

The 2001 G8 Compliance Report

Revised Version, July 7, 2001

Professor John Kirton, Dr. Ella Kokotsis, and Diana Juricevic
G8 Research Group, University of Toronto

1. Overview

It makes little sense for the leaders of G7/G8 countries to invest their time, reputations, and other resources to generate collective commitments at their annual summits, or for citizens to take these commitments seriously, if the institution's members do not comply with them in the following year. By these standards, the Japanese-hosted Okinawa G7/G8 Summit of July 21–23, 2001, was the most credible G7/G8 summit ever held. It provides a very high benchmark for the forthcoming Italian-hosted Genoa Summit on July 20–22, 2001.

G7/G8 members complied with the priority commitments made on the 12 major issue areas of the Okinawa Summit during the following ten months 81.4% of the time (see Table A). This is on a scale where 100% equals perfect compliance and –100% shows all members doing the opposite of what they had pledged.

As Table B shows, this 81.4% compliance record compares very favourably with the 39% compliance record with the priority commitments of the 1999 Cologne Summit (as measured by the average of equally weighted countries). It also compares very impressively with the 45% compliance record of the 1998 Birmingham Summit, the 27% of Denver 1997, and the 36% of Lyon 1996. Whereas the four summits prior to Okinawa yielded an average compliance score of 37%, Okinawa itself soared to register an 80% —with two months left for members to comply still further with its outstanding commitments. Okinawa's exceptional status is confirmed by compliance studies from 1988 to 1995, which yielded scores of 43% for the United States and Canada on their “sustainable development” and to “aid to Russia” commitments. It is also confirmed by the score of 32% (using different methodology) for the compliance of all members with all the economic and energy commitments made at the summits from 1975 to 1988.

Compliance with Okinawa's priority commitments was particularly high in the issue areas of information technology, health, and trade, where the Summit secured a perfect score.

The highest complying members were Germany and Britain, the immediately prior hosts, which each had a perfect compliance score. They were followed by France with 92%; Italy with 89%, Canada with 83%, Japan with 82%, the United States with 67%, and the newest G8 member, Russia, with only 14%.

Table A: Summary Scores

Issue Area	Canada	France	Germany	Italy	Japan	United States	United Kingdom	Russia	Average Score by Issue Area
1. World Economy	+1	+1	+1	N/A	+1	+1	+1	0	.86
2. ICT	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	1.0
3. Health	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	N/A	1.0
4. Trade	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	N/A	1.0
5. Cultural Diversity	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1	0	.63
6. Crime and Drugs	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	.88
7. Aging	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	N/A	.86
8. Biotech	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	.75
9. Human Genome	+1	+1	+1	N/A	N/A	0	+1	N/A	.80
10. Conflict Prevention	+1	+1	+1	0	0	+1	+1	0	.63
11. Arms Control	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	.88
12. Terrorism	0	0	N/A	N/A	0	+1	+1	N/A	.40
Average Score by Country	.83	.92	1.0	.89	.82	.67	1.0	.14	1) .808 2) .784 3) .814

Notes:

(i) N/A indicates that information is not available and no compliance score has been awarded.

(ii) TBD indicates that information is forthcoming.

(iii) Development was separated into two sections: (a) debt, and (b) health. Compliance with debt commitments was assessed at the institutional level and examines the extent to which the IMO and World Bank complied with the directives issued to them by the G8 at Okinawa. See attached Development Compliance Report.

1. Overall Average (based on 86 individual scores): 81.4%
2. Overall Average Compliance Score by Country: 80.4%
3. Overall Average Compliance Score by Issue Area: 78.1%

Note: Slight variation due to differential equalization weightings.

Note: Compliance Calculations by Country and Issue Area

The average score by issue area is the average of all countries' compliance scores for that issue. The average score by country is the average of all issue area compliance scores for a given country. Where information on a country's compliance score for a given issue area was not available, the symbol "N/A" appears in the respective column and no score is awarded. Countries were excluded from the averages if the symbol "N/A" appears in the respective column (e.g., no score was awarded to Italy in issue no. 1, "World Economy." Hence Italy is excluded from the average score by issue area result of 0.85 for issue no. 1. Also, Italy's average score by country excludes issue no. 1 from the result of 0.89.

2. Okinawa Compared to the 1996–2000 "Globalization Era"

The outstandingly high compliance rate with the Okinawa commitments can be seen through a more direct comparison with the compliance record of the G7/G8 in the preceding five years. This was the time when the G7/G8, starting at its 1996 Lyon Summit, directly and consciously addressed the process of "globalization." It is also the time when the G8 Research Group began its annual compliance studies.

Compliance by Country

The following tables report the results, by country, of the compliance of G8 members with their priority commitments at the Summit from Lyon 1996 to Okinawa 2000 (with compliance assessed through to May 2001).

Table B: G8 Compliance Assessments by Country, 1996–2001a

	1996–1997b	1997–1998c	1998–1999d	1999–2000e	2000–2001f
France	+0.26	0	+0.25	+0.34	+0.92
United States	+0.42	+0.34	+0.6	+0.5	+0.67
United Kingdom	+0.42	+0.5	+0.75	+0.5	+1.0
Germany	+0.58	+0.17	+0.25	+0.17	+1.0
Japan	+0.21	+0.50	+0.2	+0.67	+0.82
Italy	+0.16	+0.50	+0.67	+0.34	+0.89
Canada	+0.47	+0.17	+0.5	+0.67	+0.83
Russia	N/A	0	+0.34	+0.17	+0.14
European Union	N/A	N/A	N/A	+0.17	N/A
Average	+0.36	+0.27	+0.45	+0.39	+0.80

Notes:

a: Scores are an equally weighted average of a country's compliance to commitments made at the summit.

b: Applies to 19 priority issues, embracing the economic, transnational and political security domains.

c: Applies to six priority issues, embracing the economic, transnational and political security domains.

d: Applies to seven priority issues, embracing the economic, transnational and political security domains (illegal trafficking of human beings).

e: Applies to six priority issues, embracing economic, transnational and political security domains (terrorism).

f: Applies to 12 priority issues, embracing economic, transnational and political security domains (conflict prevention, arms control, terrorism).

Table C: Compliance Scores by Country

	1996–2001 Average	1988–1995	1975–1989
United Kingdom	+63%	N/A	+41.3%
Canada	+53%	+53%	+40.9%
United States	+51%	+34%	+24.6%
Italy	+51%	N/A	+27.4%
Japan	+48%	N/A	+26.2%
<i>Average of G8</i>	<i>+45%</i>	<i>+43%</i>	<i>+30.7%</i>
Germany	+43%	N/A	+34.6%
France	+35%	N/A	+24.0%
Russia	+22%	N/A	N/A

During the first half decade of the “globalization era” (1996–2001), the average compliance score was 45%. This is slightly higher than the 43% for the 1988–1995 period identified by Kokotsis for the U.S. and Canada alone on four issues areas (Kokotsis 1999). It is notably higher than the 31% discovered by von Furstenberg and Daniels (1992) for all members on all commitments for the 1975–1989 period. (They found the 1975–1988 average of the U.S. and Canada alone to be 33%). This data thus confirms the portrait offered by Kokotsis on the basis of much more limited evidence. It also suggests that the post cold war years — begun with the Gorbachev letter to the G7 at Paris 1989 — have made the Summits more credible than they were before.

In some ways, this data for the first half decade of the “globalization era” (1996–2001) confirms the pattern of compliance by country first identified by von Furstenberg and Daniels for the initial 1975–1989 period. Britain continues to rank first on compliance, followed closely by second-place Canada. France continues to rank near or at the bottom.

But there are some notable changes. Most strikingly, the United States has risen from second last in 1975–1989 to a strong third-highest in 1996–2001. This is consistent with the higher scores Kokotsis found for the U.S. on four issue areas for the period 1988–1995 (Kokotsis 1999). Italy has risen somewhat in the ranking and substantially in the percentage score. Moreover the newest G8 member, Russia comes in last place. This is perhaps due to the slow process of socializing a new member, but more likely due to limitations on the capacity of the Russian government to implement G7/G8 commitments. These often require more adjustment on even a reforming Russia’s part than they do for other G8 members.

The data in Table B, while slender, are inductively suggestive of one possible pattern. In the year leading up to a country hosting a G7/G8 summit, that country will comply with its commitments from the previous year’s summit at a higher level than it did in the immediately earlier year. The prospective new host thus appears to take its G7/G8 responsibility seriously and make the G7/G8 system appear credible, by leading through example, with a higher-than-usual compliance record. (We are indebted to Caroline Konrad for this point.)

Compliance by Issue Area

Even with its much higher overall compliance scores, Okinawa showed considerable variation by subject domain, issue area, and issue. As Table D shows, as against an overall compliance score of 78%, Okinawa scored 81% in the global/transnational domain, 74% in the economic domain, and 64% in the political security domain.

Among individual issues, it received a perfect compliance score in IT, trade, and health. Its lowest scores came in terrorism (40%), conflict prevention (63%), and cultural diversity (63%).

When compared to the 1996–2001 average, or to any individual year within this period, Okinawa had a higher (or an equal) score on virtually every priority commitment measured for 2000–2001. The only areas where it under-performed were macroeconomics and, especially, terrorism

In a longer term comparison, the “globalization era” summits of 1996–2001 had remarkably high compliance in several domains and issue areas. For this half-decade, the average compliance level was 39%, but 59% in the global/transnational domain, 37% in the economic domain, and only 33% in the political-security domain. The increase in compliance for the globalization half-decade was thus driven almost entirely by the global transnational/domain and it in turn was driven by the heavy investment in this domain at Okinawa. Nonetheless, it is clear that the age of social globalization has arrived and that the G8 has moved sharply to mount an approach of socially sensitive governance in response.

Comparisons over a longer period by issue area are possible only in three issue areas. Here it is clear the summit has suffered a sharp decline in its performance in the trade field and, less dramatically, in development assistance/aid. Conversely, in the field of exchange rates, it has experienced a sharp increase, despite the onset of intense financial globalization. While limited data make any conclusions hazardous, this finding does suggest that G7/8 governments are by no means powerless in the face of the most globalized of economic markets, and by no means cowering in self imposed fear from intervention in the belief that they can no longer win.

Table D: G8 Compliance by Issue, 1996–2001

Issue Area	1996– 1997	1997– 1998	1998– 1999	1999– 2000	2000– 2001	Average 1996– 2001
TOTAL (based on average <i>n</i>)	+36.2% (22)	+12.8% (6)	+31.8% (6)	+38.2% (6)	+78.1% (12)	+39.42
Economic Issues						
<i>Average Economic</i>	+39%	+19%	+17%	32%	+74%	+37%
Economic Issues	+0.31	–	–	–	–	+0.31
IFI Reform	+0.29c	–	–	–	–	+0.29
Exchange Rate	–	–	–	0	–	0
Macroeconomics/ World Economy	+1.00	–	–	+1.0	+0.86d	+0.95
Microeconomics	+0.29d	–	–	–	–	+0.29
Employment	–	+0.375e	0f	–	–	+0.19
Aging	–	–	+0.33g	–	+0.86n	+0.60
GIS/ICT	+0.57d	–	–	–	+1.0	+0.79
Trade	+0.29d	–	0.33h	–0.57	+1.0n	+0.26
Development	0d	0	–	–	0	0
Debt of Poorest	–	–	0	+0.86	–	+0.43
Global/Transnational Issues						
<i>Average Global</i>	+34%	+25%	+63%	+0%	+81%	+41%
Transnational General	+0.48	–	–	–	–	+0.48
Environment	+0.14	+0.5e	–	–	–	+0.32
Climate Change	–	–	+1.0j	–	–	+1.0
Nuclear Safety	+0.29	–	–	–	–	+0.29
Health/Disease	–	–	–	–	+1.0n	+1.0
Biotech	–	–	–	–	+0.75	+0.75
Human Genome	–	–	–	–	+0.80	+0.80
Crime	+0.43d	0e	–	0k	+0.88 (includes drugs)	+0.33
Human Trafficking	–	–	+0.25	–	–	+0.25
Cultural Diversity	–	–	–	–	+0.63	+0.63

Political Security Issues						
Average Political–Sec’y	+39%	–06%	–	+100%	+64%	+49%
East/West Relations	+0.80d	–	–	–	–	+0.80
Terrorism	+0.71d	–	–	+1.0	+0.40o	+0.70
Arms Control	+0.29	–	–	–	+0.88	+0.59
Landmines	+0.71	+0.75e	–	–	–	+0.73
Human Rights	+0.71d	–	–	–	–	+0.71
Security Issues	+0.31	–	–	–	–	+0.31
Regional Security	–0.43d	–	–	–	–	–0.43
Asia						
Europe	+0.86m	–	–	–	–	+0.86
Middle East	–0.43d	–	–	–	–	–0.43
Russia	–	–0.86	–	–	–	–0.86
Conflict Prevention	–	–	–	–	0.63	+0.63
Governance Issues						
UN Reform Financing	+0.14	–	–	–	–	+0.14
UN Reform Develop’t	+0.14	–	–	–	–	+0.14

Notes:

a: Data refer to members’ compliance to commitments expressed in the Communiqué, as evaluated immediately prior to the next summit (i.e., 1996–1997 data refer to commitments made at the Lyon Summit in 1996 and assessed on the eve of the 1997 Denver Summit).

b: Unless otherwise indicated, data refer to all G7/G8 countries.

c: Excludes Italy and France.

d: Excludes Italy.

e: Refers to G8 (includes Russia).

f: Refers only to Japan, UK, Russia.

g: Refers only Canada, Germany, U.S.

h: Excludes Germany.

i: Refers to debt of the poorest and the Cologne Debt Initiative.

j: Refers to G8 countries (includes Russia); is average of data for two commitment referring to the Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change.

k: Refers specifically to the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering.

l: Refers only to France, Germany, Japan.

m: Excludes Japan.

n: Excludes Russia.

o: Excludes Germany, Italy, Russia.

