G8 Institutionalization as a Cause of Compliance: The DOT Force Case

Gina Stephens
PhD Candidate
University of Toronto
stephens@trinity.utoronto.ca

Abstract

It is increasingly evident that there is a connection between incidents of G8 structural expansion (notably in the increasing number of expert working groups) and enhanced cooperation and compliance to G8 commitments. With insights provided by constructivism and social identity theory, this paper analyzes the case of the G8's Digital Opportunities Task Force (DOT Force) working group and observes that an increase in institutionalization and specialization in "top-down" created working groups effects a change in their participant's interests and identities, thereby increasing cooperation and eventually compliance. These tightly-focused groups, especially those tasked with policy areas that are relatively novel (where there is little pre-existing or divisive national policy among G8 members – such as the issue area of ICT and its role in development) provide a forum that favours the evolution of a group-centric identity that mitigates an overwhelming concentration on national conceptions of relative capability. Further, the creation of working groups that involve members from societal groups and countries beyond the G8, and whose work are embedded in a larger constellation of international bodies working in the same policy area, also seem to provide extra impetus for compliance and indeed provide a novel way of extending the G8's ability to provide coherent global governance.

Introduction:

The G8 is a rapidly evolving, and increasingly influential institution that has a substantial impact on international cooperation and coordination.[1] Following the end of the Cold War and the inclusion of Russia into a new G8, this institution has expanded in

---

[1] At its inception in 1975, the then G6 Summit was convened as an *ad hoc* meeting between the leaders of the six major industrial nations to deal with pressing issues concerning economic policy coordination and the difficulties engendered by the increasing economic interdependence of its members.   The first meeting in Rambouillet, France was then solidified and regularized in the following year by the United States, and with the addition of Canada became an annual meeting of the G7. This Group became the G8 in 1998 when Russia was accepted as a full member.

depth and breadth to deal with a growing array of global issues, both economic and political. This growth has led some to view this institution as an evolving centre for global governance in the post-Cold War era.[2]

As the G8's focus has expanded beyond its original role in economic policy coordination, so to have its instruments created to assist this expansion. In particular, the G8 practice of creating issue-specific working groups has become increasingly frequent.[3] At the same time, G8 countries as a group have also demonstrated increasing levels of compliance to their Summit commitments.[4] Thus, it seems increasingly likely that there is a connection between incidents of G8 structural expansion (notably in the increasing number of expert working groups) and enhanced cooperation and compliance to G8 commitments. With insights provided by constructivism and social identity theory, this paper analyzes the case of the G8's Digital Opportunities Task Force (DOT Force) working group and observes that an increase in institutionalization and specialization in "top-down" created working groups effects a change in their participant's interests and identities, thereby increasing cooperation and eventually compliance. These tightly-focused groups, especially those tasked with policy areas that are relatively novel (where there is little pre-existing or divisive national policy among G8 members – such as the issue area of ICT and its role in development) provide a forum that favours the evolution of a group-centric identity that mitigates an overwhelming concentration on national

---

[2] John Kirton, "Economic Co-operation: Summitry, Institutions, and Structural Change" , in John Dunning and Gavin Boyd, eds., Structural Change and Co-operation in the Global Economy, (London: Edward Elgar, 1997) Also:, Nicholas Bayne, *Hanging in There: The G7 and G8 Summit in Maturity and Renewal*, (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2000);, John Ikenberry, *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars,* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).
[3] G8 Information Centre, "G7 Official-Level Meetings and Documents", Sept. 26, 2005. Accessed February 26, 2006. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/meetings-official.html
[4] Ella Kokotsis, *Keeping International Commitments: Compliance, Credibility and the G7, 1988-1995.* New York: Garland Publishing. 1999. p. 269.

conceptions of relative capability. Further, the creation of working groups that involve

members from societal groups and countries beyond the G8, and whose work are

embedded in a larger constellation of international bodies working in the same policy

area, also seem to provide extra impetus for compliance and indeed provide a novel way

of extending the G8's ability to provide coherent global governance.

The DOT Force – Genesis and Achievements:

The DOT Force was a G8 expert working group created as an outcropping of the

Okinawa Charter on Global Information Society, which was unveiled at the 2000 G8

Okinawa Summit.[5] At this Summit, the G8 leaders mandated the creation of the DOT

Force in recognition of the need for a truly global strategy for addressing the concern of a

developing "digital divide"[6] between the developed and developing world and the

powerful potential of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) to aid in the

advancement of development:

> "[T]here is a need for greater international dialogue and collaboration to
> improve the effectiveness of IT-related programmes and projects with
> developing countries, and to bring together the 'best practices' and
> mobilize the resources available from all stakeholders to help close the
> digital divide. The G8 will seek to promote the creation of a stronger
> partnership among developed and developing countries, civil society
> including private firms and NGOs, foundations and academic institutions,
> and international organizations. We will also work to see that developing
> countries can, in partnership with other stakeholders, be provided with
> financial, technical and policy input in order to create a better environment
> for, and use of, IT."[7]

