

Keeping Genoa's Commitments: The 2002 G8 Research Group Compliance Report June 2002

**Professor John Kirton, Dr. Ella Kokotsis and the
University of Toronto G8 Research Group**

Overview

Because the G7/G8 consists of autonomous, sovereign states with democratically elected leaders who are driven by differing national interests and domestic demands, there are real limits to how much commitments collectively made at one moment can constrain or produce compliance in national government behaviour the coming year. It makes little sense, however, for the Summit leaders to invest their time and resources, potentially risking their political and personal reputations, in order to generate collective agreements if they do not comply with these commitments once they return home at Summit's end. By this standard, the Genoa-hosted G7/G8 Summit demonstrated that these meetings do matter, for it yielded tangible and credible commitments that were timely, appropriate and highly ambitious.

Since the conclusion of the Genoa Summit in July 2001, the G7/G8 have complied with their priority commitments made across 9 major issue areas 49.5% of the time (see Table A). This average is based on a scale whereby 100% equals perfect compliance, and -100% means that the member governments are in fact doing the opposite of what they committed to.

Compliance scores following the Genoa Summit varied widely by issue area, with commitments focused on international terrorism and debt of the poorest scoring perfect compliance scores across all Summit countries¹. Compliance scores were also high in the areas of international trade, infectious diseases and bridging the digital divide, followed by universal primary education. A "work in progress"² was found for commitments associated with the Genoa African Action Plan, while a score in the negative range was revealed for commitments relating to the strengthening of the International Financial System.

The highest complying Summit member across the 9 major issue areas was Canada, the next country in the hosting order, with a score of 82%. Canada's score is followed by France and the UK, both tied at 69%; Germany with 59%; Italy with 57%; Japan with 44%; the US with 35%; and the newest G8 member, Russia with only 11%.

The overall Genoa compliance average of 49.5% compares favourably with the 39% compliance record of the 1999 Cologne Summit, 45% in Birmingham in 1998, 27% in Denver in 1997, and 36 % in Lyon in 1996 (see pg 4: <http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/g7/evaluations/2001compliance/2001reportComp.pdf>). The Okinawa Summit of 2000, which yielded an exceptionally impressive compliance score of 81.4%, established an extremely high precedent for Summits to follow.

¹ Information on debt of the poorest was not available for Russia.

² "Work in progress" is depicted by an overall average score of "0".

Table A: Summary Scores³

	Canada		Germany		U.K.		Japan		
		France		Italy		U.S.		Russia	Individual Issue Average
Fighting Terrorism	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1.0
Bridging the Digital Divide	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+0.75
Infectious Diseases	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	0	+1	+0.75
Genoa African Action Plan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Universal Primary Education	+1	+1	0	0	+1	0	+1	N/A	+0.58
Economic Growth – Trade	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+0.88
Economic Growth – Strengthening International Financial System	+1	0	0	0	0	-1	-1	N/A	-1.0
Economic Growth – HIPC	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	N/A	+1.0
Environment ⁴	+0.34	+0.17	+0.34	+0.17	+0.17	+0.17	0	0	+0.17
Overall Totals	+7.34	+6.17	+5.34	+5.17	+6.17	+3.17	+4.0	+1.0	+4.13
Overall Issue Average									+0.46
Overall Country Average	+0.82	+0.69	+0.59	+0.57	+0.69	+0.35	+0.44	+0.11	+0.53
Overall Compliance Average									+0.495

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 compliance score is awarded. Countries were excluded from the averages if the symbol "N/A" appears in the respective column.

³ For a complete compliance methodological explanation, visit the G8 web site at: <http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/g7/evaluations/methodology/g7c2.htm>

⁴ Environment commitments for Genoa span across six issue areas including: Conference of the Parties 6 (COP6); Global Environment Facility (GEF); Energy; World Summit on Sustainable Development; Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs); Export Credit Agencies (ECAs); and the OECD. The environment scores for each G8 country represents an average score across the six environment sub-issues assessed.

2001 Genoa Compliance Report

Fighting Terrorism

Commitment:

We have asked our Foreign, Finance, Justice and other relevant Ministers as appropriate, to draw up a list of specific measures to enhance our counter terrorism cooperation, including:

- Expanded use of financial measures and sanctions to stop the flow of funds to terrorists
- Aviation security
- The control of arms exports
- Security and other services cooperation
- The denial of all means of support to terrorism, and
- The identification and removal of terrorist threats.

Assessment:

Score	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
Country			
<i>Britain</i>			+1
<i>Canada</i>			+1
<i>France</i>			+1
<i>Germany</i>			+1
<i>Italy</i>			+1
<i>Japan</i>			+1
<i>Russia</i>			+1
<i>United States</i>			+1
Overall			1.0

Individual Compliance Country Breakdown:

Britain: +1

In the months following the events of September 11th, the United Kingdom has moved swiftly to update and strengthen its position in the global war against terrorism. Using the September 19, 2001 G8 Statement as a framework for action, the UK has striven for full compliance in achieving the principal goal of maximum counter-terrorist cooperation.

As demonstrated by the United Kingdom Terrorism Act of 2000, the UK has always taken a strong leadership role in adopting anti-terrorist legislative measures. However, it has been in the months following the tragic events of 9/11 that this battle has been intensified. On December 14, 2001 the UK significantly enhanced its existing anti-terrorist legislation with the introduction of the Anti-Terrorist, Crime and Security Act 2001. Designed to make further provisions about terrorism and security by amending the Terrorism Act of 2000, the new act contains measures which will: curtail terrorist access to financial funds, ensure better information sharing between agencies, prevent terrorists abuse of immigration and asylum laws, tighten up security in relation to aviation, civil nuclear sites and at laboratories holding

stocks of potentially dangerous substances and finally, to enable and ensure better co-operation in efforts to tackle terrorism and other crimes.

Within the arena of transport security and in addition to the amended Terrorism Act, the British Department for Transport, Local Government and Regions issued a statement on 27 March 2002 outlining enhanced security measures designed for high threat situations. Though focusing predominantly on aviation security, the statement also included initiatives for additional security measures to be adopted in the areas of Maritime, Railway, Channel Tunnel and London Underground travel.

The United Kingdom's commitment to fighting global terrorism extends beyond the frontiers of its own borders as it is active in promoting international cooperation both within bilateral and multilateral frameworks, such as the EU, UN and G8. Within the EU, the United Kingdom has provided firm and consistent backing for Europol's new Counter Terrorism Task force, which aims to promote and re-energize cooperative measures between Europol and EU Member States' police, security and intelligence services. The UK is also supportive of the EU Action Plan endorsed on 21 September to help member States step up the fight against global terrorism and improve practical co-operation among member States. Further the UK has signed and ratified all twelve international global conventions and protocols on terrorism and is a Party to the European Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism (1977).

On December 24, 2001, pursuant to paragraph 6 of the UN Security Council Resolution 1373 (2001) , the British government fulfilled its commitment to present a report - drawing upon specific measures to combat terrorism - to the Counter Terrorism Committee (CTC) established under SCR 1373. The report, which measures twenty-two pages in its entirety, sufficiently outlines the legislative and cooperative measures that the UK has taken in its actions to ensure the safety, of those both domestically and internationally, from the global terrorist threat. Additionally, the UK has established an Interdepartmental Group to oversee the implementation of UNSCR 1373 and the preparation of the UK's response to the CTC insofar as it can provide assistance to other States.

The UK continues to support the provision of technical assistance and capacity building in a number of countries, funding programs and initiatives designed to address a range of anti-money laundering, anti-terrorist financing and other counter terrorism issues. This funding is provided both bilaterally, and through contributions to multi-lateral initiatives. In a report released by Her Majesty's Treasury on 12 April 2002, acting under the Terrorism (UN Measures) Order 2001 and the Al-Qa'ida and Taliban (UN Measures) Order 2002, the UK has frozen the assets of over 100 organizations and over 200 individuals.

Canada: +1

In the aftermath of the tragic events that unfolded in the US on September 11, 2001 the Canadian Government reaffirmed its commitment to fight and deter terrorism at both domestic and international levels. This goal has been stated in a number of declarations, including the G8 Statement on Terrorism made on September 19, 2001.

Through rapid execution of anti-terrorism legislation and intense engagement in both multilateral fora, and in cooperation with the international community, Canada has contributed extensively to confronting the global challenge of terrorism.

Canada's counter-terrorism initiatives are based on a multifaceted approach, which employs political, diplomatic, military, legal, intelligence, financial and humanitarian measures. Consequently, the Canadian authorities have as their goal not only the provision of immediate short-term remedies to terrorist attacks, but also the implementation and strengthening of mechanisms capable of defeating and eradicating the forces of terrorism.

The introduction on October 15, 2001 of the Anti-Terrorism Act, referred to as Bill C-36 is an extremely significant legislative development on the path to fighting terrorism. Bill C-36 has important provisions

designed to enhance the effectiveness of the Canadian counter-terrorism campaign both at home and abroad.

Bill C-36 defines, for the first time in Canadian law, a terrorist activity and enacts it as a punishable offense within Canada's Criminal Code. Criminalizing terrorist activities is a proactive measure that significantly enhances the Canadian ability to fight terrorism within its national borders. Additionally, Bill C-36 deals extensively with the problem of terrorist financing as the Regulation makes it an offense for any Canadian to knowingly engage, provide or collect funds and property with the intention for them to be used for terrorist activities. As one of the measures, Bill C-36 amends the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) Act to include terrorist financing. This measure will help to link terrorist financing to some money laundering transactions. Furthermore, Bill C-36 enhances the mandate of the Financial Transactions and Reports Analysis Centre (FINTRAC) of Canada to include the gathering and analysis of money laundering reports and provide strategic information to law enforcement and intelligence authorities. In fact, since September 11 the Government has invested an additional \$63 million in FINTRAC to expand its capacity to control the flow of funds.

Already, as of November 16, 2001, Canadian financial institutions have frozen 28 accounts with the total amount of CAD \$344,000. Thus, at the domestic level, Canada has implemented effective measures designed to stop the flow of terrorist funds.

In addition to financial measures, Canada's commitment to combat terrorism includes aviation security, arms control, preventive security measures, and denial of any support to terrorists. These actions are facilitated through domestic, bilateral and multilateral arrangements.

As part of its domestic initiative, the Government of Canada will allocate \$7.7 billion for counter-terrorism campaign. The Canadian Government has already begun to budget strengthen domestic public safety by amending some provisions of the Public Safety Act and making necessary modifications to the Aeronautics Act to maximize the effectiveness of the aviation security system. Canada has also modified its Immigration Act accordingly to deny asylum and refugee status to persons suspected of being involved in criminal activities. Furthermore, Bill C-42, which was introduced in Parliament on November 22, 2001 authorizes the Canadian Government to tighten its arms control regulations, both in regards to conventional arms as well as chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear threats.

Within a framework of bilateral co-operation, on December 3, 2001 Canada and the United States signed a Joint Statement of Cooperation on Border Security and Regional Migration Issues. This provides for improved visa controls, exchange of information about forged or falsified documents, intensified customs check as well as expansion in the Integrated Border Enforcement Team and integration of Canadian officials on the U.S. Foreign Terrorist Tracking Force. Furthermore, Canada has made available additional CF-18 fighter jets to patrol the shared airspace through NORAD (the North American Aerospace Defense Command). On the consultative level, Canada is working with the US through a Bilateral Consultative Group on Terrorism and the Ministerial level Cross Border Crime Forum.

Besides joint efforts with the US, the Canadian representatives hold regular diplomatic exchanges with foreign government officials, with the purpose of further advancing Canada's counter-terrorism .

Considering that terrorism is a transnational phenomenon, and that all countries are vulnerable to becoming targets of terrorist attacks, the Canadian Government is actively engaged in multilateral cooperation, which is directed at deterring the global threat of terrorism. Canada is an important participant in the international fora, including the G8, the UN, NATO, the G20, OSCE, OAS and others. Canada is one of the few countries to have ratified all 12 major UN Conventions (10) and Protocols (2) Against International Terrorism. This reaffirms that Canada acts responsibly and decisively in fulfilling its obligations to a global community to fight terrorism and provide for peaceful and secure co-existence. The Canadian authorities agree with the G8 assertion that there are common elements between international terrorism and crime, and in efforts to establish further anti-terrorism measures on May 14, 2002 they have ratified the UN Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime. Furthermore, Canada participates in the ongoing security exchange programs facilitated through the Immigration Fraud Conference, The

Pacific Rim Conference and the G8 Summit Experts Group on Transnational Organized Crime. Moreover, the Canadian Government supports and encourages legal cooperation against crime and terrorism through the Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Act.

The Canadian Government has also contributed to strengthening anti-terrorism financial regime at the international level. Canadian delegation continuously reaffirms its government's commitment to suppress the financing of terrorism through a coordinated efforts of G8 members. Furthermore, the Government has ratified the United Nations International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, which reaffirms Canada's ongoing efforts to conduct its foreign policy in conformity with universally accepted norms, principles and regulations. Furthermore, Canada is also a member of the Financial Action Task Force, which participates actively in identifying money-laundering activities. This confirms the readiness of Canadian authorities to co-operate with foreign governments in consolidating preventive anti-terrorist measures with respect to finance.

Canada is also actively involved in the international arms control regime. Canada is a party to the Wassenaar Agreement, which "promotes transparency and greater responsibility in transfers of conventional arms and dual-use goods and technologies, thus preventing destabilising accumulation".

Canada's commitment to defeating terrorism was enhanced when the Government launched a military campaign in Afghanistan, known as Operations Apollo. Canadian authorities recognize that democracy, order, law, justice, human rights and economic prosperity are guarantors of international peace and security. As such, they have undertaken appropriate measures to promote and help implement these values in unstable parts of the world, working to eliminate social and economic tension and help remove public support for extremism, crime and terrorism.

France: +1

France has extensive experience with the process of battling terrorist networks within its borders. Since the G8's September 19, 2001 statement condemning the attacks on New York and Washington, and their undertaking to work on new measures to combat international terrorism, France has done much to comply with this new G8 goal.

Firstly, with the advent of the events of 11 September 2001, the Ministries of the Interior, the Transport Ministry and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs have reinstated the domestic security plan, VIGIPIRATE, and have increased police and security force contingents as pursuant to its obligations under the plan. The Vigipirate Plan is a national security plan that uses security and military forces to secure public places such as airports, train stations, public transport, public and private buildings, as well as any other places in which there are large numbers of people at any time. As announced in a September 11 Press Release from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Vigipirate was reinstated to its maximum level for all transportation. At airports, this resulted in a reinforcement of military patrols and of security forces in public zones of airports, as well as an intensification of spot-checks on both passengers and luggage.