Table E: Compliance Scores by Issue, 1975–2001

Issue Area	1996–2001 Average	1988–1996	1975–1989
Total (per average n)	+39%	43% (C+US)	31%
Economic Issues			
Macro/World Economy	+95%		
GIS/IT	+79%		
Aging	+60%		
Debt of the Poorest	+43%	+73% a	
<i>Average of G8 All</i>	+39%		
<i>Average of G8 Economy</i>	+37%		
Economic Issues	+31%		
IFI Reform	+29%		
Microeconomics	+29%		
Trade	+26%		+73%
Employment	+19%		
Development/Aid	0		+27%
Exchange Rate	0		-70%
Demand Composition			+23%
Real GNP Growth			+40%
Fiscal Adjustments			+26%
Interest Rate			+22%
Inflation Rate			+22%
Energy			+66%
Global/Transnational Issues			
Climate Change	+100%	+34% a	
Health/Disease	+100%		
Human Genome	+80%		
Biotech	+75%		
Cultural Diversity	+63%		
<i>Average of G8 on Global/Transnational Issues</i>	+59%		
Transnational General	+48%		
<i>Average of G8</i>	+39%		
Crime	+33%		
Environment	+32%		
Nuclear Safety	+29%		
Human Trafficking	+25%		

Political/Regional Security Issues			
Europe	+86%		
East/West Relations	+80%		
Landmines	+73%		
Human Rights	+71%		
Terrorism	+70%		
Conflict Prevention	+63%		
Arms Control	+59%		
<i>Average of G8</i>	+39%		
<i>Average of G8 on Political/Regional Security</i>	+33%		
Security Issues	+31%		
Asia	-43%		
Middle East	-43%		
Russia	-86%	+81% a	
Governance Issues			
<i>Average of G8</i>	+39%		
<i>Average of G8 on Governance Issues</i>	+14%		
UN Reform Financial	+14%		
UN Reform Development	+14%		

Note:

a: Includes only Canada and the United States.

Source: Ella Kokotsis and Joseph Daniels (1999), "G8 Summits and Compliance," in Michael Hodges, John Kirton, and Joseph Daniels, eds., *The G8's Role in the New Millennium* (Aldershot, Ashgate), pp. 75-94.

3. The Okinawa Compliance Record Corrected for Ambition-significance

This comparison of the Okinawa compliance record with that of the summit in previous years highlights just how exceptionally high Okinawa was. This may well be an accurate reflection of reality. Japan traditionally takes the Summit and its role as host more seriously than virtually any other country. It devoted large sums of money, highest-level political management, and domestic political attention to Okinawa. And the mounting G7/G8 involvement of civil society actors, and their protests at other major international fora, may well have led Japan and its G7/G8 partners to be exceptionally vigilant in keeping the faith with their Okinawa pledges.

Another possibility is that the particular commitments selected by the G8 Research Group in 2000 to monitor compliance against were unusually low in ambition and significance, making it very easy for G8 members to comply and thus generate these uniquely high compliance scores for 2000.

The G8 Research Group explored this possibility in its revised Commitments Study. Here it has ranked each of the Okinawa G7 and G8 Communiqué commitments by its “ambition-significance,” using a scale and method devised by Diana Juricevic. This referent suggests that the particular commitments selected for compliance monitoring were not unusually “easy” commitments to comply with, compared to the other commitments in their respective issue areas.

A second way of checking and controlling for the possibility of easy commitment selection bias is to take the set of selected priority commitments as given, but weight them according to their level of ambition and significance, and use these weights in the compliance analysis. Consider a commitment on trade that has a compliance rate of 100%, but an ambition-significance ranking of only $3/6 = 50\%$. Consider another commitment on the environment that has a compliance rate of 80%, but an ambition-significance ranking of $6/6 = 100\%$. In the previous analysis, the commitment on trade would be deemed more successful than the commitment on the environment because it has a higher compliance score. This compliance score, however, is misleading since it does not take into account how difficult the commitment is to comply with. The difficulty of complying with a commitment is measured through the ambition-significance ranking. Coming back to the example, the trade commitment with an ambition-significance ranking of 50% is much easier to comply with than the environment commitment that has an ambition-significance ranking of 100%. To account for the difficulty of complying, the ambition-significance ranking is used as a weight in the compliance analysis. A given commitment would now have a weighted compliance score that is the product of its original compliance score multiplied by its ambition-significance ranking. In the example, the trade commitment would now have a weighted compliance score of 50% while the environment commitment would have a weighted compliance score of 80%, derived once again by multiplying their original compliance scores by their respective ambition-significance rankings.

As the results in Table F indicate, applying this individual ambition-significance weighting control does reduce substantially Okinawa's overall very high compliance scores. Yet it still leaves Okinawa as the most credible G7/G8 Summit ever. By this weighted ranking, G7/8 members complied with the priority commitments across the 12 major issue areas of the Okinawa Summit during the following ten months 59.2% of the time. This 59.2% compliance record still compares very favourably with the unweighted scores of 39% for Cologne 1999, the 45% for Birmingham 1998, the 27% of Denver 1997, and the 36% of Lyon 1996.

Compliance with Okinawa's priority commitments remained particularly high in the issue area of health where the Summit secured a perfect score. The highest complying members were Germany and Britain, the immediately prior hosts, which each had a compliance score of 72%. They were followed by France, with 66%, Italy with 64%, Canada with 60%, Japan with 59%, the United States with 48% and the newest G8 member Russia, with only 10%.

4. Further Research

These preliminary scores are offered with an invitation for others to challenge, confirm, enrich and supplement them, prior to the release of a final compliance report. Contributions are particularly welcome if they are:

- a. Empirical: Are there additional or alternative data that would adjust the scores?
- b. Methodological: Have the existing data been correctly applied to the first-order, instrumental compliance criteria employed in this study?
- c. Analytical: Is there any systematic bias in the selection of the priority commitments or the 12 issue areas chosen for assessment this year?

The individual scores, and the data and commitments on which they are based, are listed in the appendices below. For additional material see the analytical studies listed at www.g8.utoronto.ca.

Table F: Weighted Summary Scores

Issue Area	Canada	France	Germany	Italy	Japan	United States	United Kingdom	Russia	Weight	Weighted Average Score (by Issue Area)
1. World Economy	+1	+1	+1	N/A	+1	+1	+1	0	0.667	0.57
2. ICT	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0.833	0.83
3. Health	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	N/A	1.00	1.0
4. Trade	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	N/A	0.500	0.5
5. Cultural Diversity	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1	0	0.833	0.52
6. Crime and Drugs	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	0.833	0.73
7. Aging	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	N/A	0.667	0.57
8. Biotech	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	0.667	0.50
9. Human Genome	+1	+1	+1	N/A	N/A	0	+1	N/A	0.833	0.67
10. Conflict Prevention	+1	+1	+1	0	0	+1	+1	0	0.667	0.42
11. Arms Control	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	0.667	0.59
12. Terrorism	0	0	N/A	N/A	0	+1	+1	N/A	0.500	0.20
Weight	0.722	0.722	0.722	0.722	0.722	0.722	0.722	0.722	0.722	
Weighted Average Score (by country)	0.60	0.66	0.72	0.64	0.59	0.48	0.72	0.10		1) 0.578 2) 0.564 3) 0.592

Notes:

- (i) N/A indicates that information is not available, and that no compliance score has been awarded
- (ii) TBD indicates that information is forthcoming
- (iii) Development was separated into two sections: (a) debt, and (b) health. Compliance with debt commitments was assessed at the institutional level and examines the extent to which the IMO and World Bank complied with the directives issued to them by the G8 at Okinawa. See attached Development Compliance Report.
- (iv) The weights are calculated using the ambition-significance ranking. A commitment in a given issue area that has a higher ambition-significance ranking has a correspondingly higher weight score. See attached note on compliance for further details.

- 1. Overall Average (based on 86 individual scores): 57.8%
 - 2. Overall Average Compliance Score by Country: 56.4%
 - 3. Overall Average Compliance Score by Issue Area: 59.2%
- Note: Slight variation due to differential equalization weightings

Compliance Calculations by Country and Issue Area

The “average score by issue area” is the average of all countries’ compliance scores for that issue. The “average score by country” is the average of all issue area compliance scores for a given country. Where information on a country’s compliance score for a given issue area was not available, the symbol “N/A” appears in the respective score column and no score is awarded. Countries were excluded from the averages if the symbol “N/A” appears in the respective score column (e.g. No score was awarded to Italy in issue #1, “World Economy”. Hence Italy is excluded from the “average score by issue area” result of 0.57 for issue #1. Also, Italy’s “average score by country” excludes issue #1 from the result of 0.64).

References

Daniels, Joseph (1993), *The Meaning and Reliability of Economic Summit Undertakings* (Hamden, Connecticut: Garland Publishing).

G8 Research Group (annual), *Compliance Assessment*, 1996-. <<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca>>.

Kokotsis, Eleonore (1999), *Keeping International Commitments: Compliance, Credibility and the G7, 1988–1995* (New York: Garland).

Kokotsis, Ella (1995), “Keeping Sustainable Development Commitments: The Recent G7 Record,” in John Kirton and Sarah Richardson, eds., *The Halifax Summit, Sustainable Development and International Institutional Reform* (Ottawa: National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy), pp. 117–133. <<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca>>.

Kokotsis, Ella, and Daniels, Joseph (1999), “G8 Summits and Compliance,” in Michael Hodges, John Kirton, and Joseph Daniels, eds., *The G8’s Role in the New Millennium* (Aldershot: Ashgate), pp. 75–94.

Kokotsis, Ella, and Kirton, John (1997), “National Compliance with Environmental Regimes: The Case of the G7, 1988–1995,” Paper prepared for the Annual Convention of the International Studies Association, Toronto, March 18–22.

von Furstenberg, George, and Joseph Daniels (1991), “Policy Undertakings by the Seven ‘Summit’ Countries: Ascertaining the Degree of Compliance,” *Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series of Public Policy* 35, pp. 267–308.

von Furstenberg, George, and Joseph Daniels (1992), “Can You Trust G-7 Promises?” *International Economic Insights* 3, September/October, pp. 24–27.

von Furstenberg, George, and Joseph Daniels (1992), *Economic Summit Declarations, 1975–1989: Examining the Written Record of International Co-operation*, Princeton Studies in International Finance 72, Princeton, NJ, Department of Economics.

von Furstenberg, George (1995), “Accountability and a Metric for Credibility and Compliance,” *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics* 151, June, pp. 304–25.

Compliance Report
Okinawa 2000
World Economy

Commitment

Para. 8: “Reform efforts must now focus on maintaining and strengthening social safety nets to ensure strong, sustainable growth and avoid future instability.”

Assessment

Country	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
Britain			+1
Canada			+1
France			+1
Germany			+1
Italy		N/A	
Japan			+1
Russia		0	
United States			+1
Overall			+1

Britain

Further to this commitment, Britain’s 2001 federal budget included several increases to social welfare spending: a £25/£30 increase in monthly child benefits (with similar increases in 2002 and 2003); a child benefit increase to be paid from June 2001; a £10 increase for all pensioners from April 2001; a £20/£25 increase for couples aged 66 and over; a special increase of £12.90 for widow(er)s aged 66 and over; an £8 increase in other personal rates from April 2001, and; an additional 4 weeks’ maternity/adoptive benefit. In addition, 10 Downing Street announced the creation of a new social welfare agency. As part of its social welfare reform system, 10 Downing Street plans on a one-stop agency for public services to streamline and to modernize the benefits and welfare system. This agency will be equipped with personal advisors for every claimant, tailoring support to individual need.

With respect to education, the UK announced an overall increase in higher education funding for 2001. Total publicly planned funding for higher education in 2001–2002 will be over £5.8 billion,

amounting to an additional £412 million (7.6% in cash terms) compared to 2000–2001. The government plans a further £268 million (4.6%) and £298 million (4.9%) to be made available in 2002–2003 and 2003–2004.

Canada

Since Okinawa, the Canadian government has proposed to allocate large amounts of funding to social services and has even implemented new social policies for families. At the First Ministers Meeting on Health on September 11, 2000, the Health Action Plan adopted by the Canada's first ministers focused on sustaining and modernizing Canada's publicly funded healthcare system to meet the immediate and long-term health needs of Canadians. The government also created initiatives to address shortages and blockages in the delivery of primary care. Key highlights of the plan included a commitment of \$23.4 billion—one of the largest single investments by any Canadian government—to improving health care and increasing support for early childhood development; the addition of \$21.1 billion over five years to the Canada Health and Social Transfer (CHST) so that provinces and territories can enhance funding for health, post-secondary education, and social assistance; \$2.2 billion to be provided for supporting early childhood development so that children may enter school better prepared than they currently are; \$1 billion to be provided to provinces and territories for the purchase of modern diagnostic and treatment equipment such as MRI machines and CT scanners; and \$500 million towards the development of modern information technology in the healthcare sector. These new federal funding commitments build on the \$14 billion increase to the CHST previously announced in the 1999 and 2000 budgets.

With respect to strengthening education, the Canadian government announced in the post-Okinawa period that it would assist post-secondary students cope with rising costs of education by doubling the amount on which the education credit is based to \$400 a month from \$200 for full-time students, and to \$120 from \$60 for part-time students.

On the issue of parental leave, amendments to the employment insurance program as of January 1, 2001, resulted in the significant increase in the amount of time granted to parents on leave, from 10 to 35 weeks. To make maternity and parental leave more accessible, the Canadian government also lowered the required number of hours that must be worked in order to be eligible for leave from 700 to 600. These changes are part of a comprehensive strategy aimed at supporting families with children, which also includes additional tax cuts for families, new investments in the National Child Benefit, and changes to employment insurance rules.

France

The following detail actions by the French government to strengthen social safety nets:

Modernization of the French social welfare system was proposed in May 2000 in order to reform the structure of publicly owned establishments and start basic reforms regarding retirement or the assumption of responsibility of old or handicapped people. No information was found regarding legislative action to implement these proposals.