---

[5] Government of Japan, "Okinawa Charter on Global Information Society", Okinawa, July 22, 2000.
Accessed Feb. 25, 2006. http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/g7/summit/2000okinawa/gis.htm
[6] The term "digital divide" originated in the mid-1990's to describe the disparity between those that had
access to the internet and those who did not. Initially the term was used simply to describe technical
access, but later it began to encompass more complex measures of access such as social infrastructure
(access to education, literacy rates) and content (the ability to produce and consume information on the
internet). Leslie Regan Shade, "Here Comes the DOT Force: The New Cavalry for Equity?", *Gazette: The
International Journal for Communication Studies.* 65(2): 107-120. p. 108.
[7] *Ibid.*

The G8 presidency appointed a DOT Force secretariat that consisted of four individuals – two members from the World Bank and two members from the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). This secretariat was then responsible for the further construction of the rest of the 47-member task force. Each G8 country was asked to field representatives from 3 societal sectors: government, private sector business, and from non-profit organizations (NPO's). Eight non-G8, developing countries were also asked to provide governmental representatives.[8] This membership was further complemented by the addition of single members from the European Commission, the OECD, ECOSOC, UNESCO, UNCTAD, ITU, the World Economic Forum (WEF), the Global Information Infrastructure Commission (GIIC) and the Global Business Dialogue on E-Commerce (GBDE).

The objectives of the DOT Force were also laid out in the Okinawa Charter:

1. the facilitation of dialogue and discussion with a variety of stakeholders: developing countries, international organizations, NGOs;
2. G8 coordination of ICT programmes and projects;
3. the promotion of policy dialogue and education and awareness programmes;
4. examination of private sector inputs; and
5. reporting of findings and activities before the next annual meeting in Genoa.

Four priority areas were also established:

1. fostering policy, regulatory and network readiness;
2. improving connectivity, increasing access and lowering costs;
3. building human capacity; and
4. encouraging participation in global e-commerce networks.

The DOT Force was set up with a deliberate time-frame that guided its actions.

The first phase of its operation was to uncover and identify concrete methods and projects

---

[8] The developing country members were Bolivia, Brazil, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Senegal, South Africa and Tanzania.

for bridging the digital divide, and to ensure the full participation of developing countries in the global information society. To do this, the DOT Force was to undertake three two-day plenary meetings for all the members (with meetings taking place in Tokyo, Cape Town, and Siena, respectively).   These plenaries were designed to incrementally create a final report that would then be presented to the G8 leaders at the next G8 Summit in Genoa, Italy. In between plenary meetings, member countries and organizations were to focus on creating outreach consultations within their own countries thereby building a broader network of stakeholders which would not only forward inputs for the Genoa report, but provide key linkages within their own domestic contexts that would assist the Task Force in its later implementation phase.

The consultative process was taken very seriously by all members, although it was pointed out by the developing country members that their ability to field an extensive domestic consultation was more constrained by both limited resources and the short time-frame of less than a year for these consultations to take place.[9] The most extensive and arguably most effective consultation process took place in Canada. The Canadian Civil Society Consultation was undertaken both physically (at relevant events across the country) and virtually (via email lists and electronic message boards) and was organized by Maureen O'Neil, the Canadian NPO DOT Force representative from the International Development Research Centre (IDRC).[10] A website (Dotciv) was set up as a hub for the overall consultation process, and invitations were sent out to civil society organizations to

[9] Kevin McSorley, "The Securlar Salvation Story of the Digital Divide", *Ethics and Information Technology*. 5: 75-87, 2003.

[10] Jean-Francois Delannoy, "Report on the dotciv discussion", May 2001. Accessed March 1, 2006. http://www.bellanet.org/dotforce/docs/dotciv_report.doc?ois=y;template=blank.htm

participate in developing the Canadian input to the DOT Force discussions.[11] It is clear

from an examination of the working documents that stemmed from the Dotciv initiative,

that the consultative process was key to the formation of a broader and richer Canadian

position. A consistent thread in the early discussions between governmental

representatives and civil society organizations was the need to move beyond a "narrow

(emphasis on infrastructure, telecoms)" and "technicist (technical considerations driving

the Canadian position rather than a development concern)" approach.[12] It is evident that

this suggestion was taken to heart by the Canadian DOT Force representatives as this

emphasis appears in the content of the Canadian contribution to the Task Force's Genoa

Plan of Action – particularly in terms of emphasizing the importance of a gender focus in

ICT development, which was an early Canadian contribution to the document.

   The transformation and enrichment of the discussion surrounding the 'digital

divide' to one that went beyond merely technical considerations was something that

occurred within the DOT Force as a whole and reflects the development of a group

consensus on the norms that should underscore not only the course of their own work but

the projects and proposed solutions that the Task Force would eventually put forward.