Secondly, France has been supportive of and deeply involved in the proposed Pan-European Arrest Warrant. In a statement issued by the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs on February 1, 2002, the Ministry spokesperson indicated France's commitment to this proposed undertaking: he commented that adopting the Pan-European Arrest Warrant would provide increased ability to cooperate between European countries on how to have the best information about presumed terrorists and prevent them from getting away by going from one country to another unquestioned.

The French government has also fulfilled its commitment to draw up specific measures to combat terrorism by complying with its obligations under the UN Security Council Resolution 1373 to present a report to the Counter-Terrorism Committee established by the aforementioned UN Security Council resolution. France fulfilled this obligation when it submitted its report on December 27, 2001, outlining

what France has done so far with respect to preventing and punishing terrorist activity and how it is presently fighting terrorism within its own borders and abroad.

Furthermore, France has also made progress in the area of financial measures designed to stop the flow of funds to suspected terrorist organizations. On September 25, 2001, the Ministry of the Economy, Finances and Industry passed Law 2001-875 imposing a mandatory authorization of the Minister of the Economy, Finances and Industry on any transactions, investments and capital movements across French borders made by any of the persons and entities mentioned in the Annex of the Law. The Annex contains a list of organizations and persons suspected of terrorist involvement by the French government. With regards to fighting terrorism by attacking its finances, France was also a party, as a G7 member, to the three-pronged plan adopted at the G7 Finance Ministers' meeting on October 6, 2001.

Germany: +1

On January 2, 2002, as per its obligation under Paragraph 6 of the United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 1373 (2001), Germany submitted a full report to the Counter-Terrorism Committee on its status in the area of fighting international terrorism. This report illustrates Germany's fulfillment of its commitment to draw up specific measures to combat terrorism.

In the area of improving air-traffic safety, Germany has adopted the First and Second anti-terrorism packages in addition to strengthening legislation to improve the process of implementation. The German government - in cooperation with other states - has also set up a specially-trained police task-force to rout out and destroy the Al-Qaida network.

In the campaign to combating terrorist financing, the German Federal Cabinet approved the 4th Financial Market Promotion bill on November 14, 2001, which has since been submitted for parliamentary debate. The bill is primarily aimed at counteracting non-transparent, global capital flows and financial transactions of criminal origin.

With regards to preventing the commission of terrorist acts, a coordinated procedure between German intelligence services and police authorities was agreed upon to ensure that sensitive information is handled in a coordinated and effective manner. Germany has also proposed that similar arrangements be created within the European Union and G8 frameworks and to that end has undertaken a long list of cooperative actions as part of the EU framework.

Further, in the wake of the September 11 attacks, many statutory amendments have been introduced in parliament that give security forces more power and authority to investigate suspected terrorist persons and organizations. Such statutory amendments also permit the conduct of security clearance checks on persons employed at security sensitive positions within airports, with airlines or at facilities crucial for life or vital for defence. Finally, the new amendments will increase security checks of the documents used to get into Germany, as well as security checks for people applying for visas for longer than 3 months.

Also, administrative measures have been undertaken as part of the commitment to draw up measures to combat international terrorism. These include increased border controls and surveillance, more security forces present at airports, more passenger and baggage checks and closer surveillance of all parts of airports. Finally, air-marshals have been introduced on German aircraft.

With regards to measures taken to deny safe-haven to people involved in terrorist activities, Germany has passed further legal amendments to Acts governing asylum seekers, visas, resident documents, passports and identity cards, and to the Security Screening Act, which screens people working in security-sensitive jobs.

Finally, with regards to measures taken to prevent potential terrorists to enter the country, Germany has further strengthened its standards governing the implementation of border controls and the issuing of

identity and travel documents. For example, a further security feature has been added to the German passport, in the form of an individual, optically variable hologram. More border controls and less granting of residence documents has also taken place. The Customs Criminological Office has also set up a special unit (BAO INFO), whose tasks include “the coordination of the flow of information in support of counter-terrorism action within Customs and ensuring that relevant information gathered is forwarded to other competent national and international law enforcement authorities.”

As shown by the information summarized above that was originally provided by the German state to the UN Security Council’s Counter-terrorism committee, Germany has fulfilled its commitment to draw up measures with regards to fighting international terrorism.

Italy: +1

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs website has posted Italy’s report to the Sanctions Committee of the United Nations Security Council, pursuant to the UN Security Council Resolution 1373, on the country’s actions with regards to fighting international terrorism. This report is an adequate summary of the actions undertaken by Italy in its endeavour to fulfil its commitment to draw up specific measures to combat terrorism.

According to the report, Italy has adopted, under law no. 438/2001, “urgent measures to prevent and suppress crimes committed for the purposes of international terrorism.” The law also has made “conspiracy to commit international terrorism” a crime in Italy. The law also extends the normal powers of the judicial system in investigations on terrorism charges. Investigations of terrorist activity is currently taking place in a number of Italian cities.

Furthermore, the report states that civilian and military preventive measures have been adopted as indicated by the assignment of an increased number of military personnel for the protection of over 150 military targets and civil facilities. Also, “numerous measures have been introduced to deal with the safety of transport, increasing the number of armed guards in aircraft parking areas, adopting more stringent checks on passengers, crew members and personnel, boarding gate controls, and checks on baggage and post.”

With respect to the threat of bioterrorism, the Italian Ministry of Health has adopted an Action Plan in the spirit of taking preventative action. New anti-terror units have been created as part of Italy’s counter-terrorist efforts: the Financial Security Committee and the International anti-terrorist coordination with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs are the two most important. These committees monitors the ways in which the prevention system operates and the laws by which they have been created. Further, it is of importance to note that the committees are responsible for the thorough examination of how such legislation has conferred liberty of action in the fight against terrorism. Additionally, the scope of those committees existing pre-9/11 has been revised and reinforced, as in the case of the Crisis Unit and the Committee on Security and Public Order.

Finally, with regard to international cooperation, Italy has ratified the “European Convention on the Repression of Terrorism” of 1977, as well as 10 out of the 12 United Nations Conventions on the subject. The Government has also approved a bill ratifying the “Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters” between EU countries and is working for the full implementation of recently adopted mechanisms of EU lists for the freezing of assets of terrorist individuals and groups.

Japan: +1

Since September 19, 2001, when Prime Minister Koizumi adopted a G8 Statement condemning terrorism, the Government of Japan has undertaken concrete and effective measures in the ensuing global

campaign against terror. Japan's initiatives within the campaign have been successful at all three levels: domestic, regional and international.

At the level of domestic legislation, on October 29, 2001, the Government of Japan passed the Anti-Terrorism Special Measures Law, which outlines a wide spectrum of obligations that Japan is set to undertake in its goal to deter and eradicate the terrorist threat. The provisions stipulate what actions are to be carried out both within and outside of its national frontiers. Furthermore, on 12 December 2001 the Government established an International Counter-Terrorism Cooperation Division, designed to play a key coordinating role in policy planning for terrorist activities within national, bilateral and multilateral contexts. In addition to these principal measures, Japan has acted swiftly to cut terrorists' funds, freeze assets and restrict money flows for over 165 group suspected of support and/or engagement in terrorist activities. Especially impressive has been Japan's commitment to the Refugee Assistance Program. The Government of Japan has been providing immense humanitarian and financial aid to Pakistan and Afghan refugees. Through these measures, Japan is aiming to foster stable political, economic and social condition in the region, thus depriving terrorist of means for public manipulation.

The Government of Japan further contributes to removing the terrorist threat by actively participating and encouraging continued bilateral exchange. Japan's authorities have conducted extensive diplomatic dialogues with foreign representatives on the topics of aviation security, surveillance of communications systems, non-proliferation programs and crime and drug control. To advance this agenda at the regional level, the Government of Japan has been involved in ant-terrorism consultations with countries of the Asia-Pacific Region, Latin America and the Middle East.

At the multilateral level, Japan is a part of the international coalition against terrorism, and conducts its relative policies in accordance with principles of international law, order and justice. The Government of Japan has already ratified 10 of the 12 UN Conventions on Terrorism, and is working toward ratification of the remaining 2. Japan has also adopted the UN Security Council Resolution 1373 on International Cooperation to Combat threats to International Peace and Security Caused by Terrorist Acts. Russia is also a party to the Wassenaar Agreement, which "promotes transparency and greater responsibility in transfers of conventional arms and dual-use goods and technologies, thus preventing destabilising accumulation". Furthermore, available Press Releases indicate that Japan considers the G8 mechanism to be crucial in launching an effective counter-terrorism campaign.

Russia: +1

The Russian Federation has been engaged in active domestic, bilateral and multilateral processes aimed at combating terrorism. The counter-terrorism initiatives that the Russian Government has implemented thus far encompass a wide variety of domains: political, diplomatic, financial, military, legal, intelligence and law enforcement. This multifaceted approach demonstrates that Russia is determined to continue institutionalizing comprehensive anti-terrorist measures and contribute extensively to eradicating the threat of global terrorism.

The Russian Government has implemented new and amended existing legislative provisions, thus providing the authorities with essential instruments in the struggle against terrorism. Domestically, the three most important frameworks through which the Russian Government facilitates its of anti-terrorist campaign are financial, legal and political.

One of the major goals of the Russian Government since the release of the G8 Statement on Terrorism from September 19, 2001 has been to deliver a decisive blow to the financial infrastructure of terrorism. In pursuit of this objective, on 1 November 2001 Prime Minister Putin signed Decree No. 1263, which provided for the establishment of the Committee of the Russian Federation for Financial Monitoring, responsible to the Ministry of Finance. The primary function of the Committee is to gather, analyze and process information related to the illegal acquisition and allocation of funds. Furthermore, the Bank of

Russia is working actively to implement the Act on the prevention of the legalization of criminal funds, such as money laundering.

In the realm of legal domestic activity to combat terrorism, the State Duma of the Russian Federation adopted Federal Act 95528-3, re-emphasizing the criminalization of terrorist activity, and establishing increased liability for acts of supporting, financing, planning, facilitating and perpetrating terrorist acts.

The Russian Government has performed effectively in undertaking preventive political measures to deter terrorism. Responsible authorities are controlling the movement of terrorist and criminals in order to prevent them from exploiting Russia's refugee procedures and asylum system. Through intense border controls, thorough verification of documents and enhanced intelligence measures, the Russian Government ensures that the country does not become a sanctuary for terrorists.

Russia's domestic programs in the struggle against terrorism are further enhanced through bilateral activity. Russia's milestone in the domain of bilateral counter-terrorist measures was the signing on May 24, 2002 of the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Strategic Offensive Reduction. According to the terms, both states should remove from deployment two-thirds of each nation's nuclear weapons over the next 10 years. This landmark agreement will help strengthen the nonproliferation regime, and provide for increased security of weapons of mass destruction and greater transparency related to nuclear missile inventories. This measure definitely will contribute to decreasing the chances of terrorist of obtaining weapons of mass destruction. In addition to this defence arrangement, Russia has signed various bilateral protocols with different states on air traffic, which contain special articles on aviation security. Furthermore, the Russian Government provides reciprocal judicial assistance to states in criminal matters and adequately employs mechanisms of extradition.

Additionally, the Russian Federation is a key actor in the multilateral arena with respect to working in cooperation with the international community to combat global terrorism. Russia has ratified 10 of the 12 UN Conventions Against International Terrorism and complied extensively with the Security Council Resolution 1373 on International Cooperation to Combat threats to International Peace and Security Caused by Terrorist Acts. This reinforces Russia's commitment to conduct its anti-terrorist policy in conformity with international codes of law, justice and human rights. The Russian Government completely supports and encourages enhanced international exchange of strategic security information, which will ultimately contribute to improved early warning mechanisms. At present, the Russian Federal Security Service has official contacts with over 80 law enforcement agencies and special services. Furthermore, Russia is acting responsibly with respect to arms control regime. Along with number of other agreements, Russia a party to the Wassenaar Agreement, which "promotes transparency and greater responsibility in transfers of conventional arms and dual-use goods and technologies, thus preventing destabilising accumulation".

Finally, the Russian authorities believe in the imperative of fostering stability in regions where the conditions of political, economic and social grievances are exploited by extremists to advance their terrorist agendas. To discuss this matter, the Inter-Parliamentary Assembly of the Commonwealth of Independent States and the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly organized an International Conference on Combating Terrorism in St. Petersburg from March 27 to 28, 2001. In concert with the international community, the Russian Federation declares that it is prepared to contribute to a steady establishment of democratic regimes and responsible governments based on the ideals of peace, order, justice, the rule of law and human rights; and architect the development of stable economic and financial regimes. These commitments reinforce that Russia does not equate terrorism with any particular ethnic or religious groups, and works decisively to promote the peaceful international co-existence of all members of global society.

Russian participation within the framework of international institutions in an effort to combat terrorism has been most noticeable, but not limited to the G8, UN, OSCE and now the NATO-Russian Council.

United States of America: +1

Though the effects of the terrorist attacks in Washington and New York have produced worldwide concern and support, leadership in the campaign to combat global terrorism has seen no stronger a call to arms than in the United States - the site of the September 11 tragedy. The US has taken unparalleled and unprecedented steps in the months following 9/11 to ensure that all possible anti-terror forces are mobilized both at home and abroad. To that end, American President George W. Bush has promised that "every means of diplomacy, every tool of intelligence, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial, and every necessary weapon of war" will be used as a resource in the campaign to rout out and defeat the global terror network.

The Presidential Executive Order of 8 October 2001, whereby President Bush established the Office of Homeland Security and the Homeland Security Council, was heralded as a significant domestic achievement on the road to removing all terrorist threat. The new office is responsible for developing and coordinating the implementation of a comprehensive national strategy to secure the US from terrorist threats and attacks. Backed by a \$20 billion dollar budgetary commitment, its practical function lies in its ability to detect, prepare for, prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks with the US.

Further markers of achievements in domestic anti-terror legislation are embodied in the USA PATRIOT ACT of 2001 signed into law on 26 October 2001 which, amongst other measures, does the following: updates federal laws to reflect the dramatic changes that have occurred in communications technology, requires the Department of the Treasury to require financial institutions to verify the identities of the persons opening accounts, grants immunity to financial institutions that voluntarily disclosed suspicious transactions, increase the penalties for money-laundering, broadens the terrorism-related definitions in the Immigration and Nationality Act, expands the grounds of inadmissibility to include aliens who publicly endorse terrorist activity, requires the Attorney General to detain aliens whom he certifies as threats to national security, authorizes grants that will enhance state and local governments ability to respond to and prevent terrorism, and expands information sharing among law enforcement authorities at different levels of government.

In further fueling its objective of identifying and removing all terrorist threat, the US has established over 56 Joint Terrorism Task Forces and nearly 100 Anti-Terrorism Task Forces, in an effort to coordinate and improve communications between federal and local law enforcement agencies. Further the FBI has established a Counter-terrorism Division and an interagency Financial Investigation Group to further enhance information sharing and investigative abilities whilst examining and prosecuting financial crimes.