On October 11, 2000, an official statement of the Council of Ministers announced an increase of student grants to 28% of the population.

On November 15, 2000, an official statement from the Council of Ministers announced 4 billion francs of financing for the various exemptions of social security contributions, 1.7 billion francs of increase of the school allowance of re-entry, and 900 million francs for social action funds for immigrant workers.

The following action may be seen having a negative effect on the French social safety net: As part of a series of tax reforms, France also implemented a tax package to tackle some of France's controversial poverty and welfare traps such as heavy compulsory contributions for social security and other social programs. Because those social security contributions are believed to induce people to stay on welfare, costs should go down for all those earning up to 1.3 times the minimum wage.

Germany

The German government has taken a number of measures in the post-Okinawa period to improve social services domestically. On January 1, 2001, the federal finance minister, Hans Eichel, announced plans to rearrange taxation of old-age income, arguing that current tax laws were obscure and in need of reform.

With respect to health care, Joerg-Dietrich Hoppe, chairman of the Federal Chamber of German Doctors, announced the creation of a round table for health services beginning in the spring of 2001. The government's Annual Report on Economic and Fiscal Policy for 2001 (section 9) indicated that it would consider the first comprehensive Report on Poverty and Wealth, slated for completion by the summer of 2001. With respect to health policy in particular, the report indicated that the government would move forward in terms of ensuring health care for all regardless of their income. On April 15, 2001, the German government further asked for the Council for Concerted Action in Health System to indicate and assess in its medical care balancing report the areas of oversupply, undersupply, and misdirected supply.

With respect to boosting child allowances, the government indicated that it plans to reform the childcare structure with the provision of DM 5.7 billion. Parliamentary manager Uwe Küster, argued that the funds should be used to enable young persons and single parents to harmonize their desires for their children to have a good education followed by a successful professional life.

In March 2001, the Bundesrat opened increases to federal education funding assistance program payments allowing for a new maximum assistance in the order of DM 1.140 billion.

Italy

Much of the reform in Italian social policy in the post Okinawa period was focused on policy enhancements in the area of support to the disabled. According to the Finance Budget Plan for 2001, chapter 6 of the plan focused on the implementation of further improvements/benefits for the disabled. As of January 1, 2001, the Italian government has proposed a reduction of 19% for the disabled when purchasing motor vehicles equipped with special facilities. In addition, the disabled will also receive a 4% discount on any purchases of newspapers, books, and magazines.

Japan

With respect to shifts in education policy, on July 27, 2000, the Japanese government's education advisory panel to Prime Minister Yoshiro Mori demanded mandatory schooling for 5-year-olds. The government argued that they should allow children to begin their nine-year mandatory education when they turn 5, one year earlier than the current system requirements. The report also recommended that the government abolish the age limit preventing people from entering universities or colleges before the age of 18.

With respect to healthcare policy, in November 2000 the government announced that in an effort to contain health-related expenses shouldered by the state, it would pass a government-sponsored bill to increase the share of healthcare costs paid by the elderly. Under the measure, outpatients aged 70 and over would have to cover 10% of their medical costs to a maximum of 5,000 yen per month. Currently, their medical payments cannot exceed 2,120 yen per month. Elderly patients with relatively low incomes, however, would have their payments reduced. The upper limit of medical expenses paid by patients under 70 who receive expensive treatment would also be raised from 63,600 yen per patient to 121,800 yen. These hikes are intended to compensate for the bill's abolishment of a measure requiring elderly people to partially pay for their prescription drugs and medical visits. The opposition has criticized the measure, arguing it shifts the financial burden to elderly patients in a bid to alleviate financial strains within the medical insurance system.

The Japanese government also announced in March 2001 that it would take active measures to combat the homeless problem. According on a government White Paper on the homeless, the number of people living on the streets of Tokyo has increased 1.7-fold over five years to 5,700. The Tokyo Metropolitan Government's estimation was based upon a survey of 1,028 homeless in the city. To tackle the growing number of homeless, the metro government is planning to build facilities designed to help these people find shelter and rehabilitate.

Russia

No direct initiatives by the Russian government have been identified in this area in the post-Okinawa period.

The World Bank has undertaken multisectoral social protection adjustment operations in former Russian Republics such as the Kyrgyz Republic and the Russian Federation. Bank operations are guided by the Eastern Europe and Central Asia (ECA) Social Protection Strategy developed in fiscal year 1999. The strategy reviews the development of social protection systems in ECA countries during transition, outlines the experiences the World Bank acquired, and identifies the focus of World Bank operations.

Bank supervision portfolio for projects addressing social protection issues in the region reached US\$2.4 billion by the end of the 2000 fiscal year (47 projects), up from US\$100 million in fiscal 1991. An additional US\$2 billion (34 projects) are under direct management of the World Bank Human Development Sector Unit. Among these lending operations, adjustment lending has focused on policy reforms, while investment lending has focused on developing social protection programs through improvement in the policy information base and capacity building in program management. In particular, the World Bank assisted pension reforms through projects in Bulgaria, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, FYR Macedonia, Moldova, the Kyrgyz Republic, Romania, and the Russian Federation.

United States

In the post-Okinawa period, several new bills related to social welfare reform were passed as part of the Republican Contract with America initiative at the beginning of the 104th Congress, including:

- The *Family Reinforcement Act*, including child support enforcement, tax incentives for adoption, strengthening rights of parents in their children's education, stronger child pornography laws, and an elderly dependent care tax credit to reinforce the central role of families in American society.

- The *American Dream Restoration Act*, including a \$500 per child tax credit, repeal of the marriage tax penalty, and creation of American Dream Savings Accounts to provide middle-class tax relief.
- The *Senior Citizens Fairness Act*, including raising the social security earnings limit that currently forces seniors out of the workforce, repealing the 1993 tax hikes on social security benefits, and the provision of tax incentives for private long-term care insurance allowing elderly Americans save more of what they have earned over the years.
- The *Job Creation and Wage Enhancement Act*, including increased small business incentives, capital gains cut and indexation, neutral cost recovery, risk assessment/cost-benefit analysis, strengthening the *Regulatory Flexibility Act*, job creation reforms, and increased workers' wages.

Sources

<http://www.welfare.ie/dept/budget01/budget01.htm>

<http://hefce.ac.uk/News/hefce/2000/funding.htm>

<http://www.number-10.gov.uk>

<http://www.house.gov/huse/Contract/CONTRACT.html>

<http://wbln0018.worldbank.org/eca/eca>

<http://www.mof.go.jp/english/index.htm>

<http://www.japantimes.co.jp>

<http://www.finanze.it>

<http://www.mathematik.uni-ulm.de/de-news>

<http://www.bundesfinanzministerium.de/jwb/indexe.htm>

<http://elysses.fr/ang/index.shtm>

<http://www.fin.gc/toce/2000/ecOOe.htm>

<http://www.pm.gc.ca/default.asp>

Compiled by Anju Aggarwal, and Nicol Lorantffy

G8 Compliance Report
Okinawa 2000
Dot Force

Commitment

Para. 12: “We will set up a Digital Opportunities Task Force (dot force), which will be asked to report to our next meeting its findings and recommendations on global action to bridge the international information and knowledge divide.”

This commitment focus specifically on the following aspects:

1. Fostering policy, regulatory and network readiness;
2. Improving connectivity, increasing access, and lowering cost;
3. Building human capacity by focusing on education and lifelong learning with emphasis on IT skills;
4. Encouraging participation in global e-commerce networks.

Assessment

Country	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
Britain			+1
Canada			+1
France			+1
Germany			+1
Italy			+1
Japan			+1
Russia			+1
United States			+1
Overall			+1

Collective Country Initiatives

1. Plenary Meetings

DOT Force meetings are attended by a government official and private sector representative from each G8 country, one official from the European Commission, and representatives from developing countries.

- a) First Meeting of the DOT Force
November 27–28, 2001, Tokyo, Japan
Discussions centred on the stocktaking of the current situation of the international digital divide and the future work schedule of the DOT Force.

- b) Second Meeting of the DOT Force
March 1–2, 2001, Cape Town, South Africa
Draft report of the DOT Force released over the Internet
Key recommendations included:
 - Create an international policy coordination institute;
 - Widely provide public access points;
 - Establish an information and communication technology foundation;
 - Establish a virtual policy centre, a seed fund for entrepreneurs, and a government/private sector joint education program.

- c) Third DOT Force Meeting
April 23–24, 2001, Sienna, Italy
Members scheduled to adopt final DOT Force report.

2. Informal Meetings

- a) DOT Force Consultation Meeting
January 18, 2001, Dubai

- b) DOT Force Consultation Meeting
January 23–24, 2001, Berlin, Germany

- c) DOT Force Consultation Meeting
January 29, 2001, Davos, Switzerland

- d) DOT Force Consultation Meeting
February 12–15, 2001, Cairo, Egypt

- e) DOT Force Consultation Meeting
March 14–17, 2001, Naples, Italy

Specific Countries' Initiatives

Canada

- IDRC, Industry Canada, and Bellnet are organizing an online consultation network for civil society.

European Commission

- Representative attended DOT-Force meetings.

France

- VECAM is organizing consultations with French civil society organizations.

Germany

- The Centre for Development Research at Bonn University organized a consultative workshop for non-governmental organizations and think tanks in Bonn on February 20, 2001.

Italy

- Italian authorities are in the process of organizing a broad process of national consultations.

Japan

- The Centre for Global Communications is organizing consultations with Japanese civil society.

Russia

- Russia established a DOT Force website that highlights information about DOT Force activities in Russia.

United Kingdom

- The United Kingdom established a DOT Force website that highlights information about DOT Force activities in the U.K.
- UK DOT Force hosted a meeting on February 22, 2001, with private sector companies to discuss the DOT Force and the digital divide.

United States

- The Markle Foundation is hosting an online consultation for civil society.

Compiled by Jason Wong

Compliance Report
Okinawa 2000
Development

Commitments

1. Debt

Para. 24: “We welcome the efforts being made by HIPCs to develop comprehensive and country-owned poverty reduction strategies through a participatory process involving civil society. IFIs should, along with other donors, help HIPCs prepare PRSPs and assist their financial resource management by providing technical assistance. We are concerned by the fact that a number of HIPCs are currently affected by military conflicts which prevent poverty reduction and delay debt relief. We call upon these countries to end their involvement in conflicts and to embark quickly upon the HIPC process.”

- a) We agree to strengthen our efforts to help them prepare and come forward for debt relief, by asking our Ministers to make early contact with the countries in conflict to encourage them to create the right conditions to participate in the HIPC Initiative.
- b) We will work together to ensure that as many countries as possible reach their Decision Points, in line with the target set out in Cologne, giving due consideration to the progress of economic reforms and the need to ensure that the benefits of debt relief and targeted to assist the poor and most vulnerable.
- c) We will work expeditiously together with HIPCs and the IFIs to realize the expectation that 20 countries will reach the Decision Point within the framework of the Enhanced HIPC Initiative by the end of this year. In this regard, we welcome the establishment of the Joint Implementation Committee by the World Bank and the IMF. We for our part will promote more responsible lending and borrowing practices to ensure that HIPCs will not again be burdened by unsupportable debt.

Assessment

Compliance with this debt commitment is assessed at the institutional level examining the extent to which the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank have followed through on commitments a), b), and c).

Commitment	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
Assistance for Countries in Conflict		0	
Decision Points	-1		
Enhanced HIPC Initiative			+1
Overall		0	

Assistance for Countries in Conflict

The World Bank website refers to 10 countries that are at war and ineligible for debt relief. Although there is clearly contact being made with these countries at diplomatic and ministerial levels, there is no information on how this contact is being directed to “create the right conditions to participate in the HIPC initiative” apart from the obvious way of stopping the conflict. As such, compliance with this commitment is a “work in progress” and receives a score of 0.

Decision Points

The issue of how effective the HIPC Initiative is at tackling the larger issue of equity is not clear. There are many organizations critical of the HIPC Initiative for emphasizing macroeconomic reform at the expense of equity. The World Bank website materials do not fully explain all the conditions involved with the decision point. Since there is no available evidence to support that the G8 countries have “worked together” through the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank to ensure that “as many countries as possible reach their decision points,” compliance with this commitment receives a score of -1.

For a different perspective on compliance with this initiative, please refer to the notes in the Appendix.

Enhanced HIPC Initiative

Thus far, 22 states have reached their decision point under the Enhanced HIPC Initiative: Benin, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, São Tomé and Príncipe, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia. These 22 countries are now receiving relief that will amount to some \$34 billion over the next few years. Uganda, having reached its completion point, is clearly above the promises made in Okinawa. This is clearly higher than the 20 countries that were committed to.

In addition, these countries are in the process of reaching their decision point and are expected to reach it in 2001: Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Liberia, Myanmar, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, and Togo. (Ghana and Lao PDR have asked not to be included.)

NOTE: There was one site that stated the number of decision point countries to be 15. As the majority of sources claimed the total to be 22 by December 2000, this figure is used in this assessment.

Because more than 20 countries reached their decision point in 2000, compliance with this commitment receives a score of +1. The issue of whether the HIPC Initiative leads to a more equitable distribution is beyond the scope of this report.

2. Health

Para. 29: “We therefore commit ourselves to working in strengthened partnership with governments, the World Health Organization (WHO) and other international organisations, industry (notably pharmaceutical companies), academic institutions, non-governmental organizations and other relevant actors in civil society to deliver three critical UN targets”:

- a) Reduce the number of HIV/AIDS-infected young people by 25% by 2010
- b) Reduce TB deaths and prevalence of the disease by 50% by 2010
- c) Reduce the burden of disease associated with malaria by 50% by 2010

Assessment

Country	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
Britain			+1
Canada			+1
France			+1
Germany			+1
Italy			+1
Japan			+1
Russia		N/A	
United States			+1
Overall			+1

Canada

Canada contributed over C\$32 million to fight tuberculosis and to promote HIV/AIDS education and advocacy through Canadian International Development Agency and the Ministry of International Cooperation.

