total length of 529 meters and 1500

---


1507 Mikhail Kamynin, the Spokesman of Russia’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Answers a Question from Interfax News Agency Regarding the Size of the Planned Russian Aid to Lebanon, Russian ministry of foreign affairs, (Moscow), 31 August 2006. Date of Access: 20 December 2006. http://www.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/psps/F5F094B099EE05E0C323571DB0055D11C.

1508 Mikhail Kamynin, the Spokesman of Russia’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Answers a Question from Interfax News Agency Regarding the Size of the Planned Russian Aid to Lebanon, Russian ministry of foreign affairs, (Moscow), 31 August 2006. Date of Access: 20 December 2006. http://www.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/psps/F5F094B099EE05E0C323571DB0055D11C.


meters of temporary roads, were transported 7500 tons of loads. The operation ended in December, the 10th of 2006.

Within a comparatively short time the Russian battalion also inspected the presence of dangerously explosive objects more than 15 thousand square meters of territory, after rendering harmless about 20 unexploded ammunition.

Furthermore, in an August 2006 statement by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, spokesman Mikhail Kamynin indicated that Russia would also be willing to provide medical treatment to civilians injured during the war.

The Governor of the Russian region Kemerovo also hosted one hundred Lebanese children affected by the war to vacation in Kuznetsk Basin in order to rest and receive medical attention.

In an October 2006 statement to the Russian Federation Council, Defence Minister Sergei Lavrov indicated that the Russian government expended nearly 500 million rubles (nearly USD18.5 million) on the operation.

In December 2006, President Vladimir Putin hosted Lebanese Prime Minister Fouad Siniora in the Kremlin. The two leaders discussed the Israeli-Lebanese conflict, and President Putin emphasized his government's support for the rebuilding of Lebanese economy and infrastructure.

On 25 January 2007 Russia took part in the International Donors conference on Lebanon held in Paris. According to the announcement of the Deputy Foreign Minister and special representative of Russian President in the Middle East Alexander Saltanov made at the conference Russian government intends to render additional assistance to Lebanon. By the moment Russian aid to postwar Lebanon is estimated at $ 30 million.

Hence, Russia complies fully with the commitment and scores “+1”.

**Analyst: Yulay Sultanov and Farnam Bidgoli**

**United Kingdom: +1**

The United Kingdom registered a high level of compliance with the Lebanon commitment made at the St. Petersburg Summit. On 31 August 2006 the United Kingdom was represented at the International Donors Conference in Stockholm by International Development Secretary Hilary Benn, who announced that GBP4 million (USD7.5 million) of UK funding already pledged to Lebanon would be used to help provide water, sanitation, munitions clearance, other multisectoral support, and bridges in response to the priorities identified in Lebanon’s Early Recovery Plan.

In September 2006, during a visit to Lebanon, Prime Minister Tony Blair signaled the United Kingdom’s strong support for Lebanese Prime Minister Fouad Siniora and his government. During this visit, the United Kingdom’s offer to play a role in security sector reform was welcomed by Lebanon. The United Kingdom had "made certain contributions that reduced the damage that might or could have been inflicted on Lebanon," according to Prime Minister Siniora.

---

In addition to humanitarian funding the United Kingdom has committed over USD2.5 million to clear spent and unexploded munitions.\textsuperscript{1523} On 13 September 2006 it was announced that funds from the United Kingdom had been used towards the building of prefabricated bridges in the south of Lebanon.\textsuperscript{1524}

On 1 December 2006, during British Foreign Minister Margaret Beckett's visit to Lebanon, the United Kingdom announced a further contribution of approximately USD2,244,000 towards the United Nations Mines Actions Service (UNMAS) and Mines Advisory Group (MAG) for further munitions clearance work in Lebanon.\textsuperscript{1525} This brings the United Kingdom's total contribution towards de-mining work in Lebanon this year to approximately USD5,202,340.\textsuperscript{1526}

On 25 January 2007 at the Paris III conference, UK Foreign Minister Margaret Beckett announced USD 48 million of new aid for Lebanon, to go through the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA). According to Foreign Minister Beckett, "one of the most disadvantaged groups in Lebanon are the Palestinian refugees" and the United Kingdom expects that a large portion of this money will go to them.\textsuperscript{1527}

The United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) reports that the total contribution of the United Kingdom to its Lebanon commitment stands at USD19,371,276, all of which has already been committed.\textsuperscript{1528} Funding from the United Kingdom has helped to provide health care, food, water, and sanitation to the Lebanese people.\textsuperscript{1529}

\textbf{Analyst: Kyle D'Souza}

\textbf{United States: +1}

The Government of United States of America registered a high level of compliance with the Lebanon commitment established at the 2006 G8 Summit in St. Petersburg. On behalf of the Government of United States, Ambassador Randall L. Tobias, Director of US Foreign Assistance and USAID Administrator confirmed President George W. Bush's immediate assistance package of USD230 million when he attended the Stockholm Donors Conference on Lebanon's Early Recovery on 31 August 2006.\textsuperscript{1530}