Having used domestic commercial airplanes as weapons in their attacks, the terrorists responsible for September 11th have forced the re-examination and enforcement of stronger safety measures in the department of Aviation security. The US response has been vigorous. Measures include: having expanded the Federal Air Marshal Program, developed new passenger boarding procedures, limited airport access points whilst implementing secondary screening procedures and deploying more than 9,000 National Guardsmen to help secure the Nation. Signed on 19 November 2001, the Aviation Security Legislation provides the framework for these and other measures in the quest to prevent future attacks.

Internationally, the US has complied with its obligations under UNSCR 1373 as demonstrated by its report presented to the Security Council on 21 December 2001. The US report outlines that for the first time ever the UN Security Council unanimously determined that any act of international terrorism was a threat to international peace and security. Further, the report declares that the United States is ready and willing to provide technical assistance to help those countries who - for lack of expertise and resources- cannot achieve full implementation of the measures needed to combat terrorism. This is a significant

gesture towards full mobilization of global anti-terror resources and is reflective of the US desire to maximize cooperation within a global framework.

However, arguably it has been the US military campaign to rout out terror that has provoked the strongest reactions both within and outside the country. Dubbed Operation *Enduring Freedom*, the US campaign - which commenced on October 7, 2001 has enjoyed the support of a number of countries, namely, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia and Japan.. As outlined in a report entitled "The Global War on Terrorism: The First 100 Days" the US has been successful in forcing the Taliban to surrender major cities, and has destroyed 11 terrorist training camps and over 39 Taliban command and control sites.

In the arena of reducing terrorist financing and money-laundering practices the US government has created three new organizations -- the Foreign Terrorist Asset Tracking Center (FTAT), Operation Green Quest and the Terrorist Financing Task Force. These new organizations will help facilitate information sharing between intelligence and law enforcement agencies and encourage other countries to identify, disrupt, and defeat terrorist financing networks. Bilaterally, a report released on 3 May 2002 announces joint action taken by the US & European Union (EU) in the creation of a Terrorist Financiers Fact Sheet. The joint blocking action is symbolic of the close cooperation and collaboration between America and its European allies that has taken place in the months following 9/11. Such collaboration, within the spirit of the 19 September G8 Statement, has resulted in the freezing of \$34.2 million in assets of terrorist organizations by the US, with other nations having blocked another \$70.5 million for a total of \$104.8 million to date.

References

BRITAIN

HM TREASURY: INTERNATIONAL ISSUES: "International Fight Against Terrorism Financing: UK Progress Report"; April 12, 2002
http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/Documents/International_Issues/terrorist_financing

OFFICE OF THE PRIME MINISTER: 10 DOWNING STREET: NEWSROOM
"Lobby Briefing: 11AM Friday 14 December 2001: Anti Terrorism Act/ Incitement to Religious Hatred"
Accessed: May 21, 2002
<http://www.pm.gov.uk/output/page4113.asp>

OFFICE OF THE PRIME MINISTER: 10 DOWNING STREET: NEWSROOM
"Anti- Terrorism Crime and Security Bill"; November 13, 2001
<http://www.pm.gov.uk/output/page3841.asp>

UK DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSPORT, LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND THE REGIONS: Transport Security
"Transec's Response to the Terrorist Attacks in the USA on 11 September 2001; March 27, 2002
<http://www.aviation.dtlr.gov.uk.transec/02.htm>

UN SECURITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE ESTABLISHED (2001) CONCERNING COUNTER-TERRORISM: Report by United Kingdom to the United Nations Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee, pursuant to UNSC Resolution 1373 (2001), December 24, 2001.
<http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/committees/1373>

CANADA

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE. *Implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1373 (2001).*

<http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/anti-terrorism/resolution1373-en.asp>

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE. . *Backgrounder: Canada's Actions Against Terrorism Since September 11.*

<http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/anti-terrorism/canadaactions-en.asp>

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE. *Canada Ratifies International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.*

http://webapps.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/minpub/Publication.asp?FileSpec=/Min_Pub_Docs/105151.htm&bPrint=False&Year=&Language=E

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE. . *Canada Ratifies International Convention on Transnational Crime.*

http://webapps.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/minpub/Publication.asp?FileSpec=/Min_Pub_Docs/105194.htm&bPrint=False&Year=&Language=E

Saccoccio, Sabrina. *What Does the Anti-Terrorism Bill Propose to Do?* CBC News Online; November 2001

http://www.cbc.ca/news/indepth/us_strikingback/backgrounders/canada_antiterrorlaw.html

The Wassenaar Agreement. *Initial Elements.* <http://www.wassenaar.org/docs/IE96.html>

GOVERNMENT OF CANADA: *Ministers Cauchon and MacAulay Release Summary of the G8 Justice and Interior Ministers' Meeting.* <http://www.sgc.gc.ca/Release/e20020514.htm>

FRANCE

"Vigipirate: 4,500 hommes supplémentaires mobilisés". Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, Archives du Premier Ministre, September 14, 2001.

http://www.archives.premier-ministre.gouv.fr/jospin_version3/fr/ie4/contenu/28287.htm

"Reunion du Groupe Interministeriel sur les Vols Sensibles". Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, Press Release, September 11, 2001.

<http://www.equipement.gouv.fr/actualites/communiqués/2001/septembre01/AttentatsUSA.htm>

"War on Terrorism". Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, Statement by the Ministry Spokesperson, February 1, 2002.

<http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/actu/article.asp?ART=22630>

"Decret No. 2001-875 du 25 septembre, 2001 réglementant les relations financières avec certaines personnes ou entités".

<http://www.admi.net/jo/20010926/ECOX0105105D.html>

Report by France to the United Nations Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee, pursuant to UNSC Resolution 1373 (2001), December 27, 2001.

<http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/committees/1373>

GERMANY

Report by Germany to the Counter-Terrorism Committee of the United Nations Security Council, pursuant to UNSC Resolution 1373 (2001), January 2, 2002. <http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/committees/1373/>

JAPAN

THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF JAPAN. *Basic Plan Regarding Response Measures Based on the Anti-Terrorism Special Measures Law.*

<http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/terro0109/policy/plan.html#1>

THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF JAPAN.. *Establishment of International Counter-Terrorism Cooperation Division.*

<http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/terrorism/division.htm>

THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF JAPAN.. *Japan's Measures in Response to the Terrorist Attacks in the United States.*

<http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/terro0190/policy/measure.html#6>

THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF JAPAN.. *10th EU-Japan Summit.*

<http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/europe/eu/summit/terro0112.html>

THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF JAPAN. *Statement by Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Permanent Representative of Japan Mr. Yukio Satoh at the 56th United Nations general Assembly.*

<http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/terro0109/unstate.html>

The Wassenaar Agreement. *Initial Elements.* <http://www.wassenaar.org/docs/IE96.html>

GOVERNMENT OF CANADA: *Ministers Cauchon and MacAulay Release Summary of the G8 Justice and Interior Ministers' Meeting.* <http://www.sgc.gc.ca/Release/e20020514.htm>

RUSSIA

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION. *Report by the Russian Federation to the Counter-Terrorism Committee Established Pursuant to Paragraph 6 of Security Council Resolution 1373 27 December 2001.*

<http://www.ln.mid.ru/website/ns-rkonfl.nsf/8850205d7c032570432569e000362cb1/432569e00034005f43256b3600338316?OpenDocument>

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION. *Report on Measures Undertaken to Fulfil the Obligations of the UN Security Council Resolution 1373.* <http://www.ln.mid.ru/website/ns-rkonfl.nsf/8850205d7c032570432569e000362cb1/fc09cdc52bdcb81943256b420029895e?OpenDocument>

[nt](http://www.ln.mid.ru/website/ns-rkonfl.nsf/8850205d7c032570432569e000362cb1/fc09cdc52bdcb81943256b420029895e?OpenDocument)

CNN. *Bush, Putin Sign Arms Deal.*

<http://europe.cnn.com/2002/WORLD/europe/05/24/bush.europe/index.html>

The Wassenaar Agreement. *Initial Elements*. <http://www.wassenaar.org/docs/IE96.html>

GOVERNMENT OF CANADA. *Ministers Cauchon and MacAulay Release Summary of the G8 Justice and Interior Ministers' Meeting*. <http://www.sgc.gc.ca/Release/e20020514.htm>

UNITED STATES

UN SECURITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE ESTABLISHED (2001) CONCERNING COUNTER-TERRORISM: Report by United States to the United Nations Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee, pursuant to UNSC Resolution 1373 (2001), December 21, 2001.
<http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/committees/1373>

US CUSTOMS SERVICE: DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY: PRESS RELEASE
"US Customs Service Launches 'Operation Green Quest'"; October 25, 2001
<http://www.customs.ustreas.gov/hot-new/pressrel/2001/1025-03.htm>

US DEPARTMENT OF STATE: Remarks at Signing of Patriot Act, Anti-Terrorism Legislation
The East Room, Washington DC; October 26, 2001
<http://www.state.gov/s/ct/rls/rm/2001/5760.htm>

US DEPARTMENT OF STATE: Diplomacy and the Global Campaign Against Terrorism
Accessed: May 20, 2002
<http://www.state.gov/coalition>

US DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY: Office of Enforcement
"Office of Foreign Assets Control": Operation Bulletin: Accessed: May 21, 2002
<http://www.treas.gov/offices/enforcement/ofac/index.html>

US DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY: Office of Public Affairs
"US-EU Designation of Terrorist Financiers Fact Sheet"; May 3, 2002
<http://www.treas.gov/press/releases/po3070.htm>

US DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY: Office of Public Affairs
"Statement of Jummy Gurule. Under Secretary for Enforcement U.S. Department of the Treasury Before the Commission of Security and Cooperation in Europe"; May 8, 2002
<http://www.treas.gov/press/releases/po3084.htm>

WHITE HOUSE: POLICIES IN FOCUS: AMERICA RESPONDS TO TERRORISM:
Office of the Press Secretary: "Executive Order Establishing Office of Homeland Security and the Homeland Security Council"; October 8, 2001
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011008-2.html>

WHITE HOUSE: POLICIES IN FOCUS: AMERICA RESPONDS TO TERRORISM:
"The Global War on Terrorism: THE FIRST 100 DAYS: Executive Summary"; December 2001
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011008-2.html>

WHITE HOUSE: POLICIES IN FOCUS: HOMELAND SECURITY:
SIX MONTH UPDATE: "Strengthening Homeland Security Since 9/11"; Accessed: May 20, 2002
http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/six_month_update.html

WHITE HOUSE: POLICIES IN FOCUS: HOMELAND SECURITY:
"Frequently Asked Questions"; Accessed: May 20, 2002
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/response/faq-homeland.html>

Prepared by: Salimah Ebrahim, Oana Dolea & Yana Faynberg

2001 Genoa Compliance Report

Bridging the Digital Divide – Dot Force

Commitment:

Information and Communications Technologies (ICT) hold tremendous potential for helping developing countries accelerate growth, raise standards of living and meet other development priorities. We endorse the report of the Digital Opportunity Task Force (DOT Force) and its Genoa Plan of Action that successfully fulfilled the Okinawa mandate. The direct participation of representatives from public, private and non-profit sectors, as well as that of developing countries' governments, presents a unique formula for ensuring that digital technologies meet development needs.

1. We will continue to support the process and encourage all stakeholders to demonstrate ownership, to mobilize expertise and resources and to build on this successful cooperation.
2. We will review the implementation of the Genoa Plan of Action at our next Summit on the basis of a report by the G8 Presidency.
3. We also encourage development of an Action Plan on how e-government can strengthen democracy and the rule of law by empowering citizens and making the provision of essential government services more efficient.

Assessment:

Score	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
Country			
<i>Britain</i>			+1
<i>Canada</i>			+1
<i>France</i>			+1
<i>Germany</i>			+1
<i>Italy</i>			+1
<i>Japan</i>			+1
<i>Russia</i>	-1		
<i>United States</i>			+1
Overall			+0.75

For purposes of this commitment area, the extent of compliance for each G8 member country was assessed based on their respective participation in the DOT Force. As a result, it is important to measure compliance based on both the progress made by the DOT Force itself and the contributions of each G8 country toward bridging the digital divide. This caveat notwithstanding, this issue also requires that each country's domestic information technology (IT) initiatives and international contributions outside of the DOT Force be taken into account. This is due to the sizable digital divide between the G8 countries themselves – the US 'owns' approximately 83% of G8 web hosts, for example - which requires extensive infrastructural & economic initiatives to be undertaken domestically.⁵ This, in turn, enables G8 countries to lead by example and improve their ability to help the primary intended recipients of DOT Force initiatives - Less-Developed Countries (LDCs).

⁵ Caslon Analytics Profile: the Digital Divides. See <http://www.caslon.com.au/dividesprofile.htm>

Given the cautious nature of the DOT-force commitment, geared mostly toward continuing to “support” the process, it would be unreasonable to hold the G8 to a promise to secure the fulfilment of the various proposed DOT-force initiatives. Instead, compliance with the commitment would be attained by demonstrating that the G8 member countries have made progress in this issue area since the last summit – as evidenced by information-sharing, direction-setting or mobilization of resources (financial or diplomatic). In other words, while the DOT force framework does not need to be implemented as of yet, there must be tangible indications that the process is being advanced in a significant way by the G8 member countries in order for positive compliance to be effected. In other words, the promise to “bridge the digital divide” does not yet have to be fulfilled to demonstrate compliance; there must merely be evidence that it is *being* fulfilled.

On October 9-10, 2001, all G8 members attended the Organizational Meeting of the DOT Force Implementation Teams in Montreal, Canada. The meeting launched an implementation team for each of the nine priority areas identified in the Genoa Plan of Action. Each team was constituted with chairs, included active participation from developing countries in order to ensure relevance of the implementation process, and were constructed to operate in an open fashion, inviting participation from non-members of the DOT Force.⁶ The creation of the implementation teams moved the G8’s DOT Force initiatives beyond the deliberate stage and into the process setting of concrete directions and the establishment of operational frameworks through which the member countries can, as they move forward, generate concrete decisions concerning distribution of resources.

Since the format of the working groups introduced a division of labour among the DOT Force members, G8 member countries were each allocated specific responsibilities. As a result, the co-operative effort renders each member country accountable primarily for moving the DOT Force process forward within its specific sub-issue domain; all member countries should accordingly not be expected to be active on all fronts of the Genoa Plan for Action, because they were relying on their colleagues to make advances in their own issue assignments.