France

The EU Commission approved an initiative to help the developing world combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis.

Germany

Proposed a plan of action to reduce AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis in April 2001.

Italy

Italy began asking major corporations and governments to contribute to a billion-dollar fund aimed at financing drug development for malaria and other diseases in developing countries.

Japan

At the Okinawa Summit, Japan led the way with the Infectious Diseases Initiative, allocating US\$3 billion over the next five years.

Russia

Information not available at the time of this assessment.

United Kingdom

The Performance and Innovation Unit was asked to report to the Prime Minister by summer of 2001 on how to achieve better availability of drugs to treat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria in developing countries.

United States

There is a 7% increase in budget of the Department of Health and Human Services to finance research efforts to develop an AIDS vaccine. The Senate promised to allocate US\$1 billion for AIDS initiatives by 2003.

Appendix: Jubilee 2000: End of Year Statement

(<http://www.j2000usa.org/j2000/updates/endyear.html>)

At this point, the U.S. Congress and the Administration have made a commitment to cancel 100% of the bilateral debt of some 30 heavily indebted poor countries. Congress has also approved funding to assist with the partial cancellation of multilateral debts owed by these countries to international financial institutions—earmarking funds for the Inter-American Development Bank. These are remarkable achievements, considering that U.S. funding for this initiative represents a more than ten-fold increase in the amount allocated for debt relief in the foreign aid budget. So far Congress has appropriated \$545 million toward an ongoing commitment to bilateral and multilateral debt cancellation. This U.S. funding will encourage other creditor countries to fulfill their pledges totalling \$27 billion. These funds should suffice to cancel between \$90–\$100 billion worth of debt and reduce the actual debt service payments of at least 22 heavily indebted poor countries by an average of 30.7 percent between now and 2005. The total debt itself, or the “debt stock,” will be cut on average by 33.3 percent for 22 countries. Congress has also authorized the use of gold sales for the IMF in order to free up funding within the IMF for debt relief. These commitments mean more than the monies appropriated, because they represent broad bipartisan acknowledgment of the severity of the debt burden.

Debt cancellation must not be conditioned on IFI-imposed macroeconomic reform programs, such as Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs). These programs have not been formulated and implemented with transparency or authentic democratic participation of civil society. By imposing policies on countries that they have designed, the IMF and World Bank have undermined democracy and national sovereignty. These programs have often increased poverty, inequality and environmental degradation in much of the global South. We join Jubilee 2000 coalitions throughout the world in condemning these destructive macroeconomic policies.

Compiled by Jacob Young and Serena Yoon

Compliance Report
2000 Okinawa
Trade

Commitment

Para. 36: “We are firmly committed to a new round of WTO trade negotiations with an ambitious, balanced and inclusive agenda, reflecting the interests of all WTO members. We agree that the objective of such negotiations should be to:

- a) Enhance market access
- b) Develop and strengthen WTO rules and disciplines
- c) Support developing countries in achieving economic growth and integration into the global trading system
- d) Ensure that trade and social policies, and trade and environmental policies are compatible and mutually supportive.

We agree to intensify our close and fruitful co-operation in order to try together with other WTO members to launch such a round during the course of this year.”

Assessment

Country	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
Britain			+1
Canada			+1
France			+1
Germany			+1
Italy			+1
Japan			+1
Russia			N/A
United States			+1
Overall			+1

The World Trade Organization (WTO) announced a further round of trade negotiations to begin with the WTO Ministerial Conference in Doha, Qatar, on November 9–13, 2001. All member

states of the WTO are already engaged in negotiations to create the agenda and proceeds for the conference.

Britain

A new white paper published by Britain's Department for International Development (DFID) sets out an agenda for the reduction and eventual elimination of extreme global poverty. The paper is entitled *Eliminating World Poverty: Making Globalisation Work for the Poor*. It looks specifically at the challenges and opportunities presented by globalization and what this means for developing countries.

Among the measures proposed in the white paper: a 50% increase in Britain's contribution to the Global Environment Facility, a new African trade initiative, new opportunities for investing in developing countries, tough action to fight corruption, financial support for the eradication of polio, and an end to the practice of linking aid donations to buying British goods.

Canada

As of September 1, 2000, Canada reduced 570 tariff lines in part to promote trade with developing countries.

France

The French government contributed 1 million euros in October 2000 to the WTO's technical assistance fund. The Secretary of State for French external trade, François Huwart, stated that the French government wished to help finance the WTO's technical assistance actions in order to assist developing countries in participating in global multilateral trade negotiations. Additionally, France pledged to contribute to the financing of the forthcoming African Trade Ministers meeting in Libreville November 13–15, 2001.

Germany

The EU committed itself to offering tariff free treatment for almost all imports from Less Developed Countries (LDCs) and often calls on other developed countries to match EU market openness and offer comparable access to LDCs' imports.

Italy

Similar to Germany, the Italian government, within the broader framework of the EU, committed itself to offering tariff free treatment for almost all imports from LDCs and called on other

developed countries to match EU market openness and offer comparable access to LDCs' imports.

Japan

The Japanese government announced an initiative to reduce industrial tariffs, which was implemented April 2001. The duty-free and quota-free treatment for LDC industrial production will increase from 94% to 99%.

United States

There was further elaboration of the *African Growth and Opportunity Act* adapted in May of 2000. Thirty-four sub-Saharan countries are designated as beneficiaries available for benefits the Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. Export Financing and Related Programs has approved US\$30 million of new funding for biotechnology research aimed at tackling issues such as malnutrition and hunger in developing countries. The money is included as part of the fiscal year 2001 foreign operations appropriations bill for the U.S. Agency for International Development.

Compiled by Philip Popp and Audrey Johnson

Compliance Report
Okinawa 2000
Cultural Diversity

Commitment

Para. 41: “We shall strive to promote the digitalization of cultural heritage through, for example, fostering international links between national museum systems, with a view to enhancing public access.”

Assessment

Country	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
Britain			+1
Canada			+1
France			+1
Germany			+1
Italy			+1
Japan			+1
Russia		0	
United States	-1		
Overall		0	

Compliance with this commitment is starting with the establishment of the Digital Opportunity Taskforce (DOT Force). The DOT Force is a product of the Okinawa Charter on Global Information Society that was adopted at the Kyushu-Okinawa Summit in 2000. Representatives from all of the G8 countries are members of the DOT Force and recently attended a meeting in Cape Town, South Africa, from March 1 to 2. Although the DOT Force has recommended that information technology (IT) be used as an instrument to emphasize local culture and languages, there is little evidence that countries have begun to implement this on any significant scale. Some countries, however, have launched initiatives to promote the digitalization of cultural heritage, and they are listed below. Those countries not listed below receive a score of -1 for lack of compliance.

Britain

The British government has embraced the digitalization of cultural heritage by supporting 11 museums IT projects, which were to be implemented at the end of March 2001. Alan Howarth, Arts Minister, and Chris Smith, Culture Secretary, welcome the strategy to promote partnerships between museums and have indicated that £500,000 over two years will be allocated to enhance access, education, and innovation in museums through the Information and Communication Technology Challenge Fund.

Canada

In an effort to maintain its commitment to foster diversity by facilitating access to Canada's cultural heritage, the Canadian government has created the Virtual Museum of Canada. On March 22, 2001, Sheila Copps, Minister of Canadian Heritage, announced that over the next three years, C\$175 million would be invested to create and broadcast Canadian cultural content on the internet. The Virtual Museum of Canada is a collaborative effort between the Canadian Heritage Information Network, museums, educational institutions, and the private sector.

France

France has been at the forefront of increasing access to culture with its comprehensive Virtual Museum, which offers links to international museums. In the budget for 2001, Catherine Tasca, Minister of Culture and Communication, has indicated that a total of 80 million francs will be utilized to further promote cultural diversity.

Germany

The German effort to comply with the commitment includes the creation of a web-based cultural portal, www.kulturportal-deutschland.de. Michael Naumann, Minister of State for Culture and Federal Government Commissioner for Cultural and Media Affairs, which has initiated and financed the site, stated that the cultural portal is a comprehensive information and service platform designed to give internet users rapid access to cultural offerings in Germany.

Japan

Japan's efforts to promote and preserve cultural heritage have largely been the result of a strong partnership with UNESCO. Since Okinawa, the Japanese government has indicated that it will

finance the UNESCO/Keizo Obuchi Research Fellowship Programme that will award 20 fellowships of US\$7,500 each for 2001–2002 to post-graduate researchers from developing countries. The areas of research include intercultural dialogue and information and communication technologies. Despite Japan's commitment to UNESCO, the Agency for Cultural Affairs, which is responsible for the promotion of culture and the preservation of cultural property in Japan, must work to increase the presence of Japan's cultural heritage in cyberspace.

Russia

A draft agreement between the Government of the Russian Federation and the Government of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria on Cooperation in the Fields of Culture, Science, Education, Sports, Tourism, and Archives has recently been approved by Mikhail Kasyanov, Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation. Thus, both parties will agree to promote cooperation and exchange in the areas of literature, art, theatre, ballet, cinematography, libraries, and archival institutions, as well as the study of the history, culture, and languages of the peoples of the two states. As this is a new initiative, it will be necessary to monitor the progress of the agreement throughout the year in order to gauge Russia's compliance.

Italy

The latest project created by the Italian Ministry of Culture, in partnership with the private sector, was announced by Minister Giovanna Melandri on March 26, 2001. This innovative multimedia portal, SuperDante.it, is dedicated to enhancing access to the literary, musical, and iconographic patrimony of Italy. Minister Melandri has indicated that one objective of the Italian government for the coming years is to reacquaint people with the joy of literature and to increase literacy.

Sources

<http://www.culture.gov.uk/heritage/>
<http://www.pch.gc.ca/bin/News.dll>
<http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/min/budget2001/index.htm>
<http://eng.bundesregierung.de/dokumente/>
<http://www.unesco.org>
<http://www.russianembassy.org>
<http://www.beniculturali.it/novita/iniziativa/conv103.asp>

Compiled by Marilena Liguori

Compliance Report
Okinawa 2000
Crime and Drugs

Commitment

Para. 45: “We reaffirm our concern at the increasing global threat posed by the trafficking and use of illegal drugs. We remain committed to reducing demand in our own countries, and to countering the threat from the production and trafficking of illicit drugs globally. We will work with other countries, the UN system and other groups to reduce both supply and demand. We will support regional initiatives to end narcotics production and trafficking. We urge universal implementation of the conclusions of the 1998 UN Special Session on countering the world drugs problem. We are also committed to strengthening international co-operation to:

- a) Combat the illicit diversion of precursor chemicals for the production of illegal drugs
- b) Address the growing new threat from amphetamines and other synthetic drugs, and will convene an ad hoc meeting of drugs experts by the end of this year
- c) Accelerate the pace of work on asset confiscation
- d) Examine, by means of an international conference hosted by the United Kingdom, the global economy of illegal drugs.

Assessment

Country	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
Britain			+1
Canada			+1
France			+1
Germany			+1
Italy			+1
Japan			+1
Russia			+1
United States			+1
Overall			+1

G8 Countries

The G8 Ad Hoc Meeting of Drug Experts was held from December 13 to 15, 2000, at Seagaia in Miyazaki, Japan, responding to the decision of the G8 leaders in Okinawa to strengthen international cooperation to counter the growing threat from production of and illegal trafficking in drugs. The meeting gathered together G8 country representatives and other experts from the United Nations International Drug Control Programme (UNDCP).

A similar meeting of the G8 Senior Experts Group on Transnational Organized Crime (Lyon Group) took place from November 14 to 16, 2000, in Hiroshima.

At a joint press conference of the Interior Ministers of Germany, France, Italy, Liechtenstein, Austria, and Switzerland in Konstanz on September 5, 2000, the common questions of internal security were addressed. The main discussion focused on the problem of cross-border crime, in which the ministers committed themselves to a more intensive cooperation. On the question of the fight against organized crime, especially drug trafficking, they stated they would fortify their joint stance.

On December 15, 2000, the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime was opened for signatures (after being adopted by the General Assembly at its Millennium meeting on November 15, 2000). The convention was drafted by the Ad Hoc Committee established by UN resolution 53/111 of December 1998. The heads of the G8 countries reaffirmed in the G8 Communiqué during the Kyushu-Okinawa that they would support the adoption of the convention by the end of this year.

There was no reference to the issues of crime or drugs in the statements of G7 finance ministers and central bank governors in either Prague (September 23, 2000) or Palermo (February 17, 2001). There was also no evidence that an international conference was hosted by Britain or in general of acceleration of asset confiscation or any specific action to counter the diversion of precursor chemicals.

The interior ministers of Germany, Albania, Italy, and Greece met in Tirana on March 1, 2001, to bring about a closer cooperation on the questions of internal security. The four countries declared their support for building a centre in Valona, Albania, for the fight against crime, including the problem of drug trafficking, as a way to intensify and professionalize international cooperation in the fight against crime. Albania is seen as an important drug transit route, especially for Western Europe.

France

Through a number of programs on the regional and national levels, the government worked on reducing demand in France and it also cooperated in a number of international actions intended to counter the global production and trafficking of illegal drugs. There is evidence that France worked with other countries, organizations, and contributed to the United Nations (UN) system, as well as provided initiative to commence new actions and programs to counter the drug threat.

There is less evidence or information on some specific areas of international cooperation, such as combating the diversion of precursor chemicals or asset confiscation. At the same time, however, it is important to note that France made significant drug seizures—especially amphetamines, which were identified as a particular and growing threat in the communiqué.

More specifically, the following are some of the programs and initiatives that the government of France undertook to address the drug problem:

National Initiatives

In 2000 and 2001, the French Customs had significant success in the seizures of illegal drugs, notably amphetamines.