Of the total American aid package, USD180 million was earmarked specifically for infrastructure, economy rebuilding and environmental cleanups.\textsuperscript{1531} On 24 August 2006, the US Department of State announced that USD13.5 million of the funds allocated for Lebanon would go towards refugees, internally displaced persons (IDPs) and other conflict victims.\textsuperscript{1532} In addition, USAID provided 700 metric tons of wheat\textsuperscript{1533} and 300 metric tons of lentils to the World Food Program in late August 2006. The oil spill clean up project worth USD5 million was also successfully completed on 12 January


in immediate humanitarian assistance and the Disaster Assistance Response Team (DART) was deployed to the region on 23 July 2006 to assess humanitarian need. It was soon supported by a Washington, DC-based Response Management Team as well as the US Military. From 25 July to 24 August, USAID’s Office of US Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) provided 3,000 tarps, 40,000 blankets, and 18 emergency health kits in support of relief operations in Lebanon. The DART consigned these relief supplies to the Red Cross (ICRC), the U.N. World Health Organization (WHO), International Medical Corps (IMC), and Mercy Corps for delivery to nearly 300,000 beneficiaries in Beirut and southern Lebanon. The total US Government–donated commodities are valued at more than USD590,000, including transport. The most notable disaster assistance from the US came in the form of food commodities and unexploded ordnance (UXO) clearance support, valued at USD10 million and more than USD9.6 million, respectively.

On 22 September, The US-Lebanon Partnership Fund team traveled to Lebanon and witnessed the devastation firsthand. This particular fund was created to develop nationwide awareness and resources for Lebanon by a few private sector US companies. A similar initiative by Lebanese Americans termed the Lebanese American Renaissance Partnership (LARP) was assisted by USAID in January 2007. Partnering with Citibank, the United States’ Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) has also developed a public-private assistance program worth USD120 million, for local small and medium enterprises, the education sector and families. Further support through the Export-Import Bank of the United States is provided by way of loans worth USD7.5 million. All the missions aim to help the Lebanese economy in various capacities.


1537 USAID Launches Education Assistance for Development (LEAD) program to carry out public school rehabilitation projects. These initiatives are all part of the immediate assistance package of USD230 million.

2007, the Government of United States pledged an additional USD770 million towards rebuilding the country and its government.1545

As of 25 April 2007, a total of USD108,336,243 has been allocated through USAID for humanitarian assistance.1546 The aid is grouped into four major areas, which as follows: infrastructure rehabilitation, shelter, livelihood and agriculture and unexploded ordnance (UXO). Other significant areas include environmental cleanups, food security, psychosocial support, health, water, sanitation and emergency relief supplies. As of 25 April 2007, the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs reports that the US has committed a total of USD286,715,561.1547 Of the above total pledge, USD121,663,757 remains uncommitted.1548 A coordinated effort to improve the devastation in Lebanon, by various US government and international non-governmental agencies is reported to continue through May 2007.1549

Analyst: Farah Saleem

**European Union: +1**

The European Union registered a high level of compliance with the Lebanon commitment established at the 2006 G8 Summit in St. Petersburg, pledging substantial financial support to assist in reconstruction efforts, the reestablishment of internal security and the economic recovery of the private sector. In addition, the EU has demonstrated a commitment to addressing the humanitarian needs that have developed as a result of the 2006 Israel-Lebanon conflict.

The EU was represented at the International Donors Conference in Stockholm by Ms. Benita Ferrero-Waldner, Commissioner for External Relations & European Neighbourhood Policy.1550 At the donors conference the EU made a pledge of EUR42 million for Lebanon’s early recovery.1551 This package included EUR10 million to assist Lebanon in the post-conflict reconstruction process, EUR4 million towards the improvement of internal security conditions, EUR18 million towards the reinforcement of the private sector competitiveness, and an additional EUR10 million to be directed towards other needs identified by the Lebanese government.1552 The EU also allocated EUR11 million to the International Migration Office at the outset of the Israel-Lebanon Conflict in order to facilitate the evacuation of migrant workers.1553

The European conducted a 15-day assessment mission to Lebanon beginning on 11 September 2006, in which member states of the EU visited Beirut, Aytaroun, Bint Jbeil, Tyre, Nabatiyeh, Marjayoun, and Khiam as well as the Beqa’a region. The mission was aimed at carrying out a “rapid damage assessment in the fields of public infrastructure, energy, water, environment, transport and, more generally, economic and social development.”1554

By October 2006 the EU had also pledged an additional EUR50 million in humanitarian aid for Lebanon, EUR20 million of which to be facilitated through the European Commission Humanitarian Aid
Priorities identified for the funds included water and sanitation, shelter, food and household goods, activities generating income, healthcare and psycho-social counselling, and mine clearance. At the Paris III conference on 25 January 2007, European Commission President José Manuel Barroso and European Neighbourhood Policy Commissioner Benita Ferrero-Waldner presented a new assistance package, bringing the EU's total assistance for Lebanon to EUR522 million since the Lebanon Crisis began in July 2006.

By the end of 2006 the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs reported the EU pledged a total of USD95,335,480 to the Lebanon relief effort, of which USD57,647,038 had already been committed. Funds from the EU commitment have been directed primarily towards food aid and humanitarian assistance, although some funds have also been allocated to the repair and redevelopment of Lebanon’s infrastructure.

Analyst: Cliff Vanderlinden

Appendix A: Interpretive Guidelines

[To be added; currently available at http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2006_guidelines.pdf]
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