On February 25, 2002, the DOT Force Presidency and the Chairs and Co-Chairs of the Implementation Teams reviewed each Team’s progress during a conference call.⁷ Finally, the DOT Force members attended a meeting chaired by Canada in Calgary on May 5-7 to finalize their report on the implementation of their Action Plan.⁸ These meetings demonstrate active involvement, co-operation and the mobilization of diplomatic resources as committed to at Genoa. In addition, given the content of the February conference call described below – it showed clear progress in the priority areas within the Genoa Action Plan – it is unlikely that the G8 will shirk its responsibility to implement the Genoa commitment to “review the implementation of the Genoa Plan of Action at our next Summit on the basis of a report by the G8 Presidency”. Thus, while it is impossible to review compliance with this commitment until the Kananaskis Summit actually takes place, the concerted effort by the G8 members in their DOT Force membership capacity to review implementation of the Genoa Plan of Action indicates that the G8 will achieve success in this regard at the Summit.

It should be noted that the Genoa Plan of Action itself is intimately related to the more general commitment to “continue to support the process and encourage all stakeholders to demonstrate ownership, to mobilize expertise and resources and to build on this successful cooperation”. The Genoa

⁶ http://www.dotforce.org/reports/montreal_report.doc; <http://www.g8.gc.ca/aboutdivide-e.asp>

⁷ ^{2nd} Update on the Implementation of the DOT Force Genoa Plan of Action February, 2002
http://www.dotforce.org/reports/Summary_ConfCall_Feb_2002.doc

⁸ Canada Chairs Information and Communication Technologies
for Development Meeting:

<http://www.ic.gc.ca/cmb/Welcomeic.nsf/261ce500dfcd7259852564820068dc6d/85256a220056c2a485256bb20068000d!OpenDocument>)

Plan of Action identifies nine priority areas that tend toward these goals. These priorities, and the capacity in which G8 members serve in their implementation teams, are as follows:⁹

Team	Initiative	G8 Members
1.	Support Development of National e-Strategies	Canada (Chair – e-strategies), Italy (Chair - e-government), all other G8 members (Participants)
2.	Improve Connectivity, increase access, and lower costs	France (Chair), Canada (IDRC – Co-Chair), Japan (Participant), Britain (Participant)
3.	Enhance Human Capacity Development, Knowledge Creation and Sharing	Germany (Co-Chair), Canada (CIDA – Participant), Italy (Participant), United States (Participant), Japan (Participant)
4.	Foster Enterprise, jobs and entrepreneurship	(No G8 members or participants)
5.	Universal Participation in Global ICT Governance	Britain (DFID – Participant), Japan (Participant), Canada (Participant)
6.	Dedicated LDC Initiative	Canada (IDRC – Co-Chair)
7.	ICT for Health Care and Support Against Disease	Canada (CIDA – Chair), Canada (IDRC – Participant), Canada (Health Canada – Participant), United States (US Council for International Business <i>????!</i> – Participant)
8.	Support Local Content and Applications Development	Canada (IDRC – Participant), Britain (DFID – Participant), Canada (CIDA – Participant), Japan (Participant), France (Participant)
9.	Prioritize the Contribution of ICT's in ODA Programs and Enhance Coordination of Initiatives	G8 Presidency (Chair)

In terms of overall accomplishments by the G8 membership within the DOT Force, the following progress has been made since the Genoa G8 Summit in July 2001:

- Formal assignment of members from each G8 country to the DOT Force.
- Establishment of Implementation Teams to follow-up on each of the nine priority areas outlined in the Genoa Plan of Action and the Framework for Implementation.
- Two update meetings – in October 2001 (in Montreal, Canada) and February 2002 (via conference call) – to review the progress made by each of the Implementation Teams.
- Meeting in Calgary on May 5-7, chaired by Canada, at which the DOT Force members finalized their reports on the implementation of the Action Plan.¹⁰
- Development of specific models/frameworks and action plans by each of the Implementation Teams, with the intended goal of transferring implementation responsibilities to appropriate international & multilateral bodies, like the United Nations, after the G8 Summit at Kananaskis.¹¹
- Linkages formed with other organizations devoted to bridging the Digital Divide, such as the UN Information & Communications Technologies (ICT) Task Force.¹²

⁹ From 2nd Update on the Implementation of the DOT Force Genoa Plan of Action February, 2002
http://www.dotforce.org/reports/Summary_ConfCall_Feb_2002.doc

¹⁰ Industry Canada Information Bulletin, “Canada Chairs Information and Communication Technologies for Development Meeting” May 7, 2002
<http://www.ic.gc.ca/cmb/Welcomeic.nsf/261ce500dfcd7259852564820068dc6d/85256a220056c2a485256bb20068000d!OpenDocument>

¹¹ Industry Canada Information Bulletin, “Canada Chairs Information and Communication Technologies for Development Meeting” May 7, 2002
<http://www.ic.gc.ca/cmb/Welcomeic.nsf/261ce500dfcd7259852564820068dc6d/85256a220056c2a485256bb20068000d!OpenDocument>

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown:

Britain: +1

Britain has officially assigned three members from the Department for International Development (DFID) to the DOT Force.¹³

Britain is a participant on the DOT Force Implementation Team #1 (Support Development of National e-Strategies), Team #2 (Improve Connectivity, increase access, and lower costs) (through DFID), Team #5 (Universal Participation in Global ICT Governance) (through DFID), and Team #8 (Support Local Content and Applications Development) (through DFID).¹⁴

Canada: +1

Four members from two separate government ministries – Industry Canada and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) – have been assigned by Canada to the DOT Force.¹⁵

Canada welcomed the launching of the DOT Force Implementation Teams in Montreal in October, 2001,¹⁶ and, along with Italy, chairs Team #1, which was assigned the task of supporting the development of national e-strategies. The team has made substantial moves progress achieving this goal, focusing on three interrelated initiatives.¹⁷ First, it has begun work on creating an International e-Development Resource Network (leDRN) of regulatory, policy and strategy expertise from both developed and developing countries. To date, a draft organization model and business plan have been circulated to all DOT Force members. The plan proposes services and products to be offered to developing countries in order to assist individuals to find, understand and apply the wealth of existing knowledge on ICTs and meet the needs for specialized information and knowledge. Second, as a follow-on to the implementation team, the Markle Foundation and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) launched the Global Digital Opportunities Initiative (GDOI) on February 2, 2002. The GDOI is a public-private sector partnership that will build on existing efforts to develop technologies, policies and applications to assist countries in employing digital technology to improve healthcare and education. Third, an action framework on e-government, together with the private sector and civil society, is being developed by the Italian Ministry of Innovation and Technology under the aegis of this implementation team.

Implementation Team #2, charged with the responsibility to improve connectivity, increase access and lower costs, is co-chaired by Canada.¹⁸ This team is currently developing a business plan aimed at identifying an inventory of activities in the area of access and connectivity that would provide useful information to prospective donors concerning selected projects, funding priorities, and networking with other agencies. One agreed upon function of the business plan is to help G8 leaders as they undertake African development initiatives expressed in the New Economic Partnership for African Development

¹² DOT Force Statement on Linkages with UN ICT:

http://www.dotforce.org/reports/statement_G8_DOTForce.html

¹³ DOT Force list of members, alternates, contact persons.

http://www.dotforce.org/reports/DOTForce_membership.html

¹⁴ 2nd Update on the Implementation of the DOT Force Genoa Plan of Action February, 2002

http://www.dotforce.org/reports/Summary_ConfCall_Feb_2002.doc

¹⁵ DOT Force list of members, alternates, contact persons.

http://www.dotforce.org/reports/DOTForce_membership.html

¹⁶ Remarks by V. Peter Harder, Deputy Minister of Industry Canada, at the launch of the UN ICT Task Force, New York City, Nov. 20, 2001 http://www.dotforce.org/reports/DM_Remarks_Nov20_.html

¹⁷ 2nd Update on the Implementation of the DOT Force Genoa Plan of Action February, 2002

http://www.dotforce.org/reports/Summary_ConfCall_Feb_2002.doc

¹⁸ Ibid.

(NEPAD) forum. The activities centre on improving the sustainability of community access points and telecentres, supporting the planning of project development and working to improve information sharing between projects to solve collective problems.

Along with Italy and on behalf of all G8 DOT Force members, Canada officially welcomed and affirmed the launch of the UN ICT Task Force in a statement on October 10, 2001.¹⁹ Canada has indicated elsewhere that collaboration of the DOT Force with the UN ICT will “maximize synergies and ensure efficient use of resources”.²⁰

Canada (through CIDA) also chairs Implementation Team #7, responsible for ICT for Health Care and Support Against Disease. Through the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and Health Canada, Canada also works with this team in a “participant” capacity. This team met in conjunction with the UN ICT Task Force in New York on February 3, 2002, where it was agreed to form a joint working group to address the application of ICTs in Health Care and HIV/AIDS. The Team has developed a four-part Plan of Action, including a needs assessment for developing countries in the form of a survey to be distributed to a diverse audience, a stocktaking exercise, new initiatives and the creation of a coalition. The survey has been finalized and was slated to be issued in February, 2002.²¹

Within Team #6 (Dedicated LDC Initiative for ICT Inclusion), Canada is co-chair in its through its governmental organ IDRC. This team’s mandate was outlined in the last Implementation Progress Report, where it was indicated that the team would be responsible to ensure that LDCs are given special attention within the work of the other teams.²² One specific objective is to closely link with NEPAD.

As the G8 Presidency, Canada is also Chair of Team #9, responsible for prioritising the Contribution of ICT’s in ODA Programs and Enhancing Coordination of Initiatives.²³ The task of this team is to encourage discussion and collaboration among bilateral donor agencies. At the margins of the World Bank Infodev Symposium in Washington on December 6, 2001, an informal meeting of several bilateral donor agencies was held in order to exchange information on approaches and initiatives on ICT for development in Africa.²⁴

In addition, Canada has been a participant in Implementation Team #3 (Enhance Human Capacity Development, Knowledge Creation and Sharing) (through CIDA), Team #5 (Universal Participation in Global ICT Governance) and Team #8 (Support Local Content and Applications Development) (through CIDA).²⁵

Most recently, Canada chaired the May 5-7, 2002 meeting in Calgary attended by members of the DOT Force to finalize their report on the implementation of the Genoa Action Plan.²⁶

Furthermore, Canada has also promoted the DOT Force agenda in other international fora. Canada attended the International Telecommunications Union “World Telecommunication Development

¹⁹ DOT Force Statement on Linkages with the UN ICT Task Force , October 10, 2001: “On behalf of G8 DOT Force members, we welcome the launch of the United Nations ICT Task Force.”

http://www.dotforce.org/reports/statement_G8_DOTForce.doc

²⁰ <http://www.ecom.ic.gc.ca/english/inter/doc/harder/sld022.htm>

²¹ 2nd Update on the Implementation of the DOT Force Genoa Plan of Action February, 2002

http://www.dotforce.org/reports/Summary_ConfCall_Feb_2002.doc

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ As cited in ²⁴ 2nd Update on the Implementation of the DOT Force Genoa Plan of Action February, 2002

http://www.dotforce.org/reports/Summary_ConfCall_Feb_2002.doc

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Canada Chairs Information and Communication Technologies for Development Meeting:

<http://www.ic.gc.ca/cmb/Welcomeic.nsf/261ce500dfcd7259852564820068dc6d/85256a220056c2a485256bb20068000d!OpenDocument>

Conference” Conference in March 19, 2002. In a related Policy Statement issued by Mr. David Fransen, Associate Assistant Deputy Minister, Spectrum, Information Technologies & Telecommunication, Industry Canada issued on 19 March 2002, it was stated: “One of Canada's primary objectives in participating in this Development Conference is to promote the development of a coherent global strategy for bridging the Digital Divide. We believe that this must be done by building partnerships and increasing coordination among the various ‘ICT-for-development’ initiatives and by encouraging the participation of all segments of society — governments, private sector and civil society ... As a member of both the G8 DOT Force and UN ICT Task Force, the ITU brings its technical expertise in the development of telecommunications to the table”.²⁷

Canada’s Deputy Minister of Industry Canada released a document on January 22, 2002 entitled “The DOT Force Implementation Process ‘Creating Digital Opportunities for All’” that explored the progress of DOT Force initiatives in both Canada and developing countries.²⁸ Canada specified three primary priorities within this document that it would seek resources for. In this respect, Canada has made independent progress in defining the directions and framework that the DOT Force agenda will be carried forward under. The first priority is a Canadian e-Development Resource Network. This will be the Canadian contribution to the International e-Development Resource Network (leDRN) being developed by the DOT Force Implementation Team #1, and will provide a single point of contact for Canadian expertise, both public and private. Second, the document proposed the creation of the Africa Institute for Connectivity. This institution will integrate Canadian expertise and know-how through ACACIA²⁹ and other programs, and will involve a multilateral approach with partners such as the United Kingdom, France, the Commonwealth Telecommunications Organization (CTO) and la Francophonie. Finally, Canada proposed seed funding for entrepreneurs and the instatement of a new not-for-profit organization to be led by the private sector with an established fund to provide seed capital. This organization’s objective would be to support entrepreneurship in ICT through mentoring, funding and networking assistance in developing countries. The business plan for the organization was slated to be released in April, 2002.

Beyond the DOT Force framework, Canadian foreign policy has supported a number of ICT and development-related initiatives for years through CIDA. At least two recent examples of CIDA ICT projects in Africa are germane to Canada’s compliance with the DOT Force commitments. CIDA is working in the Côte d’Ivoire with the Centre Africain de formation aux TICs (CAFTIC) to provide training in ICTs.³⁰ In addition, CIDA is currently supporting the second phase of the African Virtual University, “a satellite- and Internet-based distance-education project focused on science and engineering, non-credit/continuing education, and remedial instruction in sub-Saharan Africa”.³¹

In the area of specific resource distributions, Canada’s Minister for International Cooperation announced on May 2, 2002 that Canada will be contributing \$1.5 million to the New Brunswick Department of Education to implement new technology into the Jordanian education system. Through this funding, Jordanian education professionals will be able to develop gender-sensitive educational materials and curriculum, a network of Web sites that will enable schools to correspond with each other, and exchange ideas and educational materials.³²

²⁷ www.itu.int

²⁸ <http://www.ecom.ic.gc.ca/english/inter/doc/harder/sld001.htm>

²⁹ <http://www.idrc.ca/acacia/>

³⁰ CIDA, Africa & the G8. Education and Knowledge in Africa. http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/cida_ind.nsf/vLUallDocByIDEn/8998BD5FEB1ECD9085256BAE0080C20E?OpenDocument

³¹ Ibid.

³² [Canada/New Brunswick to boost E-learning in Jordan](#), CIDA News Release, May 2, 2002

http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/cida_ind.nsf/vLUallDocByIDEn/9E1C2EE5E2244CB885256BAD004C1A05?OpenDocument

France: +1

France was charged with the task of chairing the DOT Force's Implementation Team #2, which focuses on improving connectivity, increasing access and lowering costs. Towards this end, the team is undertaking an inventory of existing initiatives. In addition, it will focus on the development of sustainable revenue models for access points and the establishment of Community Access Centres.³³ A business plan is being developed based on these goals.