International Initiatives

France participated in the meeting of the Interior Ministers at Konstanz on September 5, 2000, at which they stated they would fortify their stance against organized crime and drug trafficking.

At the recent Franco-British Summit in Cahors (February 9, 2001), the two countries identified some of the common priorities for the European Council in Stockholm. One of the main items on their agenda was the fight against drugs in the Balkans. The ministers called on the other European Union members to adopt their initiative on the European level and assist them in combating organized crime in the region. They made a further appeal to the EU to adopt the recent French proposition in the fight against drugs in South Eastern Europe, considering that there is relatively little local investment in the subject all the while the region is gaining in importance as a drug-trafficking route. Thus, they called on the other member states to implement this proposition quickly and to define the zones of priority for assistance. The two interior ministers also expressed their desire to make a joint visit to oversee the implementation of the proposed measures.

On February 21, 2001, at the 12th meeting of the high-level Franco-Dutch Group, which is dedicated to the fight against drugs, it was stated that great progress had been accomplished in the cooperation between the two states in terms of judicial, police, and customs work. A similar

conference was held earlier in Paris, on January 31, 2001, on the anti-drug policies in the Netherlands and in France. Nonetheless, the group stated that much common work remains to be done and identified the problem of synthetic drugs as being particularly of concern. The two countries declared their determination to proceed with their joint effort to fight against the development of the production and drug trafficking and to act in concert at the level of the EU.

France (with the UNDCP and the EU) has been a significant donor to Bolivia and Columbia to support exploring ways to strengthen their capacity to monitor illicit crops.

France also joined a program developed by the European Commission to support the fight against drugs in the developing world. The specific project, under the Fonds de solidarité prioritaire, the "Support to the National Centre for the repression of illicit drug trafficking," is destined to the Interior Ministry of Niger and totals 2.4 million francs over 24 months.

Based on the available information, it appears that France has made a genuine effort to comply with the communiqué commitment and should thus be assigned a score of +1.

Germany

The German government was involved in numerous programs on the regional and national levels to reduce demand in the country and it also cooperated in a number of international actions to counter the global production and trafficking of illegal drugs. There is evidence that Germany worked with other countries, organizations, and contributed to the UN system. Germany also hosted an international conference on precursor chemicals and had success on the national level in addressing the same problem.

There is less evidence of or information about asset confiscation or progress in countering the threat of amphetamines, these being some of the specific commitments to international cooperation made in the communiqué.

More specifically, the federal government undertook the following programs and initiatives to address the drug problem:

National Efforts

Otto Schily, Interior Minister, stated that Germany has had great success and has made large progress in the fight against the export of basic materials (precursors) for the narcotics production and the drugs in general. Schily and finance minister Hans Eichel reached this conclusion based on the five-year record of the Precursor Surveillance Commission, a joint effort of the Customs

Criminal Unit and the State Criminal Department, accompanied by constant international cooperation. Their success was fortified by the dialog developed with the industry sector.

The German Border Security and the Hamburg Police strengthened their joint fight against the open drug scene (January 22, 2001).

In her speech on in August 2000 on the topic of the “State of the Fight against Drugs in Germany,” parliamentary state secretary in the Ministry of Health Gudrun Schaich-Walch greeted the cooperation of various national agencies. She also pointed to the change in the anti-drug policy, as the new government emphasizes prevention rather than overstates repression. Earlier, at the ministerial conference of the Pompidou Group in October 2000 in Sintra, Portugal, she pointed to the cooperation of the German political parties and stated her support for the EU’s 2000–2004 Action Plan, noting its effectiveness as opposed to a rhetorical “war on drugs.”

International Initiatives

German minister of state Ludger Volmer stated his support for the peace process in Colombia, the “Plan Colombia,” on July 5, 2000, focusing particularly on the drug problem and strategies. He added that the “federal government is planning to increase its 2001 funding for Colombia by 50%, i.e. by another DM 10 million in addition to the DM 20 million already made available,” and that he hopes that Germany “will be able in this way to finance [its] contribution and that of Europe towards drug substitution policy, alternative crops as well as community- and democracy-building.”

The Bundeskriminalamt (Federal Criminal Police Office) directed Interpol’s “10th International Meeting on Synthetic Drugs and the Surveillance of Basic Materials” from December 6 to 8, 2000. Police, customs, and criminal technology experts from 47 countries and 7 international organizations attended the meeting, which made it one of the most important ones on this issue. The discussion themes included the growing international problem of production, smuggling, and distribution of synthetic drugs.

Germany’s interior minister participated in the meeting in Konstanz on September 5, 2000, at which the ministers jointly stated they would fortify the fight against organized crime, especially drug trafficking.

At the German-Spanish government consultations on September 15–16, 2000, the German Interior Minister wanted to address the question of organized crime and drug trafficking.

The interior ministers of Germany and Lithuania committed themselves to closer cooperation in the fight against organized crime, including drug offences, at a bilateral meeting in Vilnius on February 23, 2001.

At the meeting of interior ministers at Tirana on March 1, 2001, German interior minister Schily stated that the four countries would support the building of a centre in Valona, Albania, for the fight against crime, including the problem of drug trafficking, as a way to intensify and professionalize international cooperation in the fight against crime.

The interior ministers of Germany and Slovenia agreed on closer cooperation in the fight against organized crime and drug-related offences in Ljubiana on March 2, 2001. Schily stated that, after the events of the early 1990s, Slovenia is increasingly becoming a route for the illicit drugs, and this joint agreement is the first step toward a more effective fight against crime. Thereafter, a trilateral meeting of the interior ministers of Germany, Slovenia, and Italy took place.

At a meeting of the interior and justice ministers of the EU on March 15, 2001, German interior minister Schily proposed the development of a European border police as a means of combating organized crime and drug trafficking, a problem becoming increasingly important at a time of the EU enlargement. He also greeted the decision to form a European Crime Prevention Net. On the question of a joint fight against drugs, Schily explained that a consensus exists among the home and justice ministers, and that the fight against drug criminality must be the prime goal in the national, as well as the international political agenda.

Based on the available information, it appears that Germany has complied with the commitment made at Okinawa in taking a lead role in numerous regional agreements, as well as national programs. It should accordingly receive a score of +1.

Italy

Through a number of programs on the regional and national level, the government worked on reducing demand in Italy and it also cooperated in a number of bilateral and multilateral actions and programs to counter the global production and trafficking of illegal drugs. There is evidence that Italy worked with other countries, organizations, and contributed to the UN system, in particular through the support it provided to the implementation of the 1998 UN Special Session on countering the world drugs problem.

There is less evidence or information on the specific areas of international cooperation, such as combating the diversion of precursor chemicals or asset confiscation. At the same time, however, it is important to note that the most current report of the International Narcotics Control Board on Precursor Chemicals for 2000 would not be able to record any progress relevant to the post-summit developments.

More specifically, the government of Italy undertook the following programs and initiatives to address the drug problem:

Contribution to the UN Programs

In the year 2000, the Italian government made a voluntary contribution in the amount of Lit. 20 billion to the UNDCP.

Its support for the UN anti-drug and anti-crime programs should also be noted, as it hosted the high-level international conference for the signing of the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.

The presidency of the UN ad hoc committee was conferred to Italy, recognizing the Italian efforts in this area, and the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs helped coordinate the positions of its partners under the anti-transnational organized crime group formed by the G8. The finalization of these juristic instruments proves the effective synergy of the UN-G8 in terms of crime.

At the same occasion, Pino Arlacchi, the Undersecretary-General and Executive Director of the UNDCP, noted that it is “extremely encouraging to learn that Italy would annually devote the monetary equivalent of 25% of confiscated assets to the United Nations to help developing countries in this regard.” Senator Michele Figurelli added: “The proposal referred to yesterday to earmark annually for the United Nations Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention, 25% of assets seized from organized crime has been approved and is now part of Italian budget legislation.”

At the address of the Italian Diplomatic Corps on December 21, 2000, President Carlo Azeglio Ciampi stressed the problem of organized crime and drug trafficking, and he indicated the full support Italy gave to the UN and the Convention against Transnational Organized Crime. He added that it is up to the member states to provide the political will and ask for greater efficacy and responsibility.

International Cooperation

The Italian government was involved in a drug raid (Operation Orinoco) in Venezuela in Aug 2000 in cooperation with the U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency and several other governments.

Italy reaffirmed its fight against crime at a meeting on illegal activities in the Adriatic and the Ionian regions on August 10, 2000. It was hosted in Rome under the joint presidency of the Undersecretary for Foreign Affairs and the Undersecretary for Internal Affairs, following a similar conference in Ancona. The participating states agreed on intensified cooperation, information exchange, and monitoring.

Italy participated in the press conference at Konstanz on September 5, 2000, at which the interior ministers stated they would fortify their joint stance against organized crime and drug trafficking.

President Ciampi also noted the problem of organized crime and the related drug-trafficking at the conference on “The collaboration of Italy and Russia in Europe and in the World,” held in Moscow on November 28, 2000.

The meeting of the foreign ministers of Italy and Albania in Rome on January 30, 2001, provided an opportunity to discuss cooperation between the two countries with particular reference to the joint fight against organized crime and illegal trafficking. Iran and Italy signed an anti-crime pact, a cooperation protocol on several security issues, including drugs trafficking, in Teheran on January 7, 2001.

Italian interior minister Enzo Bianco told a news conference that one of the first measures would be the establishment of a committee of experts from the two countries. The agreement strengthens a protocol signed two years ago between Rome and Teheran.

In his visit to Syria, Italian interior minister Bianco signed an agreement on January 3, 2001, to exchange information in the fight against organized crime and drugs trafficking.

Italy’s interior minister participated in the meeting at Tirana on March 1, 2001, at which it was agreed to support the building of a centre for the fight against crime in Valona, Albania, including the problem of drug trafficking.

National Efforts

Italy has developed a number of projects under the National Fund of fight against drugs aimed mainly at prevention and curbing of addiction in the country.

To reduce the demand for illicit amphetamine-type stimulants (ATS), the UNDCP pointed out that an agreement on special measures has been signed between the Government and the national association of discotheque owners.

Based on this information, in light of the initiatives that Italy has undertaken on all levels of government, it can be assigned a score of +1. Much work is still in progress, but the commitment itself does not presuppose a finalized outcome.

Japan

Japan actively participated in the deliberations on the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, as described above. In the context of the G8, Japan demonstrated leadership in efforts to tackle such issues as high-tech crime and firearms in its capacity as chair of the Lyon Group (Toshinori Kanemoto, President of the National Police Academy and former Director-General of the International Affairs Department of National Police Agency, acted as chair). Japan was particularly active among G8 members and Asian countries concerning the convention and the three related protocols, and contributed to the agreement over the draft convention and two of the related protocols.

Furthermore, in order to strengthen the criminal, judicial, and law enforcement systems of developing countries mainly in the Asia-Pacific region, Japan has provided a variety of support for the development of legal framework, and has provided training to judicial and law enforcement experts in developing countries through such organizations as the United Nations, Asia, and Far East Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (UNAFEI). In January 2000, Japan hosted the Asia-Pacific Symposium on Trafficking in Persons. Japan also hosted the Asia-Pacific Law Enforcement Conference against Transnational Organized Crime in January 2001. In the area of drugs, on a Japanese initiative, international conferences were held in Tokyo in February 1999 and January 2000 in order to promote cooperation among authorities of Asia-Pacific countries, which have crucial importance in Japan's own measures in the fight against drugs. Japan is also cooperating through contributions to international organizations such as the UNDCP, and is dispatching experts, accepting trainees in Japan, and providing grant aid aimed at promoting the cultivation of alternative crops in place of drug producing plants and strengthening of regulations against the illegal trade of drugs.

In recent years, Japan, like many countries, has been facing incidents related to transnational organized crime, such as organized killings, the trafficking in stimulant drugs and firearms, and the smuggling of migrants, as well as high-tech crime. In order to tackle these crimes effectively, Japan has been making efforts to improve its domestic legal system to strengthen judicial and law enforcement systems. To this end, Japan has passed two pieces of legislation that relate to measures against organized crime: the Law Prohibiting Unauthorized Access and the Law for Punishing Acts Related to Child Prostitution and Child Pornography.

Based on the available information, it appears that Japan is making concerted efforts to comply with its summit initiative and should thus be accorded a score of +1.

Russia

The Russian government has concluded over 80 intergovernmental and inter-agency agreements related to drug control with other governments throughout the world. Law enforcement authorities of Belarus, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation, and Ukraine have continued their joint efforts to fight drug trafficking, which have resulted in major seizures.

In the Russian Federation, amendments to the federal law on narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances of 1997 are currently being prepared, which are extremely important for national drug control coordination. Russia also approved the governing principles and guidelines for action to counter illegal trafficking in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances and drug abuse for the period up to 2008.

Although achievements were made in the recent years by Russian law enforcement agencies in combating illicit trafficking in narcotic drugs, psychotropic substances, and precursors, Russian authorities have encountered difficulties in monitoring and reporting, as required under the three international drug control treaties, illicit activities in the country related to narcotic drugs, psychotropic substances, and precursors.

Based on the available evidence, it appears that Russia is making efforts to comply with its summit initiative. As such, it should be accorded a score of +1.

Compiled by Michael Simpson and Maria Banda

G8 Compliance Report
Okinawa 2000
Aging

Commitment

Para. 52. “The central challenge is to promote a culture that values the experience and knowledge that come with age. To this end, we will make further efforts to remove inappropriate disincentives for people below retirement age to stay in the labour market.”

Assessment

Country	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
Britain			+1
Canada		0	
France			+1
Germany			+1
Italy			+1
Japan			+1
Russia			N/A
United States			+1
Overall			+1

Britain

Since the G8 Okinawa Summit, Britain has played an active role in those EU forums that have been devoted to the development of social policies, many of which intend to tap into the benefits of active aging by removing disincentives for individuals of working age to retire early. During the EU Employment Week held in Brussels in November 2000, support for the policies of increasing the workforce by decreasing mandatory retirement was vocalized and discussed by all EU countries. Such discussions were carried through to the European Council Meeting in December 2000 and, finally, to the EU Presidency Conclusions meeting in Stockholm in March 2001, during the inter-Summit period.