The DOT Force explicitly sought, early on, to provide an overarching normative frame of

reference in the area of ICT and development – a frame of reference that would provide

coherence and guidance both within the G8 and without. This is evident in the summary

documents that stemmed from the first plenary, which state that all participants agreed to

---

[11] http://www.bellanet.org/dotforce/index.cfm?fuseaction=main&lang=en
[12] *Ibid.*

several basic principles that should "undergird the work of the Task Force."[13] Of

particular note is the stated need for G8 Governments and other participants to "feel and

actively demonstrate *ownership* of the DOT Force process" and that this should be an

"iterative, participatory process" that is as "*inclusive* as possible given the time

constraints".[14] (italics in the original) Likewise, the first plenary document underscores

the importance of embedding a solution to the 'digital divide' within a broader

development process, noting that "there is no dichotomy between the 'digital divide' and

the broader social and economic divides at the heart of the development process."[15]

The report that resulted from the consultative process, *Digital Opportunities for

All: Meeting the Challenge*, was presented to the G8 leaders, as expected, in July 2001 in

Genoa, Italy at the annual leaders' Summit.[16] This report contained a detailed, nine-point

Plan of Action designed to offer a "fresh vision of how to bridge the Digital Divide."[17]

The report supported the varying needs of different countries with regards to the

implementation of ICT use for development and suggested that developing countries

must become producers of content, not simply consumers, and it identified the key role of

community-based organizations and NGOs in providing the means to assist this

process.[18] The document also highlighted the unique ability of ICTs to address gender

---

[13] DOT Force Secretariat, "First Plenary Meeting of the Digital Opportunities Task Force (DOT Force)", Tokyo, Japan. November 27-28, 2000. Pg. 2. Accessed Feb. 15, 2006
http://www.funredes.org/mistica/english/cyberlibrary/participants/docuparti/eng_doc_05.html.
[14] *Ibid.*
[15] *Ibid.*
[16] DOT Force (2001) 'Digital Opportunities for All: Meeting the Challenge". 11 May 2001. Accessed Feb. 25, 2006. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2002kananaskis/dotforce_reportcard.pdf
[17] *Ibid.*
[18] *Ibid.*

issues and that special efforts "should aim at enhancing the level of connectivity among the poorest, women and children."[19]

The nine points of the proposed Action Plan committed the DOT Force to:

- Help establish and support developing countries and emerging economy national e-strategies.
- Improve connectivity, increase access and lower costs
- Enhance human capacity development, knowledge, creation and sharing;
- Foster enterprise and entrepreneurship for sustainable economic development
- Establish and support universal participation in addressing new international policy and technical issues raised by the Internet and information and communications technologies;
- Establish and support dedicated initiatives for the information and communications technologies inclusion of less-developed countries;
- Promote information and communications technologies to support health care and fight against HIV/AIDS and other infectious and communicable diseases;
- Encourage national and international efforts to support local content and applications creation;
- Prioritize information and communications technologies in the G8, as well as other development assistance policies and programs; and
- Enhance the coordination of multilateral initiatives.[20]

Following the acceptance of the Plan of Action at the Genoa Summit, the DOT Force moved into its implementation phase. First, under the new Canadian Chair, seven implementation teams were created and assigned to the following areas: Access and Connectivity; National E-Strategies; Human Capacity and Knowledge; Enterprise and Entrepreneurship; ICT for Health; Global Policy Participation; and Local Content and Applications. Members from the Task Force were assigned to each team with the expectation that these seven teams would prepare reports on their individual initiatives as well as contribute to a general Report Card to be presented to the G8 leaders at the

---

[19] *Ibid.*
[20] Industry Canada, "Report Released on Bridging Global Digital Divide", June 25, 2002. Accessed 2 Mar 2006.
http://www.ic.gc.ca/cmb/welcomeic.nsf/558d63659099294285256488005215 5b/85256a220056c2a485256 be3006e85ae!OpenDocument&Highlight=2,dot

Kananaskis Summit the following year.[21] The teams operated "in an independent and decentralized fashion, stressing an informal and practical approach focused on results."[22] The implementation process was highly structured, featuring several progress reviews for each team throughout the year to assess whether the implementation of the Plan of Action was on target. These reviews resulted in concrete reports to the Canadian Chair who guided the process and oversaw the group's "stocktaking" meetings and the creation of their final report which was released at Kananaskis. When this document was presented at the Summit in 2002, the achievements that it chronicled were impressive:

> Less than one year later, the DOT Force vision has moved dramatically closer to realization. Participation has reached well beyond its original membership to include almost 100 stakeholder organizations, spanning more than 30 countries. Through the work of its implementation teams, the DOT Force has generated more than 20 major bilateral and multilateral initiatives, operating across a broad range of areas crucial to balanced development – access, governance, entrepreneurship, health, and education. In designing and implementing these initiatives, DOT Force members have also given special attention to the needs of lesser developed countries, and particularly to Africa, responding directly to the requirements articulated in the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD).[23]

Although the DOT Force was formally disbanded once its report was given, the work began by the Task Force and the initiatives that it produced have continued through a variety of other bodies, both governmental and non-governmental. The United Nations Information and Communications Technologies Task Force (UN ICT) has taken over as a focal point for continuing the process begun by the DOT Force, assisted by the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC). In the private sector, former DOT Force partners such as the World Economic Forum, the Global Business Dialogue on Electronic

---

[21] *Ibid.*
[22] DOT Force Secretariat 'Digital Opportunities for All: Meeting the Challenge". 11 May 2001. Accessed Feb. 25, 2006. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2002kananaskis/dotforce_reportcard.pdf
[23] *Ibid.*

Commerce and the International Chamber of Commerce will also continue its work.[24]

Likewise, there exists a regular summit system in the form of the World Summit on the

Information Society, which takes place every two years, to anchor progress in this issue

area.

Explaining G8 Compliance with DOT Force Initiatives:

The issue area of ICT and Development is obviously a fairly new one to the G8,

especially in terms of those aspects that pertain to internet technologies, yet there is

evidence of G8 activity in the area as early as 1996 with communiqué commitments

centring on the Global Information Society. Initially, performance in this issue area was

poor -- the Summit's activities in this area were assigned a grade of "C" by the G8

Research Group in 1997.[25] This record shows a marked improvement, however, with the

creation of the DOT Force in 2000, garnering two successive "A" grades for 2001 and

2002 within that issue area.[26]

Compliance to DOT Force initiatives was also extraordinarily high, with a 100%

compliance score across all 8 countries for commitments made at the Okinawa Summit of

2000, followed by a nearly perfect score for the completion of commitments made in

Genoa the following year (all countries demonstrated full compliance with the exception

of Russia, which scored a -1 compliance rate, thereby bringing the total score down to

75% compliance).[27]

---

[24] *Ibid.*
[25] G8 Research Group, "G8 Performance Assessment by Issue, 1996-2004". Accessed 2 March 2006.
http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/evaluations/assessments.htm
[26] *Ibid.*
[27] G8 Research Group, "G8 Compliance Report – Okinawa 2000". Accessed 2 March 2006.
http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/2001compliance/2001reportDot.pdf

What explains these extraordinarily high compliance scores? I suggest that G8 compliance was positively affected in this case by a number of key factors: the creation of a working group; the structure and content of the working group and its particular policy task; the development of a group identity and norms; and the existence of other international organizations with a similar, and sometimes overlapping, membership.

The creation of a working group by the G8 leaders represents, in the first instance, a high measure of political will to seek results in a particular policy area, results that may not otherwise be achievable at other levels of the Summit structure.   The Foreign Ministers' process, for example, is quite vibrant but it is also quite broad in terms of the number of different policy areas and initiatives that are brought forward during the Summit cycle, making it difficult to achieve a more detailed and focused policy outcome with attainable goals and commitments. A working group allows a tighter focus on a particular policy area and produces a more substantial and detailed policy outcomes. Likewise, it has been proven by previous analytical studies that increased institutionalization has a positive effect on G8 compliance.[28] Reasons for this are readily apparent: institutionalization creates a focus on a particular area of policy and also creates necessary linkages within G8 domestic political structures that favour follow-through on these commitments. The multistakeholder structure of the DOT Force multiplied this effect, as it mobilized not only members of the G8 countries' domestic bureaucracies, but it also mobilized two other key societal sectors that had influence within the policy area: the business community and the non-profit, civil society sector. This unique structure, combined with the extensive consultation process that

---

[28] Ella Kokotsis, *Keeping International Commitments: Compliance, Credibility and the G7, 1988-1995.* New York: Garland Publishing. 1999. p. 269.

communicated the aims of the Task Force to a broader audience within the G8 countries, created the necessary "buy-in" at the domestic level, and mobilized consent for the financial expenditures required to fulfill the Task Force's work.