In addition, France was a participant in both Teams #1 (Support Development of National e-Strategies) and #8 (Support Local Content and Applications Development). As of the latest DOT Force update, a draft organization model and business plan for Team #1 had been distributed to all DOT Force members. As for Team #8, progress has been made toward planning and design of three interrelated initiatives: 1) an International e-Development Resource Network of regulatory, policy and strategy expertise from both North and South; 2) the Global Digital Opportunities Initiative (GDOI) which will provide developing nations with pro bono expertise and resources to create e-strategies that advance development goals, and 3) the Italian initiative on "E-Government for Development". Moreover, it has launched a pilot study in the Pondicherry region of India in order to test the feasibility of recommendations surrounding the establishment of an Open Knowledge Network (OKN).³⁴

Finally, France officially assigned members from two separate government ministries - Foreign Affairs and Economy, Finance & Industry ministries – to the DOT Force and has sustained its encouragement of involvement by French NGOs and the private sector.³⁵ This is being done in parallel with France's continuing efforts to improve the delivery and personalization of e-government services (to be accomplished by 2005) and increase overall French participation in the information society – in line with the eEurope 2002 goals shared with other EU jurisdictions.^{36,37} Specifically, all EU member states have committed to having all their basic public services for citizens and businesses online by the end of 2002. In addition, essential public data is also be online at this point, including legal, administrative and cultural information as well as information on the environment and road traffic.³⁸

Germany: +1

As with other G8 member countries, Germany assigned resources to the DOT Force, specifically personnel from the Ministries of Economics & Technology, and Economic Cooperation and Development. Germany also assumed co-chair responsibility for the Human Capacity Building, Knowledge Creation and Sharing Team (Team #3), alongside Siemens, representing the German Private Sector. The Team's goals include assessing the supply of activities/initiatives versus their demand in the area of capacity building and knowledge creation, and then determining which additional activities and programs should be developed in order to respond to the urgent needs of developing countries. By February 2002, the Team had completed an inventory of planned G8 country activities and approved new projects, and the Team was finalizing the need assessment of selected developing countries.³⁹

³³ DOT Force October update – The Way Forward: http://www.dotforce.org/reports/montreal_report.html

³⁴ 2nd Update on the Implementation of the DOT Force Genoa Plan of Action February, 2002

http://www.dotforce.org/reports/Summary_ConfCall_Feb_2002.doc

³⁵ DOT Force – Annex 1 – List of Members: see

http://www.dotforce.org/reports/DOTForce_membership.html

³⁶ France Moves Towards Open e-Government: see <http://petition.eurolinux.org/pr/pr15.html?LANG=en>

³⁷ How France Pols say Pork: Net. See <http://www.wired.com/news/politics/0,1283,45280,00.html>

³⁸ Important eEurope 2002 dates: see

<http://www.google.ca/search?q=cache:ikn9NQb9Ht4C:www.government-online.be/chronology/europe.htm+Europe+%22eEurope+2002%22&hl=en&ie=UTF8>

³⁹ 2nd Update on the Implementation of the DOT Force Genoa Plan of Action February, 2002

http://www.dotforce.org/reports/Summary_ConfCall_Feb_2002.doc

Germany has also made progress on other fronts. In the long-term, it is working towards more intensive co-operation in ICT development policy with Tanzania, Uganda, Laos, Vietnam and Peru.⁴⁰ Furthermore, it is directly supporting a number of international organizations in the area of ICT that complement the work of the DOT Force. For instance, it has committed \$5 million over three years to the Development Gateway Foundation, which funds projects that “bridge the digital divide”.^{41, 42}

Domestically, Germany has pursued implementation of eEurope 2002, in great part through its own “Innovation and Jobs” action plan, which calls for specific e-Business and e-government initiatives to be implemented by 2005. Actions will be taken in several areas, including ensuring broad access to the internet, providing an infrastructure that encourages the development of new applications, improving European and international co-operation, and modernizing governmental services through electronic delivery.^{43, 44} As a testament to its success towards meeting its overall eCommerce goals thus far, Forrester Research projects Germany to represent a 406 billion (\$345 billion) eCommerce market by 2004 and account for more than 25% of all eCommerce turnover achieved in Europe, making it by far the eCommerce leader in that region.⁴⁵

Italy: +1

Italy co-chaired the first DOT Force Implementation Teams meeting in Montreal, Canada, October 9-10 2002, where one Implementation Team was established to address each of the nine Priority Areas of the Genoa Plan of Action.⁴⁶ Four officials from three separate government ministries have been assigned by Italy to the DOT Force.⁴⁷ Italy is the Co-Chair (e-government) of Team #1 (Support Development of National e-Strategies) and has initiated the “E-Government for Development” project⁴⁸ that organized the International Conference on E-Government for Development in Palermo, Sicily, held on April 10-11, 2002.⁴⁹ Domestically, Italy is keeping pace with its international objectives, as it has the second fastest national research network, but the percentage of the population which uses the internet is below the EU average, as studied in a recent eEurope benchmarking report.⁵⁰

⁴⁰ Information Society Germany – Progress Report on the Federal Government’s Action Programme

“Innovation and Jobs in the Information Society of the 21st Century:

http://www.iid.de/aktionen/aktionsprogramm/fortschritt/english/kapitel2_7.html

⁴¹ New Foundation to Help Bridge Digital Divide and Reduce Poverty: see

<http://wbln0018.worldbank.org/news/pressrelease.nsf/673fa6c5a2d50a67852565e200692a79/cd596dc1e23fddd085256a940074b73c?OpenDocument>

⁴² Development Gateway Foundation FAQ: see

<http://www.developmentgateway.org/node/118859/faq/#123855>

⁴³ Germany’s Innovation and Jobs Action Plan: see

http://www.bmwi.de/textonly/Homepage/download/english/innovation_and_jobs.pdf

⁴⁴ “Methods Used by Various Countries with Regards to Increased Usage of eCommerce”: see

http://www.geocities.com/ecuk_dec_2001/Chris.html

⁴⁵ “eBusiness 2004: Germany Far Ahead in Europe”: see http://www.hamburg-newmedia.net/_en/new_text/new_media/ebusiness.html

⁴⁶ http://www.dotforce.org/reports/montreal_report.doc, page 1.

⁴⁷ DOT Force list of members, alternates, contact persons.

http://www.dotforce.org/reports/DOTForce_membership.html

⁴⁸ http://www.dotforce.org/reports/Summary_ConfCall_Feb_2002.doc, page 1;

<http://www.palermoconference2002.org/en/egov2.htm>

⁴⁹ http://www.dotforce.org/reports/Summary_ConfCall_Feb_2002.doc, page 2; Alan Friedman “Using IT to fight poverty” *International Herald Tribune*, 12 April 2002, <http://www.iht.com/articles/54460.html>

⁵⁰ http://europa.eu.int/information_society/eeurope/news_library/new_documents/benchmarking/benchmarking_en.pdf, pages 5-7.

Japan: +1

Japan has officially assigned 7 members from 4 separate government ministries to the DOT Force, including representatives from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry, and the Ministry of Public Management, Home Affairs, Posts and Telecommunications.⁵¹

Within the DOT Force Implementation Teams, Japan is an official participant in Team #1 (Support Development of National e-Strategies), Team #2 (Improve Connectivity, increase access, and lower costs), Team #3 (Enhance Human Capacity Development, Knowledge Creation and Sharing), Team #5 (Universal Participation in Global ICT Governance), and Team #8 (Support Local Content and Applications Development).⁵² Japan also works in the UN ICT Task Force's High Level Advisory Board.⁵³

Beyond the immediate DOT Force Grouping, Japan has also exhibited extensive involvement in promoting DOT Force initiatives. In particular, Japan has hosted and attended a number of relevant meetings. One such meeting was the Japanese-hosted East Asia ICT Cooperation Conference in Okayama on September 17, 2001.⁵⁴ A wide range of issues pertaining to ICT cooperation in East Asia were discussed here, and participation included international organizations as well as senior officials from ministries and agencies within ASEAN member countries, delegates from the ASEAN Secretariat, the chair of the e-ASEAN Working Group and members of the e-ASEAN Task Force, as well as businesspersons working in the ICT related industry from East Asia. At this meeting, Japan explained its "e-Japan Strategy" that aims to make Japan the most advanced nation in the domain of information and communication technologies within five years. Participants at the meeting discussed and pointed to the importance of promoting cooperation in a variety of ICT-related areas, including e-government, capacity building, e-society, standardization, content, ICT infrastructure, e-commerce, trade and investment, human resource development, policy and institution building and ICT for development (poverty alleviation, health, education and competitiveness). In this context, Japan outlined its "Comprehensive Cooperation Package to Address the Digital Divide" announced the previous year, including concrete efforts for the development of networks, infrastructure and information technology-related industries, the realization of e-government and the facilitation of e-commerce, as well as prospective areas for further-cooperation. In the area of e-commerce and trade promotion, Japan described the "Asia PKI (Public Key Infrastructure Forum)" and TEDI (Trade Electric Data Interchange) Initiative. In addition, reports on the progress of cooperation for a common scheme of skill standards for information technology engineers and e-learning were also delivered.

The Minister for IT Policy of Japan chaired the People's Republic of China-hosted Asia IT Ministers' Conference held in Hong Kong on October 28, 2001. The conference was convened in order to bolster the potential of information technologies for the future growth of the Asian economy and to share views on the participants' information technology policies. This meeting was attended by ministers and their representatives from the People's Republic of China, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, India, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Malaysia, and the Republic of Singapore.⁵⁵

A number of DOT-Force related initiatives were outlined in a Japanese government statement issued in November, 2001, entitled "Japanese Government's Cooperation to Asia in the Field of Information and Communications Technology (IT)".⁵⁶ The statement noted that the Japanese Government considers

⁵¹ DOT Force list of members, alternates, contact persons.

http://www.dotforce.org/reports/DOTForce_membership.html

⁵² 2nd Update on the Implementation of the DOT Force Genoa Plan of Action February, 2002

http://www.dotforce.org/reports/Summary_ConfCall_Feb_2002.doc

⁵³ DOT Force Statement on Linkages with the UN ICT Task Force, October 10, 2001:

["http://www.dotforce.org/reports/statement_G8_DOTForce.doc"](http://www.dotforce.org/reports/statement_G8_DOTForce.doc)

⁵⁴ <http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/economy/it/asia/state0109-2.html>

⁵⁵ <http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/economy/it/asia/press0110.html>

⁵⁶ <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/asean/relation/it.html>

information technology a crucial ingredient of economic development, and that it has already been extending more than US\$1.2 billion assistance program in the area of information technologies. The Japanese Government committed to contributing about 1,270 million yen in the current fiscal year to the ADB, a program aimed at promoting information technologies in the developing countries of the Asia and Pacific region. In the area of technical co-operation, the statement noted that a joint program has been implemented for building the human resources of developing countries; the costs of the Japan-Singapore Partnership Program for the 21st Century (JSPP21) are borne on a 50-50 basis by Japan and Singapore. This program was set to open eight IT-related training courses in the 2001 Japanese fiscal year, where trainees would be accepted from neighbouring countries.

An additional related press release was delivered by Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs in August, 2001, entitled "Japan's International Cooperation on Information and Communications Technology (IT) – Primarily about the implementation situation of Japan's Comprehensive Cooperation Package to Address the International Digital Divide".⁵⁷ A number of Japan's initiatives to advance the DOT Force agenda outside the context of formal DOT Force meetings were outlined in the press release. Highlights included the following:

- Allocation of 1.5 billion yen in the FY2000 supplementary budget and the FY2001 budget for J-NET (IT Center), a network with core centers in Tokyo and Okinawa connected via satellite at human resource building bases in developing countries to offer policy advice, technical cooperation and distance training.
- 6.5 billion yen in grant aid for information technology projects (providing the financing, equipment and materials to the construct telecommunication infrastructure, facilities for remote education and telemedicine, and disaster prevention/management).
- Planned contribution of US \$5 million (approximately 540 million yen) for the newly established United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) IT Fund.
- Establishment of the Japan Fund for Information and Communication Technology in July, 2001 within the Asian Development Bank (ADB) (Approximately 1.27 billion yen).
- Planned contribution of 856 million yen for the World Bank Information for Development Program (InfoDev).
- Hosting a number of conferences: a) IT and Development Cooperation (Co-hosted by Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Japanese Ministry of Finance, UNDP and the World Bank), b) APT Asia-Pacific Summit on the Information Society, c) First Meeting of the Digital Opportunity Taskforce (DOT Force), d) Seminar on Information Technology for Development in the Pacific, e) Millennium Forum - Voice of Asia "21st Century Asia and the IT Revolution", f) Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) Seminar on the Digital Opportunity, g) East Asia IT Cooperation Conference (Planned for Japan's fiscal year 2001), and h) Japan-India IT Summit, Japan-India IT Eminent Persons Meeting (Both planned for Japan's fiscal year 2001)
- Significant contributions for relevant projects, including the Pacific IT Promotion Project: US\$1 million (contribution to UNDP) and IT-related assistance to CARICOM countries: Approximately US\$1.4 million (contribution to UNDP and UNESCO), e-TICAD (Tokyo International Conference on African Development) Project: US\$1.5 million (contribution to UNDP), DOT Force administrative costs: US\$750,000 (contribution to UNDP).
- Undertaking the Asia-Pacific Region International Humanitarian Assistance Centre (e-Centre) Project: Approximately US\$1.9 million (contribution to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) through the UN Trust Fund for Human Security). This centre uses the Internet to train for emergency humanitarian assistance to UN staff, NGO members and government officials in the Asia-Pacific region in order to reinforce human resources for emergency preparedness.

⁵⁷ <http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/economy/it/coop0108.html>

Russia: -1

Russia has assigned one government official, the assistant to the Russian sherpa, to the DOT Force.⁵⁸ The only DOT Force implementation team involving Russian participation is in Team #3 (Enhance Human Capacity Development, Knowledge Creation and Sharing), where Microsoft Russia has participant status.⁵⁹ However, given that this compliance study assesses first order compliance (i.e. national government action geared toward fulfilling the summit commitment), private sector participation in DOT Force initiatives alone does not entail compliance. Given these operational parameters, Russia's participation within the DOT Force implementation teams has little to offer in the area of compliance with the Genoa commitment.

Moreover, the website for the Russian Digital Opportunities Task Force⁶⁰ has not been updated since June 1 2001. Russia's partnership with Global Knowledge Partnership to organize a consultative process appears to have ended,⁶¹ and their discussion forum has not had any messages posted since 16 March 2001.⁶² There are no records from a planned conference, "Global Knowledge Russia", scheduled to be held on 25-26 September 2001.⁶³ This could reflect the fact that Russia may be more on the receiving end of the digital divide rather than on the information technology providing side. Their compliance with the DOT Force plan, though, should take into account the lower expectations of the Russians from the beginning.