Britain is considered one of the G8 countries with an advanced tax system that would require little reform to reach the policy objectives of “removing disincentives” as put forth in the G8

Okinawa Communiqué. Britain's score of +1 is based solely on its participation in the EU process, while its record for policy change in the past year has not yet reflected any timely shifts that would coincide with the recommendations made during its cooperation in these forums.

Canada

In working from the conclusions put forth by the Chair of the G8 Labour Ministers Conference held in Turin November 10–11, 2000, the policy of active aging was heralded, since the Cologne Summit as an incipient part of strengthening and building social policies of modern societies.

Canada's contribution toward developing a policy of active aging in the period between Okinawa 2000 and Genoa 2001 and, more specifically, since Turin, has been neither evident nor clear. Although the Liberal Party, which was re-elected in Canada's November 2000 election, supported a platform of investment in education and health care, no specific commitments were made within the Ministry of Labour or within the annual budget to support active aging. This, however, may be due to the fact that of all the G8 countries, Canada's taxation and transfer system is the one most conducive to bearing the burden of an aging population. Investing in active aging is already part of the Canadian social fabric, as exemplified by the social mandate of the Canada Pension Plan. Therefore, there is little incentive for Canada to pursue a policy of integrating the elderly back into society when those individuals are already included in society. It was difficult for Canada to move toward incorporating active aging into its social policy over the past year as it is already a leader and a model for its seven counterparts in this particular area. Many of Canada's counterparts (namely Germany, the U.S., and Japan) are implementing programs and policies that emulate those of Canada in an effort to increase their investment in active aging.

France

With a French president heading the EU in 2000, France led the way to the Nice European Council Meeting and the advancement of the new European social policy agenda that was proposed in June 2000. This policy strongly supports the establishment of "the new economy," which highlights the importance of active aging. Since this goal was outlined in the days before the Okinawa Summit, it has since been advanced in many forums in the EU processes.

During the EU's Employment Week, held in Brussels in November 2000, the opening speech was made by France's Odile Quintin, Director General of Employment and Social Policy of the EU, in which she highlighted the need to reduce the number of retirees. The speech also emphasized the need to increase the number of people in the job market by removing mandatory retirement age policies. Specific policy suggestions were made to design retirement systems that would promote increased labour force participation.

In December 2000, there was movement toward implementing these suggestions at the Nice European Council Meeting. At the meeting, member states of the regional EU were invited to explore the possibilities of implementing the policies outlined during Employment Week 2000. As a result, feasible policy changes were recommended in Stockholm during the EU Presidency Conclusions meeting in March 2001. The recommendations promoted active aging and the pursuit of the European policy of increasing labour force participation.

Germany

In meeting the recommendations put forth at the 2001 EU Presidency Conclusions meeting in Stockholm, Germany succeeded in introducing a tax reform expected to alleviate tax burdens on families and to bring more opportunities for the pursuit of small business ventures. Tax Reform 2000 is outlined in Germany's National Action Plan, which was submitted to the EU Council in Stockholm. It strives to "structure Germany's ability to meet the challenges of the future." The country's 2000 Tax Reform is intended to contribute much to Germany's goal of modernization, and will work in tandem with the objectives of the EU as they were demarcated from November to March 2000/2001.

Italy

Similar to its member EU countries, Italy participated in the EU's Employment forums from Brussels to Stockholm that led up to the EU Presidency Conclusions meeting in March 2001. Italy contributed to the process of developing social policy throughout this inter-Summit period by this participation. It brought suggestions and recommendations to the discussion of which social policies would take precedence over others in creating a modernized European society. Such discussions identified the importance of pursuing active aging as a policy of diversification for both the European society as well as the economy, which would result in a more sustainable European society and economy.

Japan

In September 2000, the Japanese Institute of Labour released *The 2000 White Paper on Labour*, the second part of which addressed "How Best to Mix the Young, the Middle-aged, and the Elderly in an Aging Society." Much emphasis was placed on the changing demographics of the Japanese population and, in particular, of the Japanese workforce. Because there are fewer young people and more elderly in Japanese society, the white paper recognized the need to adjust social policies in order to make the best use of these overlooked members of what has become a

shrinking Japanese labour force. The paper also looks forward to the next 10 years when aging baby boomers will increase the number of elderly available to work., The report heralds a social change inherent to Japan that will address the weak relationship felt by the aged with their local community and that often leads to “low levels of satisfaction with their life in retirement.”

To mitigate these rising dilemmas in Japanese society, the report makes four main recommendations to the government: 1) to call on management and employers to voluntarily raise the retirement age to 65 over the next ten years, 2) to make gradual efforts to ensure that employment opportunities are available to the elderly, 3) to support efforts to dispel stereotypes held by companies about standard recruitment ages of employees and to broaden these criteria to include the aged as well as the young, and 4) to support the efforts of individuals to increase and improve their skills.

Consequently, the Japanese Ministry of Finance set forth a budget plan for the year 2001 that emphasizes allocation of funds to policies that promote active aging, along with the environment, information technology, and the provision of urban infrastructure.

Russia

Information on the Russian Ministry of Labour’s efforts to advance the mandate set forth in the Turin Meeting of G8 Labour Ministers was not readily available during the time of this compliance study.

United States

Since the Okinawa Summit in July 2000, the United States has undergone a presidential election and a consequent change in White House administration, with the election of Republican George W. Bush to the presidency. This new administration’s Secretary of Labor, Elaine L. Chao, did not hesitate to address the issue of active aging in the U.S. during her inaugural speech. The U.S. is facing the prospects of entering into the next few decades with a workforce that will not be large enough to meet the demands of a growing economy. To compound this urgency to stimulate the workforce, current policies do not provide a sufficient tax base to take care of the next generation of retirees.

The resulting effect is the need to create a “New 21st Century Workforce.” Movement toward this goal has begun with the Department of Labor’s creation of the Office of the 21st Century Workforce, which will focus on addressing the changing dynamics of the country’s workforce and meeting those changes with social policies. The department also plans to convene a group of

business, labour union, and government leaders to address the structural changes, such as an aging populace, that are affecting the U.S. workforce and the U.S. economy.

Sources

http://www.g8.gc.ca/2000/chairs_conclusions-e.asp

http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/employment_social/speeches/001107oq.pdf

http://europa.eu.int/council/off/conclu/dec2000/dec2000_en.htm

<http://ue.eu.int/presid/conclusions.htm>

<http://www.mof.go.jp/english/hyouka/hyouka3.htm#3?2?>

http://eng.bundesregierung.de/top/dokumente/Background_Information/Germany_in_the_Global_Economy/Action_Plan_2000/ix2658_14178.htm?template=single&id=14178&ixepf=2658_14178&script=0

<http://ideas.uqam.ca/EDIRC/minlabor.html>

<http://www.jil.go.jp/bulletin/year/2000/vol39-09/07.htm>

Compiled by Petra Akacuk

Compliance Report
Okinawa 2000
Biotech

Commitment

Para. 56. “We attach strong importance to the work of the CODEX Alimentarius Commission (CAC), the principal standard-setting body in food safety, and encourage its Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Task Force on Foods Derived from Biotechnology to produce a substantial interim report before completion of its mandate in 2003.”

Assessment

Country	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
Britain			+1
Canada			+1
France			+1
Germany			+1
Italy			+1
Japan			+1
Russia	-1		
United States			+1
Overall			+1

This very particular commitment is based on the Second Session meeting of the International Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Task Force on Foods Derived from Biotechnology held in Chiba, Japan, on March 25–29, 2001. Most of the G8 countries participated, in a variety of degrees, to produce a substantial interim report.

During this meeting, the main advancement was the approval of the Proposed Draft Principles for the Risk Analysis of Foods Derived from Modern Biotechnology as well as the Proposed Draft Guideline for the Conduct of Food Safety Assessment of Foods Derived from Recombinant-DNA Plants. The Second Session of the Task Force brought these proposals to the fifth stage in the eight-stage CODEX Elaboration of Standards procedure. The procedure establishes and allows for the discussion, before meeting approval or rejection, of CODEX’s operating principles and its developments.

Further advancement at the Second Session meeting came with the agreement to document the present status of validation of methods used by member countries that detect foods derived from biotechnology. Along with this came the recommendation to establish a register or repository containing relevant information on methods for the detection or identification of foods or food ingredients derived from biotechnology.

In addition, a discussion paper on the concept of traceability and an information paper on familiarity were advanced by the U.S. and French delegates, respectively, and discussed by the Task Force.

These advancements were compiled into a document for submission to the 24th Session of the CODEX Alimentarius Commission to be held from July 2–7, 2001, in Geneva.

Britain

Aside from sending its delegates to participate in the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Task Force on Foods Derived from Biotechnology, Britain provided feedback on components of the First Session of the Task Force Committee, which led to the establishment of the March 2001 agenda for the Second Session. Therefore, Britain fully participated in the advancement of its commitment to support the work of the Task Force.

Canada

Much like Britain, Canada contributed the participation of its delegates, as well as comments and discussion to the Second Session meeting in Chiba. The exact contents of the delegation's comments, however, were not revealed in the official report, nor were the contents of the delegation's inquiry into the process and discussions from the First Session meeting. Indeed, no detail was provided to this extent for any country. Canada, therefore, receives merit for full participation for its contributions to furthering the goals of the Task Force and CODEX.

France

France sent delegates to the Second Session of the Intergovernmental Task Force on Food Derived from Biotechnology and offered feedback and comments in the discussions of the agenda items. The French delegation also drafted the Discussion Paper on Traceability, which advanced agreement on the contentious issue of defining traceability. Traceability was one of the most thoroughly and ardently discussed topics at the meeting. France led the debate for the incorporation of traceability as a risk management tool in determining the status of food products

and whether they have been derived from biotechnology. France argued that such a broad risk management tool should be used in principle and on a CODEX-wide level, rather than just in relation to food derived from biotechnology.

This proactive involvement as well as France's contribution in the drafting of the discussion paper warrants full compliance with its Okinawa commitment to the Task Force's production of a substantial interim report.

Germany

Germany succeeded in sending delegates to the Second Session meeting and in providing feedback and commentary in the First Sessional Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Task Force on Foods Derived from Biotechnology meeting in July 2000. This feedback helped to construct the agenda for the Second Session meeting in Chiba, furthering the goals of both the Task Force and CODEX itself.

Italy

Italy's participation in the meeting and events leading up to the meeting falls very much in line with that of Germany, Britain, and Canada, allotting it full compliance acknowledgement for its Okinawa commitment to the work of the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Task Force on Foods Derived from Biotechnology.

Japan

The Japanese hosted the March 2001 meeting of the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Task Force on Food Derived from Biotechnology meeting as a part of its mandate as the chair of the committee. The meeting's organization and subsequent success in producing a substantive interim report can be correlated to the efforts of the Japanese delegation. This delegation was extensive as it called upon the expertise of the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Education, Sports, Culture, Science and Technology, the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries, and the Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry.

Aside from its organizational and hosting duties, Japan also provided substantial comments in the discussion portion of the session's agenda, which indicates its full compliance with its Okinawa commitment to support the work of the Task Force.

Russia

Russia is the only G8 country that did not participate in the Ad Hoc Task Force on Foods Derived from Biotechnology in Chiba. According to article 3 of the Statutes of the CODEX Alimentarius Commission, any member country or organization of CODEX is eligible to participate in the ad hoc meetings as observers. Russia was not listed as a participant in the Second Session of the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Task Force on Foods Derived from Biotechnology, nor did it provide feedback on the First Session of the Task Force, which led to the drafting of the agenda for the Second Session.

For these reasons, Russia earned a score in the negative range for failing to contribute to the Task Force's drafting of a substantial interim report.

United States

The United States, in addition to sending delegates to the Intergovernmental Task Force's Second Session and providing feedback, furthered its contribution by drafting *Conference Room Document 3: Comments Relating to the Discussion Paper on Traceability*. The U.S. thus led the dissenting debate against France, claiming that the very definition of traceability was ambiguous, making it difficult to establish it as a broad-level tool for risk management, if at all.

These proactive efforts and participation merit the U.S. a score of full compliance with their Okinawa commitment to advance further toward a substantial interim report on the road to the completion of the mandate of the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Task Force on Foods Derived from Biotechnology in 2003.

Sources

<http://www.codexalimentarius.net/Manual/statutes.htm>

<http://www.sptimes.ru/cgi-bin/htsearch>

<http://www.iht.com/articles/16573.htm>

<http://www.codexalimentarius.net/>

<ftp://ftp.fao.org/codex/alinorm01/al0134ae.pdf>

<http://www.codexalimentarius.net/Reports.htm#fbt2>

Compiled by Petra Akacuk

Compliance Report
2000 Okinawa
Conflict Prevention

Commitment

Para. 73: “We express special concern that the proceeds from the illicit trade in diamonds have contributed to aggravating armed conflict and humanitarian crises, particularly in Africa. We therefore call for an international conference, whose results shall be submitted to the UN, building on the UN Security Council Resolution 1306 and inter alia the ‘Kimberley’ process launched by the Government of South Africa, to consider practical approaches to breaking the link between the illicit trade in diamonds and armed conflict, including consideration of an international agreement on certification for rough diamonds.”