Likewise, the structure and work plan of the Task Force encouraged compliance. The goals of the organization were clearly elucidated at its creation and a concrete work program with clear target dates for completion were established, which guided and focused the work, preventing any lags or confusion that might occur with a group of that size. Similarly, once in the implementation phase, the further split of the group into smaller units tasked with narrower goals also served to provide focus, and the institution of "stocktaking" exercises and the requirement for team progress reports during implementation further encouraged compliance by assigning transparent accountability. The effectiveness of the group's structure was even apparent to the members of the group themselves, as this was noted explicitly in the plenary documents: "the tripartite, participatory, iterative, experimental nature of the process with developing countries at its center, permitted a degree of informality, speed, and creativity that might not always be possible in international fora."[29]

An increase in G8 compliance in this policy area may also be caused by the particular task that the group worked on. In this case, the DOT Force's work involved an area that was novel in terms of policy. The internet and its uses for development was a subject area that was fairly undeveloped within G8 governments and therefore there were few conflictual policy stances between G8 members in this area. Likewise, the upper-

---

[29] DOT Force Secretariat, "First Plenary Meeting of the Digital Opportunities Task Force (DOT Force)", Tokyo, Japan. November 27-28, 2000. Pg. 2. Accessed Feb. 15, 2006
http://www.funredes.org/mistica/english/cyberlibrary/participants/docuparti/eng_doc_05.html.

levels of the G8 structure were more likely to accept the recommendations of an expert

group in an area that required technical knowledge – especially if those experts had been

chosen by the G8 governments themselves. This potential for breaking new ground was

also recognized by the Task Force early on in the plenary phase : "the multi-

constituency, participatory nature of this Task Force could help to set the standard for

international policymaking bodies on the digital economy at a time when international

policy frameworks and mechanisms are still fluid in this area;"[30]

That working groups within the G8 structure should have such a significant effect

on a policy area has previously been observed in the academic community. Sir Nicholas

Bayne accurately noted that the increase in institutionalization is inevitable given the

complexities of globalization, and further that it is not surprising that these groups should

have a wider effect beyond that even of the G8:

> This expanding summit apparatus is not just the usual bureaucratic spread;
> …The most powerful influence on this proliferation is the iterative way in
> which the summits work. The summits grapple with difficult and unfamiliar
> issues. They often need several attempts before hitting the right solution.
> They handle subjects for which there are no satisfactory global institutions.
> In these conditions, it becomes natural to create G7 or G8 groups to work on
> the issues between summits, to prepare future decisions and to keep track of
> problems, even when they have been handed on to wider institutions. *These
> subsidiary groups, at ministerial or official level, gradually acquire a life of
> their own.* [31][emphasis added]

Bayne implies, but doesn't explore, the creation of a group-centric identity that may form

in groups such as the DOT Force. This group identity and the formulation of group

norms, may then increase their members' perception of the importance of the work and

encourage compliance when those members return to their domestic bureaucracies.

---

[30] *Ibid.*

[31] Nicholas Bayne, "Continuity and Leadership in the Age of Globalisation", in Hodges, Michael, John
Kirton, Joseph Daniels (eds.), *The G8's Role in the New Millenium.* Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Co.,
1999. pp. 21-44. p. 38

The creation of a group identity within a group like the DOT Force has also been noted in the broader constructivist literature on international organizations.[32] As Martha Finnemore observes, actor and structure begin to act on each other in a feedback loop: "Actors create structures which take on a life of their own and in turn shape subsequent action."[33] The increase in the G8's institutional breadth and depth, especially in the post Cold War period, has therefore created a dense system of groups in which the interaction of individuals creates policy outputs. The negotiation of these policy outputs are clearly shaped by the internal dynamic of the individuals comprising these groups. The social interactions which occur within these groups may shape not only what their members see as their individual interests, but ultimately how they view their own identities – especially when dealing with new problems where few pre-existing national policies exist. These individual estimations of interests and identities (and the social norms that engender them) may then be exported further to other G8 groups at different levels (ie. working groups to Sherpas), to domestic bureaucracies, and/or other international fora. In this way, the interactions that shape interests and identities may play as powerful a role as material factors in shaping agenda setting and policy outcomes, as Finnemore observes:

> The fact that we live in an international society means that what we want and, in some ways, who we are are shaped by social norms, rules, understandings, and relationships we have with others. These social realities are as influential as material realities in determining behaviour. Indeed they are what endow material realities with meaning and purpose.[34]

---

[32] Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of World Politics*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 1999. Andrew Baker, ""The G-7 As a Global 'Ginger Group': Plurilateralism and Four-Dimensional Diplomacy." *Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations* 6, No. 2 (April/June 2000): 165-89.

[33] Martha Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1996. p. 30.

[34] *Ibid.* p. 128.

Alison Bailin also points to the importance of iterated group interaction and information

sharing in the Summit context on the formation of individual identity and its related

impact on group cooperation:

> Summit discussions reinforce group identity. Summiteers develop personal
> relationships. The group designates roles for members through discussion.
> Each knows that fulfilling its role is critical for success. In such a small,
> exclusive group, it is easy to discern a single actor's contribution or effect on
> the situation.[35]

Thus, the structure of the DOT Force – with its well-defined work programme, replete

with clear deadlines, frequent meetings, and smaller micro-groups for implementation –

was exemplary of this effect.