United States: +1

The United States is a participant in the DOT Force Implementation Team #3 (Enhance Human Capacity Development, Knowledge Creation and Sharing) and the US Council for International Business is a participant in Team #7 (Information and Communications Technologies (ICT) for Health Care and Support Against Disease).⁶⁴ The section of the US State Department which is responsible for the DOT Force is the Strategic Planning and Satellite Policy (CIP/SP) in the International Communication and Information Policy (CIP) group of the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs.⁶⁵ The United States government have left more of the DOT Force work to the private sector than the European participants. Nevertheless, the United States has assigned three officials from three government agencies to the DOT Force.⁶⁶

Prepared by: Robert Bacinski, Ryan B. Lavalley and Andrew Morgan

⁵⁸ DOT Force list of members, alternates, contact persons.

http://www.dotforce.org/reports/DOTForce_membership.html

⁵⁹ http://www.dotforce.org/reports/Summary_ConfCall_Feb_2002.doc

⁶⁰ <http://www.iis.ru/dotforce/index.en.html>

⁶¹ <http://www.globalknowledge.org/>

⁶² <http://www.iis.ru/dotforce/forum/archive1/threads.ru.html>

⁶³ <http://www.iis.ru/dotforce/events/events.en.html>

⁶⁴ http://www.dotforce.org/reports/Summary_ConfCall_Feb_2002.doc

⁶⁵ <http://www.state.gov/e/eb/cip/c621.htm>

⁶⁶ DOT Force list of members, alternates, contact persons.

http://www.dotforce.org/reports/DOTForce_membership.html

2001 Genoa Compliance Report

Fighting the Spread of HIV/AIDS and other Infectious Diseases

Commitment:

At Okinawa last year, we pledged to make a quantum leap in the fight against infectious diseases and to break the vicious cycle between disease and poverty. To meet that commitment and to respond to the appeal of the UN General Assembly, we have launched with the UN Secretary-General a new Global Fund to fight HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis. We are determined to make the Fund operational before the end of the year. We have committed \$1.3 billion. The Fund will be a public-private partnership and we call on other countries, the private sector, foundations, and academic institutions to join with their own contributions - financially, in kind and through shared expertise. We welcome the further commitments already made amounting to some \$500 million.

Assessment:

Score	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
<u>Country</u>			
<i>Britain</i>			+1
<i>Canada</i>			+1
<i>France</i>			+1
<i>Germany</i>			+1
<i>Italy</i>			+1
<i>Japan</i>		0	
<i>Russia</i>			+1
<i>United States</i>		0	
<i>Overall</i>			+0.75

The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria:

On 26 April, 2001, at the African Leaders Summit in Abuja, Nigeria, United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan called for the creation of a multilaterally funded global fund for the purposes of fighting HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria. Two months later, a special assembly of the UN was convened to address the issue of HIV/AIDS (June 25-27, 2001). The result of this session was the *Special Session Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS*, which called for the appropriation of 7-10 billion a year to be governed under a non-United Nations board comprised of representatives from the public and private sector. The funding was to come from both the public and private sectors with approximately 90% of the total revenue coming from donor governments.

The fund has met with mixed success and has raised approximately US\$2 billion (<http://www.un.org/News/ossg/aids.htm>). After operating for just under one year, the fund has now begun distributing funds. On April 22-24 at the Mailman School of Public Health at Columbia University in New York, the fund executive met and committed a total of US\$378 million over two years to forty programs in 31 countries. (http://www.globalfundatm.org/journalists/journalists_pr.html)

Overall Compliance:

According to the commitment in the Genoa Communiqué, it was necessary to fulfil two conditions in order to receive a score of +1 for the G8 countries as a whole:

- a) The Global Health Fund was operational by December 31, 2001; and
- b) The pledge of \$1.3 billion US was fulfilled.

The Fund, which was launched at the Genoa Summit in July 2001, spent the first several months after its creation coordinating itself and did not have its first meeting of the Board of Directors until January 28-29, 2002, just missing the December 31, 2001 deadline. However, by April 2002, the Fund had reviewed applications and announced the first round of grants totaling \$378 million US to be allocated in 30 countries, across 40 projects, over a 2 year period. (*Washington Post*, April 29, 2002).

Originally, the Fund was expected to require \$7-10 billion US annually in order to be effective, however, the G8 member countries pledged \$1.3 billion US at Genoa. By May 2002, the fund had a total of almost \$2 billion US, of which over \$1.4 billion US came directly from the G8 member states (www.globalfundatm.org).

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown:

Britain: +1

According to World Bank GDP figures, Britain's US\$200 million guarantee to the Global Fund's US\$1.3 billion target is a significant contribution relative to that of the other G8 countries. Representing 6.65% of total GDP for the G8 countries for FY 2000, Britain's contribution is significantly higher than the amount forecasted. It is reported, however, that the grand total of US\$ 200 million is to be allocated to the Global Fund in increments over a five-year period.

www.unaids.org/whatsnew/others/un_special/Declaration020801_en.htm

The sum to be allocated to the Fund in the first year of operation has not been declared. Nevertheless, according to a framework of equitable contributions by the Health and Development Network, Britain's total pledge represents approximately 44% of an equitable pledge- a compliance accomplishment surpassed only by Italy with 57% and rivaled by Canada with 41% (*The Global Fund: Which Countries Owe How Much*, by Tim France, Gorik Ooms, and Bernard Rivers, April 2002, available at:

http://www.hdnet.org/UNGASS%20docs/GFATM/Global%20Fund%20Contributions%20Article%20_%2021%20April%202002.pdf).

Canada: +1

Based on figures provided by the World Bank, Canada was responsible for approximately 3.23% of the aggregate Gross Domestic Product of all G8 nations for FY 2000

(<http://www.worldbank.org/data/databytopic/GDP.pdf>). One would therefore expect Canada to be responsible for approximately three and a quarter percent of the total US\$1.3 billion commitment to the fund. Canada's pledge of US\$100 million represented 7.69% of the total amount pledged and, as such, more than double the 3.23% for which Canada was responsible. However, while the Canadian government touted its US\$100 million pledge as a significant and appropriate commitment to the global fund, it was much less widely reported that the sum was apparently allocated over a three-year period. This means that by the time the fund begins to allocate its grants (FY 2002), Canada will have committed somewhere in the order of US\$38 million.

(http://www.hdnet.org/UNGASS%20docs/GFATM/Global%20Fund%20Contributions%20Article%20_%2021%20April%202002.pdf).

Given that the annual budget for the fund was mandated to be between US\$7-10 billion, with approximately 90% of the funds coming from world governments, this contribution of approximately US\$38 million is well short of Canada's appropriate level of contribution. Indeed, the international human rights organization, Oxfam, has proposed that Canada's contribution to the global fund be about US\$291 million or almost C\$450 million per year - nine times what Canada has committed to date. Although the consensus seems to be that Canada would be required to make a greater contribution to the fund based on GDP levels, the Canadian government has nonetheless made a contribution, thereby supporting the fund and its efforts against infectious diseases.

France: +1

When weighted by France's market share of the G8 countries in terms of their 2000 GDP figures (www.worldbank.org), France's share of the \$1.3 billion US pledged in Genoa equals approximately US\$80 million. However, according to www.globalfundatm.org, France has pledged over US\$133 million to date, thereby exceeding its proportional GDP to the fund's contribution by over 50%.

Germany: +1

Germany announced on 13 July 2001, that it would earmark US\$135.4 million to the Global Fund (see www.un.org/News/ossg/aids.htm). Accounting for 8.8% of total GDP for FY 2000, Germany's contribution to the US\$1.3 billion fund package exceeded the target amount calculated relative to GDP standings of the other G8 countries by approximately 18%. (<http://www.worldbank.org/data/databytopic/GDP.pdf>) However, world GDP standings and rankings on the Human Development Index (HDI) suggest that Germany's total pledge represents only 24% of an equitable contribution value (*The Global Fund: Which Countries Owe How Much*, by Tim France, Gorik Ooms, and Bernard Rivers, April 2002: http://www.hdnet.org/UNGASS%20docs/GFATM/Global%20Fund%20Contributions%20Article%20_%2021%20April%202002.pdf). This suggests that Italy, Canada, France and the Britain rank ahead of Germany in equitable contribution standards. Only the pledges of the United States and Japan yield less equitable ratings.

Italy: +1

After having endorsed infectious diseases as a key Summit priority during the 2001 meeting in Genoa Italy, the Italian government has led the G8 nations in the fight against HIV/AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis. On July 21, 2001, the Italian Government committed US\$200 million to the global fund. This commitment was well over the approximate US\$66 million of funding relative to its GDP levels. Furthermore, the Italian Government has made more funding available for the global fund than any other G8 country (with the exception of the US), by providing US \$73 million to the fund for FY 2002. Moreover, Italy leads all other nations in terms of its relative contribution.

Japan: 0

Proportionally, Japan's GDP would suggest a contribution of approximately 23% of the \$1.3 billion US pledge, or an amount of US\$296 million. To date, the Fund has received pledges from the Japanese government totaling \$200 million US (www.unaids.org) or 35% short of its expected target value.

Russia: +1

On 20, July 2001, Russia pledged US\$19.2 million to the Global Fund to fight Aids, Tuberculosis, and Malaria (www.un.org/News/ossg/aids.htm). Of this total, an estimated US\$7 million was earmarked for distribution in FY 2002. (*The Global Fund: Which Countries Owe How Much*, by Tim France, Gorik Ooms, and Bernard Rivers, April 2002, available at: <http://www.hdnet.org/UNGASS%20docs/GFATM/Global%20Fund%20Contributions%20Article%20%2021%20April%202002.pdf>) Accounting for 1.18% of the total GDP- the lowest share within the G8 membership for FY 2000 - Russia's contribution fulfils its donation requirement of the total US\$1.3 billion target. (GDP figures for FY 2000 available at: <http://www.worldbank.org/data/databytopic/GDP.pdf>.)

According to a joint report by UNAIDS, UNICEF and WHO, Eastern Europe and Central Asia are currently experiencing an unprecedented 1300% increase in the prevalence of the HIV virus (*Coordinates 2002: Charting progress against AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria, April 2002: www.unaids.org*). It is anticipated that Russia's need for financial support and program assistance to combat AIDS will only accelerate in the future as the country's population becomes increasingly burdened with the disease. In light of this prediction, Russia's equitable contribution should reflect an increased effort to promote and appropriate funding for the Global Fund through the G8 forum as well as internationally in order to move closer to the achievement of the annual needs-based funding objective of \$7-10 billion (US) proposed at the Genoa Summit.

United States: 0

Though making the largest pledge to the Global Aids Fund, the United States still lags behind in its compliance with the objectives set out in Genoa. In total, the United States has pledged US\$500 million to the global fund. This allocation was made in three separate commitments: 11 May 2001, 24 July 2001 and 28 January 2002 for US\$200, \$100, and \$200 million respectively. In doing so, the United States still fell short of the approximately US\$ 601.1 million for which it was responsible given its approximate 46.2% share of the G8's total GDP (GDP figures for FY 2000 taken from the World Bank:<http://www.worldbank.org/data/databytopic/GDP.pdf>)

However, the United States must be given some credit for making approximately half of those funds (US\$250 million) available to the fund for FY 2002. While this immediate payment is a step in the right direction, these funds only represent approximately 7% of the total (of the 7-10 billion annually) amount for which the United States should be responsible given the size of its GDP. It has recently been suggested that the US ought to be responsible for \$3 479 million annually (*The Global Fund: Which Countries Owe How Much*, by Tim France, Gorik Ooms, and Bernard Rivers, April 2002, available at <http://www.hdnet.org/UNGASS%20docs/GFATM/Global%20Fund%20Contributions%20Article%20%2021%20April%202002.pdf>). While this figure may be somewhat inflated, America's contribution of approximately one third of the world' economy (GDP figures taken from World Bank as above) should put America's annual contribution at approximately US\$3 billion. As such, these contributions represent a meager portion of their total responsibility.

Despite these grim figures, it must also be noted that the United States has made contributions beyond the scope of the global fund that factor into its overall compliance in less tangible ways. The United

States has budgeted for the distribution of an additional, non-fund related, US\$485 million bilateral aid through USAID for FY 2002. This represents a nearly 52% increase over the 2000 USAID budget of \$320 million and is more than double the FY 2000 budget of \$200 million.

Prepared by: Serena Yoon, Dan Ben-Aron and Oksana Werbowy

2001 Genoa Compliance Report

Africa Action Plan

Commitment:

“To take this process forward, each of us will designate a high level personal representative to liaise with committed African Leaders on the development of a concrete Action Plan to be approved at the G8 Summit next year under the leadership of Canada.”

Assessment:

Country	Non-Compliance	Work in Progress	Compliance
Britain		0	
Canada		0	
France		0	
Germany		0	
Italy		0	
Japan		0	
Russia		0	
United States		0	
Overall		0	

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown:

Britain: 0

The Blair government has been actively engaged in the furthering of the G8 Africa Plan, first introduced in Genoa. Upon his return, Prime Minister Blair designated Baroness Valerie Amos as his APR. As the current Parliamentary Undersecretary for foreign and commonwealth affairs, Baroness Amos is one of the Government's spokespersons in the House of Lords on foreign and Commonwealth affairs, and is the principal spokesperson in the House of Lords on international development. She is also the Minister for Africa at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) and is responsible for Sub-Saharan Africa. Previously, from 1995 to 1998, she served experience as an adviser to the post-apartheid South African Government on public service reform, human rights, human resource development and employment equity.

Since Genoa, Baroness Amos has met with the other APRs, visited Africa, and liaised with African leaders. There have been three meetings: London (October 2001), Addis Ababa (December 2001) and Cape Town (February 2002). Each of these meetings has been critical in the development of the G8 response to the NEPAD Initiative as well as continuing the dialogue with African leaders.

In May 2002, Baroness Amos traveled to Mozambique where she was responsible for confirming the 100% cancellation of all of Mozambique's debts to the UK, consolidated in the UK/Mozambique debt agreement. She also represented the UK at another meeting of the G8 APRs while in Mozambique and

met senior Mozambicans including President Chiassano, PM Mocumbi and Mr. Dhlakama, the leader of the opposition.