Assessment

Country	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
Britain			+1
Canada			+1
France			+1
Germany			+1
Italy		0	
Japan		0	
Russia		0	
United States			+1
Overall			+1

Britain

Britain has played a seminal role in all aspects of the Kimberly Process. Britain initially rallied support for a technical forum on rough diamond certification in Kimberly, and then acted as a vocal proponent of the process at the International Diamond Ministerial in Pretoria, South Africa. Moreover, it also jointly supported adding conflict diamonds to the agenda of the G8 Summit in Okinawa. Britain also hosted the London Inter-Governmental Meeting on Conflict Diamonds—a meeting conceived in Okinawa to explore ways to break the link between conflicts and illicit diamonds. Britain also provided leadership in crafting and ratifying UN General Assembly

Resolution 56 intended to diminish or eliminate the role of diamonds in fuelling conflicts. Lastly, Britain has also shown support for the nascent workshop in Windhoek, Namibia, aimed at developing certification guidelines for rough diamonds.

Canada

Canada has been a vocal advocate for breaking the link between illicit diamonds and conflict. In September 2000, Prime Minister Jean Chrétien stated that there was a need to “deny the agents of violence and conflict their sources of supply,” particularly through methods such as “controlling the illicit trade in diamonds.” Canada’s official position on this issue was further solidified in a January 25, 2001, statement by Michel Duval, Deputy Permanent Representative of Canada to the United Nations, who stated that “We reiterate our support for international efforts to devise effective and pragmatic measures to eliminate conflict diamonds, with a particular focus on proposals for an international certification scheme for rough diamonds.”

As a participant in the Kimberley Process, Canada co-sponsored, along with the UK, the concluding international ministerial conference in Pretoria in September 2000. At this meeting, a working group established in May 2000 put forth proposals for a global certification process. On October 25–26 of that year, Canada participated in the London Conference along with representatives of 36 other governments involved in the processing, exporting, and importing of rough diamonds. This conference sought to foster greater international support for breaking the link between illicit diamonds and conflict as well as increasing dialogue on a possible certification regime. The international consensus and support forged in London led to the General Assembly Resolution 56 on December 1, 2000, sponsored by Canada, which reaffirmed the G8 Okinawa commitment to break the link between rough diamonds, particularly through an international certification process. Namibia has agreed to host an international technical conference to discuss the certification process in February 2001, the results of were reported back to the UN General Assembly.

In addition to the global certification process, the Canadian government has also sought to eliminate conflict diamonds through improving the sanctions policy of the United Nations. As chair of the Angola Sanctions Committee, Canada has recommended that the United Nations develop a more systematic approach to monitoring sanctions. Canada asserts that this method would better detect violations of Security Council measures, such as the export of conflict diamonds, rather than the case-by-case approach currently adopted.

France

Although France is not a major exporter, importer, or processor of diamonds internationally, it has nonetheless played an active role in global efforts to break the illicit trade of diamonds through its position as a permanent member of the UN Security Council. As an active member of the UN Panel of Experts that examined the link between the sale of diamonds and conflicts in Angola, Liberia, and Sierra Leone, and through its role as the rotating president of the European Union during the first stages of the Kimberley Process, France was able to further the issue of illicit diamond trading through its membership in such critical international forums.

France attended and supported the proposals of the London Intergovernmental Conference in October 2000, which examined several means of breaking the link between conflict and illicit diamonds. It also supported and ratified General Assembly Resolution 56, which built on the proposals of the London conference and laid the groundwork for a forum to establish an international diamond certification scheme. Furthermore, as the president of the EU in the last six months of 2000, France was charged with speaking on behalf of EU members during important debates at the UN General Assembly on the issue of illicit diamond trading.

However, although the French government officially has endorsed and supported all international efforts since the Kimberley Process began, it has also used this issue to bring a less punitive approach to sanctions against leaders of “blood diamond” nations. For example, France fought for the inclusion of a sunset clause on UN sanctions against Liberia, which resulted in accusations by many non-governmental organizations of a self-serving French policy of supporting sanctions on the sale of diamonds, but rejecting sanctions against other areas of the Liberian economy such as timber (France is Liberia’s largest importer of timber). However, France’s concern about sanctions against Liberia reflected their overall view of punitive sanctions, which, in the opinion of the French government, had in the past been destructive to many innocent civilians. As such, France fought hard and won support for the more limited but flexible sanctions that it believed allowed the UN Security Council to measure their effectiveness more consistently. This approach enabled the international community to target the leaders of these blood diamond nations directly, thus avoiding the unnecessary suffering of innocent civilians through punitive sanctions.

While France has been criticized certain aspects of international sanctions on this issue, its constructive and vocal approach has nonetheless supported all major initiatives taken by the international community to break the link between conflict and illicit diamonds. Since France is not a major exporting, importing, or processing nation of diamonds, it will most likely assume a more diminished role on this issue in the future as the targets become more specific and the impetus is placed on exporting, importing, and processing nations to take action. Since Okinawa, however, France has been an active participant in the important progress spearheaded by the G8 in breaking the link between armed conflict and the international trade of illicit diamonds.

Germany

As part of its regional African policy, which aims to promote democracy, order, and stability in the region, Germany has supported all efforts undertaken by the UN and the EU to halt the sale of illicit diamonds responsible for financing and prolonging conflicts that threaten democracy and stability in many parts of Africa. Since the issue of conflict prevention has been a key foreign policy priority of the current Red-Green coalition, Germany has been an active member of concerted international efforts aimed at finding a final solution to the illegal sale of raw diamonds used to finance conflicts in states under civil strife including Angola and Sierra Leone.

However, because Germany is not a major exporting, importing, or processing state on the international diamond market, its influence on finding a solution to “blood diamonds” is limited. Due to its incapacity to exert a meaningful leadership role on this issue, the German government has instead employed a supportive approach to all international efforts, including the establishment of an international diamond certification scheme, and has promoted its policy on this issue through multilateral organizations such as the UN, the EU, and the G8. Germany attended the London Intergovernmental Conference in October 2000, which examined ways to break the link between conflict and illicit diamonds. Germany further supported UN General Assembly Resolution 56, which built on the proposals of the London conference and laid the groundwork for a forum on establishing an international diamond certification scheme at Windhoek, Namibia, in February 2001.

As part of its approach on this issue, Germany endorsed all international efforts aimed at attacking the sources of prolonged conflicts created as a result of the financing of illicit diamonds in several African countries. At a conference in Berlin in November 2000 devoted to the new regional foreign policy of the German government in Africa—hosted by the German government and attended by members of the EU, South Africa, and other African nations—Germany reaffirmed the role played by diamonds in financing conflicts in Africa, and called for an immediate end to this situation in an effort to promote democracy and stability on that continent. Furthermore, the German government has also taken the lead on pushing major international diamond cartels such as De Beers in adopting similar measures.

Overall, Germany has played a constructive and supportive role in international efforts aimed at limiting the role of illicit diamonds in fuelling armed conflicts. However, while Germany’s role to curb the sales of illegal diamonds has been very positive to date, its role will most likely be reduced even further as the process moves to more specific and ambitious targets, in which the major exporting, importing, and processing nations of diamonds will have to assume the lead on this issue.

Italy

Although Italy has not been at the forefront of the movement to eliminate conflict diamonds, it has been involved in some of the more important international efforts to push this agenda forward. Italy was among the 36 countries at the London Intergovernmental Conference in October 2000 and played a key role in the discussions about the need to break the link between illicit diamonds and conflict. Italy further supported the subsequent December 1, 2001, General Assembly Resolution 56 which confirmed international support for this issue. The General Assembly resolution reaffirmed the commitment made by the G8 in Okinawa to break the link between illicit diamonds and conflict, particularly through the development of an international certification process.

Japan

Japan's commitment to conflict prevention has been most pronounced in its involvement in Africa; a continent that, according to the Japanese, has been a leading source of conflicts resulting from the illicit trade of rough diamonds. Prime Minister Yoshiro Mori demonstrated his commitment to the issue of illicit diamond trading during a series of bilateral visits to Africa in the post-Okinawa period. In his discussions with African state leaders during these bilaterals, the Prime Minister promoted support for the work of Economic Cooperation of West African States (ECOWAS) and the Kimberley Process. On more than one occasion during these bilaterals, Prime Minister Mori stressed the importance of resolving the issues pertaining to natural resources such as diamonds in terms of conflict prevention.

Japan, along with its G8 partners and 36 other countries, was present at the October 2000 London Intergovernmental Conference on Diamonds and Conflict. In addition, on December 1, 2000, Japan voted in favour of unanimously adopting UN General Assembly resolution 55/56, aimed at breaking the link between the illicit transaction of rough diamonds and armed conflict, as a contribution to the prevention and settlement of armed conflicts.

Russia

As the world's second largest diamond producer, Russia initially approached proposals for an international certification scheme cautiously in the post-Okinawa period, sensing that these measures might extend too far in terms of intervening in Russia's domestic politics. However, in spite of its initial position, Russia has taken decisive action to halt the illegal trade in diamonds used to finance protracted violent conflict, particularly in countries such as Sierra Leone, Angola, and the Democratic Republic of Congo. Further to its Okinawa pledge to establish an international conference that would build on the Kimberley Process, Russia reinforced this

commitment by attending and contributing to the meeting of experts in Windhoek, Namibia (September 4–5), the ministerial meeting in Pretoria (September 19–20), and, subsequently, the London Intergovernmental Conference on Diamonds and Conflict in October. At London, practical approaches aimed at breaking the link between the illicit trade in diamonds and armed conflict were considered, as an increased international consensus among a broader array of states on the need to drive forward the Kimberly Process was reached. In December, Russia declared to the UN General Assembly that it was working on concluding the preparation and launching of a national certification system for rough diamonds. Finally, as an active participant in the London Intergovernmental Conference on Diamonds and Conflict and as an endorser of the UN General Assembly Resolution 55/56, Russia supported the initiative of the government of Namibia to host further expert discussions on the development of certification guidelines for rough diamonds.

United States

The U.S. initiated leadership towards exploring ways of preventing conflicts fuelled by diamonds by jointly leading the initiative to place conflict diamonds on the agenda of the G8 Summit in Okinawa. Following Okinawa, the U.S. hosted an international conference in Washington that focused on economies of war, which, inter alia, opened a direct dialogue with diamond officials from Botswana and Angola. At Kimberly, the U.S. reached an agreement on principles with Belgium and Britain on key aspects of the Kimberly Process. Moreover, it jointly led an initiative that guided the World Diamond Council in establishing a “chain of warranties” to hedge against illicit diamonds. In addition, it contributed to the communiqué of the London Intergovernmental Meeting—a conference conceived of at the G8 Okinawa Summit and intended to further the momentum of the Kimberly Process by exploring ways to de-link conflicts and illicit diamonds. Finally, the U.S. not only ratified UN General Assembly Resolution 56 (aimed at mitigating the role of diamonds in fuelling conflicts), but also pledged to the General Assembly that it would advance the process of creating certification guidelines for rough diamonds at the international technical conference and workshop in Windhoek, Namibia.

Compiled by Andre Belelieu, Bryn Gray, Klaudina Osiaka, Jonathan Papoulidis

Compliance Report
2000 Okinawa
Disarmament/Non-Proliferation/Arms Control

Commitment

Para. 74: “We are determined to implement the conclusions reached at this Conference, including the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) and the immediate commencement and the conclusion within five years of negotiations for the Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty. We remain committed to promoting universal adherence to and compliance with the Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT).”

Assessment

Country	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
Britain			+1
Canada			+1
France			+1
Germany			+1
Italy			+1
Japan			+1
Russia			+1
United States		0	
Overall			+1

The treaty’s International Monitoring System detects any nuclear explosion in the atmosphere, underwater, underground, or anywhere on the earth. Each will continuously transmit data back to the International Data Centre in Vienna for collation, analysis, and interpretation. The system is overseen by the CTBT Organization, which essentially monitors compliance to the provisions of the treaty.

When a country ratifies the treaty, it indicates that its domestic law has been altered to be consistent with the provisions of the treaty and, furthermore, that the country has set up monitoring systems.

With regard to the Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty (FMCT), when a state declares fissile materials excess, that state commits to refrain from using these materials as weapons.

Britain

Britain officially ratified the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in April 1998 (following its 1996 signing of the treaty). It currently possesses 12 monitoring facilities in the International Monitoring System. These are one seismic auxiliary station, four radionuclide stations, one radionuclide laboratory, two hydro-acoustic stations, and four infrasound stations. The monitoring system is under international observation. Britain has made efforts to maintain its various monitoring systems, thereby demonstrating its commitment to the entry-into-force of the CTBT.

Britain has also established nuclear-weapon-free zones and stopped producing fissile material for use in nuclear weapons.

In 2000, Britain has contributed £12 million to the destruction of Russia's chemical weapons arsenal and £70 million to plutonium disposal. It reaffirmed its commitment to the Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and to the elimination of nuclear weapons. This is evident through its commitment to the obligations of the NPT, which involves reducing the size of its nuclear deterrent, restructuring its forces, including British nuclear weapons in international negotiations, ensuring greater transparency about nuclear and fissile material stockpiles, placing fissile material under international safeguards, and verifying the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons. Furthermore, Britain has demonstrated not to retain concealed stocks of fissile material outside international supervision of the Atomic Energy Authority. Britain has committed to the Strategic Defence Review (which aims to produce an initial report of defence fissile material production through declassification and historical accounting).

In regard to the FMCT, Britain is regarded to have a sophisticated nuclear material accounting system and, thus, can release more information regarding its stocks, as well as declare material in excess (although it has released some information at this point). Currently, Britain does have some fissile material under safeguards (under the International Atomic Energy Agency).

Canada

Canada officially ratified the CTBT in December 1998 (following its 1996 signing of the treaty). Canada currently possesses 16 monitoring facilities in the International Monitoring System (IMS): three seismic primary stations, six seismic auxiliary stations, four radionuclide stations, one radionuclide laboratory, one hydro-acoustic station, and one infrasound station. The monitoring system is under international observation. Canada has made efforts to maintain its

various monitoring systems, thereby demonstrating its commitment to the entry-into-force of the CTBT.