Insights from the field of social psychology are also useful in illuminating the

importance of the group structures that have evolved within the Summit system in the

post Cold War era and their impact on the internal functioning of the G8 by their effect

on the individual policymakers that comprise these groups. Social identity theory reveals

the importance of group membership to the establishment of personal identity.[36] In

particular, Tyler and Blader identify the role of group status (how influential/important a

group is perceived to be) on the formation of individual identity.[37] The more influential

a group is, the more attractive group membership is to the individual as it reinforces

positive perceptions of individual status, which in turn encourages the individual to

---

[35] Bailin, Allison "From Traditional to Institutionalized Hegemony", *G8 Governance*, February 2001. p. 17. Accessed Feb. 26, 2006 from the University of Toronto's G8 Information Centre: http://www.g7.utoronto.ca.

[36] Tom Tyler and Steven L. Blader, "Identity and cooperative behavior in groups", *Group Processes &Intergroup Relations.* Volume 4 (3), 2001. 207-226. p. 209. See also: Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B., "Self and Social Identity", *Annual Review of Psychology,* 53, 161-196. 2002. Brown, Rupert, "Social Identity Theory: Past achievements, current problems and future challenges", European Journal of Psychology, 2000, Nov-Dec v. 30(6), 745-748. Ellemers, N. Koretakaas, P. & Ouwerkerk, J.W. "Self-categorization, commitment to the group, and group self-esteem as related but distinct aspects of social identity." *European Journal of Social Psychology,* 29, 1999. p. 371-389.; Hogg, M. & Abrams, D. *Social identifications: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes.* (London: Routledge) 1988.

[37] Tyler and Blader.

increasingly act in ways that further the group's collective interest. In high status groups, the individual's own identity becomes co-mingled internally with that of the group:

> Since the perceived quality of the group literally reflects on [the individual's] sense of self and their feelings of self-worth, the group's success can bring about benefits for their identity and vice versa. This leads to a link between the success of the group and the maintenance of a positive sense of self. Alternatively, they may be motivated to work on behalf of the group simply as a behavioral expression of their connection with the group… We expect that when people are identified as such with their group, they will be more willing to act cooperatively toward the group – investing their time and energy in working to see the group succeed.[38]

Most importantly, Tyler and Blader, and other social psychologists, specify that this co-mingling of individual and group identity internally leads to changes in the individual's attitudes and values, and that this change in values is not motivated "by external contingencies such as resources."[39] This finding echoes the constructivist literature on norms, which posits that material factors may simply be a secondary motivator of compliant and cooperative behaviour.[40]

Another factor that influenced G8 compliance to the DOT Force commitments was the embeddedness of the group in other ongoing processes in the policy area that involved other international organizations with an overlapping membership. The DOT Force work was also in line with other broader programs of development, adopting similar conclusions to that of the OECD's DAC on mainstreaming gender into bilateral and multilateral development programs. Similarly, the DOT Force also connected its own work to the larger G8 Africa Action Plan initiative presented at Kananaskis, allowing it to utilize the political momentum for the Africa plan to assist compliance to

---

[38] *Ibid.* p. 210.

[39] A. Kohn, *Punished by rewards: The trouble with gold stars, incentive plans, A's, praise, and other bribes.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin. 1999.

[40] Jeffrey Checkel, "Social Constructivism in global and European politics: a review essay", *Review of International Studies,* Volume 30:2 April 2004. pp. 229-224; Steve Bernstein, "International institutions and the framing of domestic policies: The Kyoto Protocol and Canada's response to climate change", *Policy Sciences,* 35(2): 203-236, June 2002; Finnemore. 1996.

its own agenda. Additionally, the DOT Force included representatives from relevant

international organizations that worked in the policy area of ICT and development (the

OECD and the World Bank, for example), and it deliberately located its work within a

constellation of likeminded organizations in order to ensure that work in the area (and the

guiding norms that the DOT Force created) continued past its own end-date:

> As a process conducted under the G8, the DOT Force formally sunsets
> with this report. Its agenda, however, has now become the business of a
> number of other bodies that will carry on the leadership role of the DOT
> Force within the international community. The UN ICT Task Force,
> established by the Secretary-General in November 2001, shares the DOT
> Force vision and approach, and provides a focal point for establishing
> strategic direction, policy coherence and advocacy in relation to the
> global, ICT-based development agenda. Through its regional networks,
> the UN ICT Task Force provides an effective means for broader outreach
> and the effective involvement of developing countries in future
> implementation work. In the private sector, organizations such as the
> World Economic Forum, the Global Business Dialogue on Electronic
> Commerce, and the International Chamber of Commerce have also
> accepted the challenge of widening digital opportunities within the
> developing world.[41]

Finally, the fact that the Task Force was headed by a Canadian Chair during the

Canadian presidency of the G8 assisted in securing compliance during the

implementation phase. The Canadians were motivated to ensure a smooth completion of

the DOT Force's work and to provide a successful conclusion to an initiative that

essentially showcased many successful Canadian projects in the area of ICT and

development, projects that connected not only with the DOT Force initiative but also with

the larger Kananaskis priority of the Africa Action Plan.[42] Thus, Canada employed the