Baroness Amos' efforts are very much in line with the Blair government's statements regarding the 2002 G8 summit and the Action Plan for Africa. In February 2002, at a press conference given in Dakar with the President of Senegal, Prime Minister Blair emphasized trade and conflict resolution in Africa as areas in which he anticipated that concrete measures would be agreed upon at upcoming G8 Summit. At the same press conference, Blair declared that he will be a "very strong advocate for NEPAD," and suggested that "it will effectively dominate the G8 proceedings." Later that month in Nigeria, Prime Minister Blair presented a speech to the Nigerian National Assembly entitled "Partnership for African Development," wherein he promised to advocate in Kananaskis that all G8 countries should introduce duty-free and quota free access for imports from all the Least Developed Countries, and that where there is a clear commitment to reform, donors should increase their aid flows. He also stated that he would call upon the G8 to redouble its efforts to end the conflicts in the Great Lakes region of Africa, and in the Sudan.

While the Blair government has taken concrete steps to fulfill the commitments made at Genoa, the plan remains a work in progress. As Prime Minister Blair himself has said, Kananaskis will be a benchmark in the efforts of the G8 to help Africa develop, and it is only at the Summit that a more complete sense of the success of the project will emerge.

Canada: 0

Canada has been one of the most ardent supporters for the development of a G8 Action Plan for Africa. As host of this year's Summit, Canada has from the start placed African Development as one of major focuses of G8 discussion in Kananaskis. Even following the events of September 11th and the focus on terrorism in the international community, Canada is committed to ensuring that the African remains a priority at the upcoming G8 Summit.

Following Genoa, Prime Minister Chretien was quick to appoint his personal representative to Africa (APR). Mr. Robert Fowler, the Canadian Ambassador to Italy, was chosen by the Prime Minister no doubt for his previous experience with the United Nations and with the African continent. He began his government service with the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) in 1968 and has held numerous posts in Ottawa's civil service for a variety of ministries.

Since his appointment, Fowler has met with the other G8 APRs on three occasions in London (October 2001), Addis Ababa (December 2001) and Cape Town (February 2002). In addition, he has extended consultations on the New Economic Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) initiative with both African leaders and civil society representatives. Within Canada, Mr. Fowler has spoke at Universities and other public discussions in order to increase awareness of the NEPAD and receive input from Canadians. This Canadian-African dialogue has been further promoted by CIDA. In May 2002, CIDA hosted a conference that brought together CIDA's African and Canadian partners to discuss the challenges facing Africa and what NEPAD can do for the poor of that continent. Topics discussed were related to key issues outlined in the NEPAD, such as governance, health and education, peace and security, and economic growth. CIDA has also established a NEPAD Africa Outreach Fund, which is designed to support African-driven initiatives that promote awareness and public discourse on NEPAD in Africa.

In addition to the above efforts, there has also been high-level political involvement to bring international attention to issues of African development. Prime Minister Chretien has been particularly active in this area. His efforts culminated in a nine-day, six country visit to African where he consulted with 14 African leaders on the G8 Africa Action Plan. The Prime Minister has also demonstrated his willingness to back his dialogue and rhetoric with well-needed funds. On February 1st, he announced that Canada, as the G8 host, is setting aside \$500 million as a special fund for NEPAD.

While Canada has been an extremely active supporter of NEPAD, they still receive a compliance grade of 0 since NEPAD is a work in progress and the outcome of the above mentioned consultations will not be known until after Kananaskis.

France: 0

Since the introduction of the *Genoa Plan for Africa* at the 2001 G8 Summit, France has maintained its unwavering support for the new partnership and affirmed its commitment to see concrete progress and its final implementation at the upcoming 2002 G8 Summit in Kananaskis. France has long been characterized as the champion of African development. Within the G8, French President Chirac has placed particular emphasis on Africa since the 1999 Summit in Cologne. While the focus of African development at the upcoming Summit has been challenged by international efforts to counter terrorism, President Chirac has stated that France would “keep guard that the procedure of partnership with Africa, put in place in Genoa, would be translated into concrete results following the next summit in Canada.”

In terms of the above commitment, President Chirac was the first G8 leader to appoint his APR. He designated Mr. Michel Camdessus, the former managing Director of the IMF (until May 2000) and a prominent figure internationally on questions of development and world poverty, thus indicating the weight attached to the successful completion of this G8 initiative.

Since assuming the post, Mr Camdessus met his G8 counterparts for a series of discussions in what is expected to produce a program of support to be endorsed by the G8 leaders at Kananaskis. Meetings of the APRs took place in London (October 2001), Addis Ababa (December 2001) and Cape Town (February 2002). At the third meeting, working papers were introduced on the top four priorities: governance, peace and security, human development, growth, and the themes of cooperation, regional integration, agriculture, and the problems of water. France has stated its intentions to concentrate most on the areas of ‘peace and security’ and ‘growth’ along with a focus on the problems of water.

France has also hosted a number of bilateral and multilateral meetings with African heads of state and representatives, such as the February 8th NEPAD meeting, where President Chirac met with the Presidents of Nigeria, Egypt, Senegal, Algeria, and Zambia. President Chirac (assisted by Mr Camdessus) expressed hope that this meeting would enable all present to gain some perspective before the next G8 meeting and to demonstrate to the Africans France’s level of commitment. He emphasized the need to have a “departure point” before Kananaskis and strongly urged his African partners to be present at Monterrey (Mexico).

At the Monterrey meeting, President Chirac indicated that France would reverse the downward trend in public spending on official assistance (0.5% in five years, 0.7% in ten). He added that his participation at Monterrey was a clear indication of the French support for the attainment of this “new and great ambition” and that at the negotiation table in Mexico, as later in Canada, he “will plead for Africa.”

Although France has been very active in the area of African development throughout the year, it remains a work a progress until the action plan is adopted in Genoa.

Germany: 0

Following the Genoa Summit in 2001, German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder appointed Dr. Uschi Eid of the Green Party as his APR. Dr. Eid holds the position of Parliamentary State Secretary at the Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Since her appointment, Dr. Eid has attended the meetings of the APRs in London (October 2001), Addis Ababa (December 2001), and Cape Town (February 2002). On the 13th and 14th of May, she invited the NEPAD steering committee to an information meeting in Berlin. This included representatives from the

five founding countries of NEPAD - Algeria, Egypt, Nigeria, Senegal and South Africa. She has also been involved with various Africa-related initiatives on the part of the German government during the past months, including the "Afrika ist im kommen--Africa works" forum devoted to the African economy and its potential (held in Berlin during April 2002) and the awarding of the German Africa Prize 2002.

Within the German government's broad focus on African development, there has been a particular emphasis placed on the potential of the African economy and international trade with the African continent. Chancellor Schröder, speaking in Berlin on April 22, emphasized that the German government is committed to assisting Africa, particularly through the development of a trade relationship. While the German government has fulfilled its commitment to appoint a high-level representative for Africa, their efforts remain a work in progress until the plan is adopted.

Italy: 0

Through its 2001 Presidency of the G8, Italy played an integral role in bringing NEPAD to the G8 agenda. Indeed, the first international acknowledgement of the New Initiative for Africa (NIA) took place at Genoa with the G8 *Genoa Africa Action Plan*. As in 2001, African development and poverty has remained a key objective of Italy in the G8. Despite the changes in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and a seemingly shaken international profile, Italy remains committed to the Plan.

The Italian Prime Ministers Berlusconi, appointed Minister Alberto Michelini as his Personal Representative for the Africa Plan. Minister Michelini was elected to the House of Representatives in 2001 as a member of Forza Italia (Prime Minister Berlusconi's party). A former journalist, Minister Michelini also holds the Humanitarian Emergencies portfolio in the Berlusconi government.

Since his appointment, Minister Michelini has met with the other G8 APRs on three occasions: London (October 2001), Addis Ababa (December 2001) and Cape Town (February 2002). Given the introduction of the plan under the Italian Presidency of the G8, Italy has worked with Canada to ensure the agenda it introduced maintains momentum. In December 2001, Prime Minister Berlusconi's Personal Representative for the G8, Ambassador Castellaneta, and Minister Michelini (accompanied by the Canadian Sherpa and Mr Chretien's APR, Ambassador Fowler) held a press conference in December 2001 to outline the functioning of the Africa Plan. Prime Minister Berlusconi also received Mr Chrétien on 10 May in Rome in the anticipation of the Kananaskis Summit.

The Italian parliament has also taken a leadership role in stimulating dialogue with Africa leaders. This culminated in the "Italy-Africa Parliamentary Day" that took place in Rome in late May. Promoted by the Italian House of Representatives and attended by the Italian Head of State, Carlo Azeglio Ciampi, and the President of the House of Representatives, Pier Ferdinando Casini, the event provided for an exchange of views on democracy, development, and Euro-African partnership. The main theme, "Parliamentary cooperation and support for Africa," embraced the topics of "The strengthening of representative institutions in new African democracies" and "The role of parliaments in cooperation between Europe and Africa" and was attended by the Presidents of 36 African State Assemblies (notably including the NEPAD member states).

Mr Casini had previously met with the South African Archbishop Tutu (President of South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission), Namibia's President Sam Nujoma, and South Africa's President of the National Assembly Ginwala, to discuss the launching of Italy and Europe's commitments regarding the problems facing Africa: poverty, AIDS, conflict prevention, economic development, and the growth of democratic institutions.

Also in March, President Ciampi made an official visit to South Africa. Meeting with President Mbeki and other dignitaries, he affirmed Italy's commitment to the G8 Genoa obligations and its intention to reach the level of 0.7% GPD for ODA.

While Italy has remained engaged in the elaboration of the Action Plan and the ongoing African dialogue, the commitment remains a work in progress until a concrete action is introduced in Kananaskis.

Japan: 0

Following Genoa, Prime Minister Koizumi appointed Minister Oshima Shotaro as his APR. In addition to this recent appointment, he currently serves as the vice-minister of Foreign Affairs. Minister Shotaro joined the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1968 and has since held a variety of positions in embassies around the world, including, the United States, Israel, Russia and Saudi Arabia. He has also served the Ministry as the Director of Overseas Establishments Divisions.

Since his appointment, Minister Shotaro has met with the other APRs in London (October 2001), Addis Ababa (December 2001) and Cape Town (2002) in order to discuss the most effective and efficient way to implement the NEPAD.

In addition to these meetings, Japan also hosted the Third Tokyo International conference on African Development (TICAD). In December 2001, the TICAD held its Ministerial-Level Meeting which welcomed representatives from all 53 African nations, 11 countries in Asia, 23 donor countries, 38 international organizations as well as the host organizations (Japan, the United Nations, the World Bank and the Global Coalition for Africa). Key Japanese participants at the TICAD meeting included: Prime Minister Koizumi, Foreign Affairs Minister Makiko Tanaka, Senior Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs Seiken Sugiura and Parliamentary Secretary for Foreign Affairs Taimei Yamaguchi. In addition to evaluating the efforts of the international community in implementing the 1998 "Tokyo Agenda for Action", participants also exchanged views on NEPAD. Discussions included themes like governance, education, health and information technology.

Similar to the other G8 member countries, Japan has received a grade of 0 because the action plan for Africa has not yet been adopted.

Russia: 0

In contrast to the other G8 leaders, President Putin was significantly delayed in fulfilling the Genoa commitment to appoint an APR. Indeed, at the first meeting of the APRs in October 2001, Russia was the only country to have sent an interim representative. Following this, President Putin appointed Dr. Simonia Nodari, Director of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations. Dr. Nodari has a strong background in Third World economic development. It is interesting to note, however, that Dr. Nodari's research has focussed much more on Asia than Africa.

Since his appointment, Dr. Nodari has participated in two subsequent meetings of the APRs in Addis Ababa (December 2001) and Cape Town (February 2002). Both of these meetings have included discussions with members of the Steering Committee for the NEPAD. The APRs also had the opportunity in Cape Town to meet with several African Heads of State on the NEPAD Implementation Committee.

In addition to discussions between the African leaders and Dr. Nodari, the Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov has also been active in the dialogue on the Africa Action Plan. In December 2001, he completed his first African tour, visiting Angola, Namibia and South Africa.

Although President Putin was delayed in appointing a representative, Russia has since become relatively engaged in this process. It does, however, remain a work in progress until a concrete action plan is adopted.

United States: 0

Following the introduction of the G8 *Genoa Plan for Africa* in July 2001, President Bush appointed Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Walter H. Kansteiner, III, as his APR. Assistant Secretary Kansteiner has brought extensive African experience to the table of APRs. Prior to his current appointment, he served as the Director of African Affairs on the National Security Council. He also has more than 20 years experience in various advisory capacities on emerging market business issues in Africa.

Since his appointment, Assistant Secretary Kansteiner has met with the other G8 APRs on three occasions: London (October 2001), Addis Ababa (December 2001), Cape Town (February 2002). These meetings have included discussions with African members of the Steering Committee for NEPAD. At the meeting in Cape Town, the APRs had the opportunity to liaise with the African Heads of State on the NEPAD Implementation committee.

Outside the APR process, the US Administration has also been engaged in the dialogue with African leaders regarding the Action Plan. President George Bush discussed the issue in bilaterals with President Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria in November 2001 and President Thabo Mbeki of South Africa in January 2002. He also met in February 2002 with Presidents dos Santos of Angola, Chissano of Mozambique, and Mogae of Botswana to discuss efforts aimed at bringing peace, prosperity, and stability to Southern Africa. In addition to these efforts, in May 2002 Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill also visited four African states (South Africa, Uganda, Ethiopia and Ghana) with the purpose of highlighting and enhancing the effectiveness of US African development policies.

In addition to this dialogue, at the International Conference on the Financing of Development in Monterrey, Mexico, President Bush recently proposed a 50 percent increase in the core US development assistance over the next three budget years. This would eventually translate into a \$5-billion annual increase over current levels. President Bush has stipulated that these additional funds would be allocated to a new Millennium Challenge Account. This account would provide money for projects only in countries that govern justly, encourage economic freedom and invest in their people.

The US has thus been actively involved in the development of an Action Plan for Africa. Although the plan is nearing completion, it remains a work in progress until its adoption in Kananaskis.

REFERENCES

Canada

Canadian Government Press Release, "*Robert R. Fowler Personal Representative of the Prime Minister for the G8 Summit and Personal Representative of the Prime Minister for Africa*", available on line at <http://www.g8.gc.ca/mediabiofowler-e.asp>

Address by Prime Minister Jean Chrétien To the World Economic Forum Plenary Session February 1, 2002 New York, New York available on line at http://www.pm.gc.ca/default.asp?Language=E&Page=newsroom&Sub=Speeches&Doc=g8wef.20020201_e.htm

Canadian Government Press Release, "*Prime Minister to Visit Africa*", March 28, 2002 Ottawa, Ontario available on line at http://www.pm.gc.ca/default.asp?Language=E&Page=newsroom&Sub=NewsReleases&Doc=africa.20020328_e.htm

Government of Canada website, *CIDA, Africa and the G8*, available on line at <http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/summit>

OECD Report, *Net Official Development Assistance Flows in 2001: Provisional Data*, available on line at <http://www.oecd.org/pdf/m00029000/m00029445.pdf>

France

“Conférence de presse conjointe de M Jacques CHIRAC Président de la République, de M Olusegun OBASANJO Président de la République fédérale du Nigéria, de M Hosni MOUBARAK Président de la République arabe d'Égypte, de M Abdoulaye WADE Président de la République du Sénégal, de M Abdelaziz BOUTEFLIKA Président de la République algérienne démocratique et populaire et de M Lévy MWANAWASA Président de la République de Zambie, Président en exercice de l'OUA à l'occasion de la réunion sur le [NEPAD],” (Palais de l'Élysée, 08.02.2002), *Présidence de la République*, http://www.elysee.fr/cgi-bin/auracom/aurweb/search/file?aur_file=discours/2002/PP020208.html.