Canada is also one of the first signatories of the treaty and has continued to take a leading role in the entry-into-force of the treaty. Canada continues to support the conveying of an annual conference regarding the CTBT (which would examine the extent to which the requirement for the treaty's entry-into-force has been met and consider what measures might be taken to accelerate the ratification process). Canada has also encouraged the U.S. to ratify the treaty early (as "a world accustomed to U.S. leadership can only be disturbed by a lack of US support for the treaty").

Canada has also reaffirmed its commitment to the provisions of the Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty (which bans the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices). Canada stated that it has and will continue to work toward nuclear non-proliferation objectives in FMCT negotiations. Canada also reaffirms the objectives laid out in the document titled *Elements of an Approach to Dealing with Stocks of Fissile Materials for Nuclear Weapons or Other Nuclear Explosive Devices*, which it presented to other member states for consideration in 1999. In the meantime, Canada is promoting an immediate and universal moratorium on the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

France

France officially ratified the CTBT in April 1998 (following its 1996 signing of the treaty). France currently possesses 15 IMS facilities: one seismic primary station, two seismic auxiliary stations, six radionuclide stations, one radionuclide laboratory, two hydro-acoustic stations, and five infrasound stations. The monitoring system is under international observation. France has made efforts to maintain its various monitoring systems, thereby demonstrating its commitment to the entry-into-force of the CTBT.

France has officially reaffirmed its commitment to the entry-into-force of the CTBT. France also draws attention to the fact that it was one of the first signatories of the treaty and has continued to take unilateral initiatives to reduce a limited amount of nuclear forces (i.e., its nuclear forces "have been maintained at a level of strict sufficiency" and some of its testing centres have been closed).

In regard to the FMCT, France has been regarded to have a sophisticated nuclear material accounting system and can thus release more information regarding its stocks, as well as declare material in excess.

Germany

Germany officially ratified the CTBT in August 1998 (following its 1996 signing of the treaty). Germany currently possesses four IMS facilities. These are one seismic primary station, one radionuclide station, and two infrasound stations.

Together with its partners in the EU, the German government is endeavouring to speed up the CTBT ratification process with a view to the swift entry-into-force of the treaty and has called upon all countries that have not yet signed and ratified to do so. It particularly urges India and Pakistan, both of which have yet to accede to and ratify the treaty despite calls for them to do so from the Security Council of the United Nations in Resolution 1172 following their nuclear tests in May 1998.

An implementing law was adopted in 1998 to implement the treaty in Germany. On the treaty's entry-into-force, the Federal Foreign Office will assume the role of the National Authority, which is to serve as the national focal point for liaison with the Treaty Organization and with other state parties.

Italy

Italy officially ratified the CTBT in February 1999 (following its 1996 signing of the treaty). Italy possesses two monitoring facilities: one seismic auxiliary station and one radionuclide laboratory.

Japan

Japan officially ratified the CTBT in July 1997 (following its 1996 signing of the treaty). Japan currently possesses 10 IMS facilities. These are one seismic primary station, five seismic auxiliary stations, two radionuclide stations, one radionuclide laboratory, and one infrasound station. The monitoring system is under international observation. Japan has made efforts to maintain its various monitoring systems, thereby demonstrating its commitment to the entry-into-force of the CTBT.

Following the 2000 Summit, Japan submitted to the First Committee of the UN General Assembly a new draft resolution entitled, "A Path to the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons." The path consists of measures that must be dealt with immediately, including the early entry-into-force of the CTBT before 2003 and the immediate commencement of the negotiations on the Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty, as early as possible, before 2005.

Japan has also continued to urge the countries that have not yet ratified or signed the treaty to ratify the CTBT early. It has stated that it will continue to promote actively and effectively the early entry-into-force of the CTBT, thereby taking a leading role. This is evident through the letters and high-level missions sent by Japan to countries that are required to ratify the treaty.

Japan has acknowledged and commended recent countries that have ratified the treaty, especially Chile and Bangladesh. Japan has also offered to increase its assistance to Pakistan by enhancing the annual US\$500 million assistance (provided Pakistan was ready to ratify the CTBT). Japan has made serious recommendations to Pakistan that it sign the treaty as early as possible.

Japan reaffirmed its commitment to the ratification of the treaty as it has been the only country in the world to have suffered the tragedy of atomic bombings and has a serious interest in the CTBT.

Japan's 2000 diplomatic blue book reaffirms Japan's commitment to the early entry into force of the CTBT. Japan has pressured the U.S. to ratify the treaty to ensure the efficient proliferation of the entry-into-force process. Japan also re-established its commitment to the early commencement of the Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty negotiations as a concrete step toward the progress of negotiations and disarmament.

Russia

Russia officially ratified the CTBT in June 2000 (following its 1996 signing of the treaty). The ratification was pushed by President Vladimir Putin, who desired to obtain an advantage over the United States, which has failed to ratify the treaty as yet. Furthermore, it is in the best interests of Russia to ratify the treaty considering the financial implications of another arms race (as opposed to a system that promotes disarmament and arms control).

Russia currently possesses 24 facilities in the International Monitoring System. These are six seismic primary stations, 13 seismic auxiliary stations, eight radionuclide stations, one radionuclide laboratory, and four infrasound station. The monitoring system is under international observation. Russia has made efforts to maintain its various monitoring systems, thereby demonstrating its commitment to the entry-into-force of the CTBT.

In 2000, Russia committed to the Joint Statement on the Principles of Strategic Stability. The statement called for a reduction in the current number of nuclear arsenals, the preservation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, the continued commitment of START II Treaty, and the control of the spread of missiles and missile technology. The purpose of the statement was to supplement the Missile Technology Control Regime (which integrated Russia's proposal for a global monitoring system and the U.S.-initiated missile code of conduct). The statement also affirmed

commitment to the initiation of a joint U.S.-Russian centre for exchange. Finally, the statement reaffirmed Russia's commitment to the CTBT.

In regard to the FMCT, Russia has made efforts to organize a nuclear material accounting system in order to release more information regarding its stocks, as well as declare material in excess, although Canada has indicated that this area still requires improvement.

United States

The U.S. signed the CTBT in 1996, but has failed to ratify the treaty as of yet.

The U.S. currently possesses 39 monitoring facilities in the International Monitoring System: five seismic primary stations, 12 seismic auxiliary stations, 11 radionuclide stations, one radionuclide laboratory, two hydro-acoustic station, and eight infrasound stations. The monitoring system is under international observation. The U.S. has made efforts to maintain its various monitoring systems, thereby demonstrating some commitment to the entry-into-force of the CTBT.

The U.S. has been criticized by the international community and member states for its failure to ratify the CBTB. Essentially, the Senate has prevented the U.S. government from fulfilling its requirements as a signatory to the treaty by refusing to allow (via a vote on the policy) the U.S. government (including the executive) to ratify the treaty.

A resolution in the House of Representatives was introduced on January 3, 2001, by Representative Lynn Woolsey and her co-sponsors. The resolution essentially recognized the security interests of the United States in furthering complete nuclear disarmament. It has been referred to the House Committee on International Relations and is being deliberated by the relevant committees and sub-committees. In the past, such bills have failed as a result of the lack of necessary votes by the Senate for the bill to become law. The result of this bill, in the 107th session of Congress, will help determine the extent to which the U.S. executive pursues nuclear non-proliferation and the CTBT.

Nevertheless, the new Bush administration, which has opposed the ratification of the treaty, may pose even further problems. Bush has dismissed the treaty's provisions as unverifiable and unenforceable; secretary of defense Donald Rumsfeld, in addition, indicates that the CTBT would restrain the U.S. from developing a new generation of nuclear weapons (i.e., defence missile shield). The administration has been urged to ratify the treaty (mainly because the effect of not ratifying would perpetuate nuclear weaponry development by problematic countries such as Pakistan, India, and China).

In regard to the FMCT, the U.S. has been regarded to have a sophisticated nuclear material accounting system and can thus release more information regarding its stocks, as well as declare material in excess (although the U.S. has released some information at this point). Currently, the U.S. does have fissile material under safeguards.

Note: A further challenge faced by G8 countries is to encourage the ratification of the treaty by other compulsory countries, including India, Pakistan, and China. Japan and other G8 members have contributed financially and diplomatically to the process, as it is necessary for the international implementation of the treaty. Nevertheless, in order for full implementation to occur, other member states must contribute to a greater extent.

Compiled by Jennifer Stanton and Oana Dolea

Compliance Report
2000 Okinawa
Terrorism

Commitment

Para. 79: “We renew our condemnation of all forms of terrorism regardless of their motivation. We are determined to combat them. ... We call for all states to become parties to the twelve international counter-terrorism conventions to enhance international co-operation against terrorism.

Assessment

Country	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
Britain			+1
Canada		0	
France		0	
Germany	N/A		
Italy	N/A		
Japan		0	
Russia	N/A		
United States			+1
Overall		0	

Due to the sometimes highly sensitive nature of material relating to a government’s anti-terrorism strategy, information regarding current initiatives is often not forthcoming. As a result, this study is based on the limited amount of declassified material present in the public domain.

Britain

Britain has achieved full compliance with the commitment identified. It has become party to all 12 international conventions for the suppression of terrorism and has clearly illustrated its commitment to supporting the international community in the fight against terrorism. On February 19, 2001, the *Terrorism Act 2000*, the intent of which is “to help the police and prosecuting authorities take effective action against those concerned in terrorism,” officially came into force. This piece of United Kingdom-wide anti-terrorism legislation replaced the existing,

separate pieces of temporary legislation for Northern Ireland and Great Britain. The Act provides a new definition of terrorism, which applies to all types of terrorism; new powers to seize suspected terrorist cash at borders; a new offence of inciting terrorist acts abroad from within the UK; new judicial arrangements for extensions of detention (as opposed to ministerial arrangements), enabling the United Kingdom to lift its derogations under the European Convention on Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; and specific offences relating to training for terrorist activities.

Canada

Canada was the first of the G8 to ratify the first 10 conventions and since then has signed the eleventh convention. In the past year, Canada's reputation for compliance in this area has suffered as a result of its failure to sign the latest convention regarding the "Suppression of Finance to Terrorist Activities" and the Ahmed Ressam trial in California. Second only to the U.S., Canada has more active terrorist branches than any other G8 country. As of 1998, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service has targeted 50 potential organizations and 350 potential individuals within Canada as having links to terrorist operations, both domestically and internationally.

France

France has ratified all of the counter-terrorism treaties, with the exception of the 1973 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons. Moreover, the newest convention was the result of a French proposal. As a result, France was the first of the G8 to sign the 12th convention. At the signing, the French issued a strong statement on terrorist activities in which it noted it would be "seeking stronger diplomatic, judicial, and police co-operation with its EU and G8 partners and in the framework of the UN and regional co-operative bodies."

Germany

No information is available at present.

Italy

Terrorism is not addressed in any of the Italian government websites, with the exception of the mere denunciation of terrorist acts. In one article published in *Analisi Difesa*, the author

highlights “the lack of prevention and fight against the terrorism” and refers to how the “U.S. treats Italy as a country of the Third World from the security point of view.”

Japan

Japan has adopted 10 of the 12 UN counter-terrorism conventions and is currently working with other countries of the G8 to promote the global fight against terrorism by urging other countries to ratify these as well. Japan clearly recognizes the escalation of terrorism, the dangers associated with this issue, and supports the strengthening of international cooperation.

Russia

Russia has signed the last counter-terrorism convention—the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

United States

As one of the leading nations combating terrorism, the United States has ratified all 12 of the UN conventions to counter-terrorism. It signed the latest international convention—the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism—on January 10, 2000, the first day available, illustrating its commitment to the international community in its fight against terrorism. The United States employs a four-fold policy on terrorism: make no concession to terrorists and strike no deals; bring terrorists to justice for their crimes; isolate and apply pressure on states that sponsor terrorism to force them to change their behaviour; and bolster the counter-terrorist capabilities of those countries that work with the United States and require assistance. In the course of the past year, the U.S. has expanded bilateral dialogues with Russia, India, the United Kingdom, Israel, and Canada, and has extended cooperation in intelligence sharing, law enforcement, and antiterrorism training. In addition, it has worked closely with the member states of the G8, which continued to condemn terrorism emanating from Afghanistan and Iran, and made strides in cutting off terrorist financing.

Appendix: Conventions Against Terrorism

1. Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed On Board Aircraft
(Tokyo Convention, 1963 — safety of aviation)
2. Convention for the Suppression on Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft
(Hague Convention, 1970 — aircraft hijackings)
3. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation
(Montreal Convention, 1971 — applies to acts of aviation sabotage such as bombings aboard aircraft in flight)
4. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons
(1973 — outlaws attacks on senior government officials and diplomats)
5. International Convention against the Taking of Hostages
(Hostage Convention, 1979)
6. Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material
(Nuclear Materials Convention, 1980 — combats unlawful taking and use of nuclear materials)
7. Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation
(1988—extends and supplements the Montreal Convention)
8. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation
(1988 — applies to terrorist activities on ships)
9. Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf
(1988 — applies to terrorist activities on fixed offshore platforms)
10. Convention on the Marking of Plastic Explosives for the Purpose of Detection
(1991 — provides for chemical marking to facilitate detection of plastic explosives)
11. International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombing
(1997 — UN General Assembly Resolution)
12. International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism
(1999)

Sources

Gianandrea Gaiani, “The Return of International Terrorism in Italy,” in *Analisi Difesa* (December 2000–January 2001): <http://www.analisedifensa.it/numero10/eng/indiceng.htm>

Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Japan, *Diplomatic Bluebook: Towards the 21st Century—Foreign Policy for a Better Future*, (2000): <http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/other/bluebook/2000/II-3-c.html#1>

Judy Aita, "U.S. Signs International Treaty Targeting the Financing of Terrorism," (12 January 2000). U.S. Department of State, International Information Program, Washington File.
Secretary Colin L. Powell Remarks on Release of "Patterns of Global Terrorism 2000" Annual Report Washington, DC April 30, 2001
http://www.odccp.org/terrorism_conventions.html

Compiled by Denisse Rudich and Melanie Martin