---

[41] DOT Force Secretariat 'Digital Opportunities for All: Meeting the Challenge". 11 May 2001. Accessed
Feb. 25, 2006. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2002kananaskis/dotforce_reportcard.pdf
[42] There were three such Canadian initiatives: the Canadian e-Policy Resource Centre (CePRC), the
Centre for Connectivity in Africa, and Enablis (which was formerly the DOT Force Entrepreneurship

hosting prerogative to place particular emphasis at the G8 leader-level on the Africa

Action Plan, and within that, the DOT Force initiative.

Conclusion:

The DOT Force represents a successful experiment on the part of the G8 with the

institutionalization of an expert working group that extends beyond the original G8

parameters. Certainly members of the DOT Force themselves recognized that their group

represented a unique and almost magical formula for a successful task force:

> The DOT Force implementation teams have become the primary means of
> implementing the Genoa Plan of Action. Their initiatives illustrate the key
> elements in the DOT Force formula – they include innovative models of
> development that are scalable and replicable; they involve partners from
> developing countries in all phases, from design to delivery; they rely on
> public-private partnerships; and they carry minimal overhead, allowing for
> speedy implementation. Their autonomy and operational flexibility are
> key values to nurture in the deployment of projects, while seeking high-
> level support from global organizations.[43]

The unique structure and task of the DOT Force, resulted not only in clear,

detailed, and achievable policy objectives, it also led to the expression of common values

and the development of a group identity that encouraged compliance. The combination

of separate societal sectors within the group's composition, and the unifying aspect of the

working group in terms of identifying and prioritizing policy objectives also enhanced

compliance. Likewise, the reporting structure and internally constructed measures of

accountability throughout the consultative and implementation phases assisted greatly

with maintaining the focus on the task at hand for all member countries and transmitted

this focus to G8 member bureaucracies, thereby ensuring compliance.

Network – DFEN). Richard Simpson, "The G8 DOT Force" : powerpoint presentation presented at the
OECD Global Forum on Knowledge Economy, March 4-5, 2003.
[43] DOT Force Secretariat 'Digital Opportunities for All: Meeting the Challenge". 11 May 2001. Accessed
Feb. 25, 2006. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2002kananaskis/dotforce_reportcard.pdf

The case of the DOT Force represents an ideal model for the construction of future working groups with the G8. The broad membership of a group like the DOT Force silences critics who vilify the G8 for being unrepresentative of the developing world and the broader sectors of their own societies. The breadth of its membership, which employs a similar strategy to the World Health Organization's Public Private Partnerships (PPPs)[44], also extends the reach and the available resources of the G8 to enact truly effective global governance.

---

[44] The World Health Organization (WHO has recently begun their own successful program that brings together "national Ministries of Health, the WHO, companies within the private sector, international development agencies and foundations, non-governmental organizations, research and academic institutions, and local communities" in an effort to fight disease. World Health Organization, "Partnerships". Accessed Mar 2, 2006. http://www.who.int/neglected_diseases/partnership/en/

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bailin, Allison "From Traditional to Institutionalized Hegemony", *G8 Governance*, February 2001. Accessed Feb. 26, 2006 from the University of Toronto's G8 Information Centre: http://www.g7.utoronto.ca.

Bayne, Nicholas "Continuity and Leadership in the Age of Globalisation", in Hodges, Michael, John Kirton, Joseph Daniels (eds.), *The G8's Role in the New Millenium.* Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Co., 1999. pp. 21-44.

Bayne, Nicholas, *Hanging in There: The G7 and G8 Summit in Maturity and Renewal*, (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2000)

Bernstein, Steven, "International institutions and the framing of domestic policies: The Kyoto Protocol and Canada's response to climate change", *Policy Sciences,* 35(2): 203-236, June 2002;

Brown, Rupert, "Social Identity Theory: Past achievements, current problems and future challenges", European Journal of Psychology, 2000, Nov-Dec v. 30(6), 745-748.

Checkel, Jeffrey, "Social Constructivism in global and European politics: a review essay", *Review of International Studies,* Volume 30:2 April 2004. pp. 229-224

Delannoy, Jean-Francois, "Report on the dotciv discussion", May 2001. Accessed March 1, 2006. http://www.bellanet.org/dotforce/docs/dotciv_report.doc?ois=y;template=blank.htm

DOT Force Secretariat, "First Plenary Meeting of the Digital Opportunities Task Force (DOT Force)", Tokyo, Japan. November 27-28, 2000. Pg. 2. Accessed Feb. 15, 2006 http://www.funredes.org/mistica/english/cyberlibrary/participants/docuparti/eng_doc_05.html.

DOT Force Secretariat 'Digital Opportunities for All: Meeting the Challenge". 11 May 2001. Accessed Feb. 25, 2006. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2002kananaskis/dotforce_reportcard.pdf

Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B., "Self and Social Identity", *Annual Review of Psychology,* 53, 161-196. 2002

Ellemers, N. Koretakaas, P. & Ouwerkerk, J.W. "Self-categorization, commitment to the group, and group self-esteem as related but distinct aspects of social identity." *European Journal of Social Psychology,* 29, 1999. p. 371-389.

Finnemore, Martha, *National Interests in International Society.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1996. Hodges, Michael, John Kirton, Joseph Daniels (eds.), *The G8's Role in the New Millenium.*)Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Co., 1999)

G8 Information Centre, "G7 Official-Level Meetings and Documents", Sept. 26, 2005. Accessed February 26, 2006. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/meetings-official.html

G8 Research Group, "G8 Performance Assessment by Issue, 1996-2004". Accessed 2 March 2006. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/evaluations/assessments.htm

G8 Research Group, "G8 Compliance Report – Okinawa 2000". Accessed 2 March 2006. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/2001compliance/2001reportDot.pdf

Government of Italy, "G8 Communique Genova 2001 Final" July 22 2001. Accessed March 1, 2006. http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/g7/summit/2001genoa/finalcommunique.html

Government of Japan, "Okinawa Charter on Global Information Society", Okinawa, July 22, 2000. Accessed Feb. 25, 2006. http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/g7/summit/2000okinawa/gis.htm

Hogg, M. & Abrams, D. *Social identifications: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes.* (London: Routledge) 1988.

Ikenberry, John, *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars,* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001)

Industry Canada, "Report Released on Bridging Global Digital Divide", June 25, 2002. Accessed 2 Mar 2006. http://www.ic.gc.ca/cmb/welcomeic.nsf/558d63659099294285256480052155b/85256a220056c2a485256 be3006e85ae!OpenDocument&Highlight=2,dot

Jervis, Robert "From Balance to Concert: A Study of International Security Co-operation," *World Politics* 38 (October 1985): 58-79

Kirton, John "Explaining G8 Effectiveness", in Hodges, Michael, John Kirton, Joseph Daniels (eds.), *The G8's Role in the New Millenium.* Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Co., 1999. pp. 45-68. p. 54, 55.

Kirton, John "Contemporary Concert Diplomacy: The Seven-Power Summit and the Management of International Order", Paper prepared for the annual meeting of the International Studies Association and the British International Studies Association, London, March 29-April 1, 1989. Unpublished in print. Accessed 03/12/02 from the University of Toronto G8 Information Centre: http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/g7/scholar/kirton198901/index.html.

Kirton, John, "Economic Co-operation: Summitry, Institutions, and Structural Change" , in John Dunning and Gavin Boyd, eds., Structural Change and Co-operation in the Global Economy, (London: Edward Elgar, 1997)

Kirton, John, "The Seven Power Summits as a New Security Institution," in David Dewitt, David Haglund and John Kirton (eds.), *Building a New Global Order: Emerging Trends in International* Security (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 335-357.

Kohn, A., *Punished by rewards: The trouble with gold stars, incentive plans, A's, praise, and other bribes.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin. 1999

Kokotsis, Eleanore and John Kirton, Compliance with G8 Commitments: The Peace and Security and Conflict Prevention Agenda, From Okinawa 2000-Genoa 2001. Prepared for the DFAIT's Policy Planning Division in Preparation for the Canadian Presidency of the G8 Foreign Ministers' Process in 2002. October 24 2001.

Kokotsis, Eleanore. *Keeping International Commitments: Compliance, Credibility and the G7, 1988-1995.* New York: Garland Publishing. 1999.

Kupchan, Charles and Clifford Kupchan, "The Promise of Collective Security," *International Security* 20 (Summer) 1995. 52-61.

Kupchan, Charles and Clifford Kupchan, "Concerts, Collective Security, and the Future of Europe," *International Security* 16 (Summer) 1991. 114-161.

Martin, Lisa A. and Beth A. Simmons, "Theories and Empirical Studies of International Institutions", *International Organization.* 52:4. 1998. pp. 729-757

McSorely, Kevin, "The Secular Salvation Story of the Digital Divide", Ethics and Information Technology. 5: 75-87, 2003.

Putnam, Robert D. and Nicholas Bayne, *Hanging Together: Cooperation and Conflict in the Seven-Power Summits.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press). 1987

Tyler, Tom and Steven L. Blader, "Identity and cooperative behavior in groups", *Group Processes &Intergroup Relations.* Volume 4 (3), 2001. 207-226.

Wendt, Alexander, *Social Theory of World Politics*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 1999

World Health Organization, "Partnerships". Accessed Mar 2, 2006.

http://www.who.int/neglected_diseases/partnership/en/