“Conférence de presse de Monsieur Jacques CHIRAC Président de la République à l'issue de la Conférence internationale sur le financement du développement,” (Monterrey, Mexico, 22.03.2002), *Présidence de la République*, http://www.elysee.fr/cgi-bin/auracom/aurweb/search/file?aur_file=discours/2002/MX020322b.html.

“Déclaration du porte-parole du Quai d'Orsay : Entretien de M. Josselin avec M. Camdessus, représentant du président de la république pour l'Afrique auprès du G8,” *Ministère des Affaires étrangères*, (Paris, 27 November 2001), <http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/actu/article.asp?ART=8356>.

“Discours de Monsieur Jacques CHIRAC Président de la République lors de la présentation des voeux du Corps diplomatique,” (Palais de l'Élysée, 04.01.2002), *Présidence de la République*, http://www.elysee.fr/cgi-bin/auracom/aurweb/search/file?aur_file=discours/2002/VXCD02.html

“Discours de Monsieur Jacques CHIRAC Président de la République en introduction à la réunion franco-africaine,” (Monterrey, Mexico, 21.03.2002), *Présidence de la République*, http://www.elysee.fr/cgi-bin/auracom/aurweb/search/file?aur_file=discours/2002/MX020321.html.

“Le Nouveau partenariat pour le développement de l'Afrique,” (Réunion de NEPAD, 08.02.2002), *Présidence de la République*, http://www.elysee.fr/cgi-bin/auracom/aurweb/search/file3?aur_file=actus/arch0202/020208/nouveau.htm

Italy

“Casini incontra Arcivescovo Desmond Tutu, Presidente di Namibia e Presidente dell'Assamblea Sudafricana,” *Camera dei Deputati* (04/01/2002), <http://www.camera.it/index.asp?content=/primapagina/primapagina/08.comunicati.asp>

“Dichiarazione alla stampa del Presidente della Repubblica Carlo Azeglio Ciampi, in visita di Stato in Sud Africa, al termine del colloquio con il Presidente del Sud Africa Thabo Mbeki,” *La presidenza della repubblica* (13/03/2002), <http://www.quirinale.it/Discorsi/discorsi.asp?qMese=2&qAnno=2002>

“Giornata Parlamentare Italia—Africa, alla presenza del capo dello stato,” *Camera dei Deputati* (23/05/2002),

"Illustrazione alla stampa del piano d'Azione di Genova per l'Africa," *Ministero degli Affari Esteri* (27/12/2001), <http://www.esteri.it>.
<http://www.camera.it/index.asp?content=/primapagina/primapagina/08.comunicati.asp>

Japan

Japanese Government Website, *African Development and TICAD*, available on line at
http://www.japan.org.za/oda_ticad.html

Press Conference by The Press Secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, available on line at
<http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/press/index.html>

OECD Report, *Net Official Development Assistance Flows in 2001: Provisional Data*, available on line at
<http://www.oecd.org/pdf/m00029000/m00029445.pdf>

Policy Speech of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan Makiko Tanaka on the occasion of the TICAD Ministerial-level Meeting, Tokyo, December 3, 2001, available on line at
<http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/afrika/ticad/min01/fmspeech.html>

Biography of Oshima Shotaro, available on line at
<http://www.weforum.org/site/knowledgenavigator.nsf/Content/Oshima%20Shotaro>

Russia

Fowler, Robert, Speaking Notes to the Canadian Institute for International Affairs.
<http://www.g8.gc.ca/statements/speechfowler2-e.asp>. November 15, 2001

Government of Canada, *Progress of the Personal Representatives for Africa*.
http://www.g8.gc.ca/summitafrica_apr-e.asp. March 25, 2002

Institute of World Economy and International Relations, *Simonia Nodari, Academician, Research Institute Director*. <http://webcenter.ru/~imemorand/directore.htm> May 19, 2002

Pravda, *Russian Foreign Minister to Embark on his First African Tour Wednesday*.
<http://english.pravda.ru/diplomatic/2001/12/12/23463.html> December 12, 2001

United States

Fowler, Robert, Speaking Notes to the Canadian Institute for International Affairs.
<http://www.g8.gc.ca/statements/speechfowler2-e.asp>. November 15, 2001

Government of Canada, *Progress of the Personal Representatives for Africa*.
http://www.g8.gc.ca/summitafrica_apr-e.asp. March 25, 2002

US Department of State, *Biography - Walter H. Kansteiner, III, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of African Affairs*, <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/biog/4059.htm>. July 12, 2001

US Department of State, *US Treasury Secretary to Visit Four African Nations*, _____
<http://www.usinfo.state.gov/regional/af/a2042303.htm>. April 24, 2002

The White House, *President Meets with African Leaders*.
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/new/releases/2002/02/20020226-3.html>. February 2002

The White House, *President Outlines U.S. Plan to Help World's Poor*.
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/03/20020322-1.html> March 2002.

Prepared by: Bryn Gray, Melanie Martin, Maria Banda, Sonali Thakkar

2001 Genoa Compliance Report

Universal Primary Education

Commitment

Para. 18: "...We reaffirm our commitment to help countries meet the Dakar Framework for Action goal of universal primary education by 2015... We will help foster assessment systems to measure progress, identify best practices and ensure accountability for results..."

Drawing on the World Declaration on Education for All made in Jomtien in 1990, the universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Dakar Framework, adopted at the World Education Forum in Senegal in April 2000, embodies a 'revitalized collective commitment to achieve Education for All (EFA) by 2015.' This commitment puts particular emphasis on the fulfillment of the goals and strategies of EFA, in practice, through multi-sectoral participation and through the use of existent structures, institutions and infrastructures.

Since the 2001 Genoa Summit, relevant institutions which have advanced the goals of EFA have included the Working Group on EFA, the High-Level Group meeting on EFA (both of which are subsidiary bodies of the United Nations) and the G8's Education Task Force. Further to this, forums which have addressed EFA include the International Conference on Education in Geneva (September, 2001), the International Summit on Financing for Development in Monterrey (March, 2002), and the UN Special Summit on Children (May 2002).

Assessment

Although some initiatives have been taken by countries such as Canada, France, Britain and Japan, it is worthwhile to note that the G8, as a whole, still falls behind multilateral organizations (such as UNESCO, UNICEF, the ILO and even the World Bank) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), which have made significant strides to advocate EFA and subsidize its implementation.

Country	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
Britain			+1
Canada			+1
France			+1
Germany		0	
Italy		0	
Japan			+1
Russia	N/A		
United States		0	
Overall			+0.58

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown:

Britain: +1

Britain has achieved full compliance with the commitments identified. Since Dakar, the British government has made major investments to education, allocating £22 million to South Africa, £61 million to Malawi and £13 million to Rwanda. The aid budget is set to rise to £3.6 billion by 2003. Furthermore, at the EFA High Level Group meeting, the British government circulated a paper entitled *Children Out of School* which describes the size and nature of the education challenge and identifies the policy response as multi-dimensional. This means that the demand for education must be addressed alongside the supply for education and that education strategies must be linked to the reduction of poverty, discrimination and greater efforts to combat AIDS/HIV.

The British government supports the need to improve international and national capacities to monitor progress towards the Dakar targets and has made several recommendations for progress in this area. One proposition details the establishment of a small group, with members selected by the Director-General of UNESCO and representatives of key constituencies of bi-lateral and multi-lateral agencies, developing countries and civil society groups. Further support for implementing monitoring systems for EFA came from Britain's Chancellor, Gordon Brown, at the UN Special Summit for Children where Mr. Brown stood alone among the G8 leaders in promoting the World Bank's EFA Action Plan, which has been deemed as 'the best chance in a generation for getting kids into school'. Moreover, Prime Minister Tony Blair proposed a new private/public initiative called "Imfundo: Partnership for IT in Education", which will promote the use of new information technologies to support teacher training, professional development and support, and the management of education systems. This is intended to help improve the quality of primary education.

Canada: +1

As a country committed to the Highly Indebted Poor Countries Initiative, Canada has declared a "unilateral moratorium on debt payments for well-performing HIPC countries". According to the Minister of International Development and Cooperation who addressed the High-Level Group on EFA during its meeting in Paris in October, this development is seen as a way to "provide flexibility, so that developing countries can focus on their priorities, like poverty reduction and education, without the burden of repaying crippling international debts". Furthermore, Canada's presence as one out of eighteen states with government representatives to this UNESCO-appointed High-Level Group also demonstrates Canada's active engagement in advancing the goals of EFA. The High-Level Group succeeded in fulfilling its role as a "lever for political commitment and technical and financial resource mobilization" by calling for the timely creation of an International EFA Strategy to operationalize the Dakar Framework for Action. In addition to this institutional support, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) solidified Canada's commitment to the development of education by quadrupling its investment in basic education over five years, to a total of \$555 million.

In developing effective monitoring and accounting for advancements in EFA, CIDA released its *Action Plan on Basic Education*, emphasizing the need for multi-dimensional and multi-level cooperation in attaining the goals of EFA. The CIDA report affirms that Canada will engage in improving and implementing the standards and indicators of EFA advancement by assisting with the establishment of National Plans of Action that detail country-specific, time-bound, and action-oriented reforms.

France: +1

In November, 2001, the education sector became an increased priority for the French Development Agency (Agence Française de Développement), which since Genoa 2000 has taken the initiative to build on its 1998 reform calling for the extension of official development assistance to education and health

infrastructures. The controversial policy shift reflects the desire of some of France's top development personnel and experts for the country to become a 'reference point' for making development more accountable to the poor. By collaborating with NGOs, at home and abroad, as well as developing country governments, France has increased its direct contribution to the advancement of EFA financially, as well as institutionally, by strengthening its own bilateral aid programs. Furthermore, it has increased its level of collaboration with multilateral groups and organizations, such as UNESCO, in order to enhance its contribution to EFA.

France also contributed to the G8 Education Task Force, which will present its findings and recommendations to the delegation leaders at the 2002 Kananaskis Summit

Germany: 0

After adamantly opposing increases in budget allocation for foreign aid and development in the EU, Germany agreed to dedicate 0.39% of its GDP to development in order to work towards the goal of a 0.7% allocated by 2006. This followed similar commitments made by the US and Canada at the Monterrey UN Summit on Financing for Development. Nevertheless, there is no indication of how much of this funding will be dedicated to education, which renders the budgetary allocation to be inconclusive in advancing EFA.

Germany's contributed to the G8 Education Task Force on-line forum and discussion, which allowed for civil society and other stakeholders to become actively involved in the process of meeting the Dakar Framework for Action. The results of the forum, however, are to be reviewed at the upcoming G8 Summit in Kananaskis, thereby making the German contribution to advancing EFA a work in progress.

Italy: 0

As the Italian Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Alfredo Mantica, outlined in his address to the International Conference of Financing for Development, Italy is most supportive of providing development aid for private sectors in developing countries rather than the public sectors, on which education is built. Mr. Mantica explained that Italy is a country that believes "a strong private sector is essential if sustainable development is to be generated." He also took the opportunity to herald trade, rather than debt relief, as a mechanism for fueling development. In Monterrey, Italy joined Germany and the US in opposing development funding increases in the absence of substantive mechanisms and measures that will track the impact of such funding.

Nevertheless, Italy has committed (albeit reluctantly) to increasing its budgetary allocation for debt relief to 0.39% of GDP, alongside its fellow EU member states. The portion of this development assistance to be allocated to education remains yet to be determined. Also, along with other G8 countries, Italy's advancement of EFA through its role as a member of the G8 Education Task Force will be determined at this year's Summit in Kananaskis during the review of the Task Force's findings.

Japan: +1

The Japanese government has identified education as a pillar of "nation-building," linking human resources to development. Over the past few years, the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA) has made efforts to aid local personnel, giving priority to "nurture and develop" the ability of peoples in developing countries.

Regarding Japan's direct contribution to the Dakar Framework for Action, the Japanese government has complied with the goals announced at the 2nd Tokyo International Conference on African Development (TICAD II), held in October 1998, and the G8 Kyushu-Okinawa Summit of July 2000. During the former,

the government pledged to provide approximately 90 billion yen in grant aid over 5 years in the sectors of education, health, and water resources. At the latter conference, the Japanese announced its allocation of 3 billion US dollars over the course of 5 years to target HIV/AIDS and also presented a proposal for bridging the international digital divide with the view to grant 15 billion US dollars through non-ODA and ODA assistance. Moreover, the presence of the President of JICA at the EFA High Level Meeting in October 2001 provides evidence of the country's attempt to help foster assessment systems.

Russia N/A

No information on Russia's contribution to this commitment available at the time of this assessment.

United States: 0

The Bush Administration highly supports primary education and development. While addressing an audience at the Inter-American Development Bank, President Bush identified education as one of "the values that make life worth living" and proposed a 5 billion dollar plan to help developing nations. He pledged that the United States would increase development assistance by the stated amount over the next three budget cycles, placing the funds within the new Millennium Challenge Account. Under this account, the United States will give computer instruction to young professionals in developing nations, expand the fight against AIDS, and provide textbooks and training to students in African and Islamic countries, amongst other initiatives.

Yet, regardless of such advocacy and budgetary allocation, the Bush Administration has failed to translate policy into action. In fact, the US led the argument against an increase in development aid in the lead-up to the Monterrey Conference on Financing for Development and had all references to aid targets removed from the draft text for the Monterrey conference. To justify this removal, the US administration reiterated its stance that much aid has been wasted in the past, as it cannot be tied to measurable increases in poor country performance.

Such seemingly contradictory actions coupled with the promotion of inward looking foreign and domestic policies gives little evidence that the nation is working closely with other states to develop assessment systems.

References

Clare Short, British Secretary of State for International Development, Speech entitled "The Challenge of Universal Primary Education," (13 March 2001):

<http://62.189.42.51/DFIDstage/AboutDFID/Education/Policy?UPE/upe.asp>

Clare Short, British Secretary of State for International Development, Speech entitled "Children out of School," at EFA High Level Group meeting (30 October 2001).

Department of International Development: <http://www.dfid.gov.uk>

GCE, *Global Campaign For Education News*, (16 May 2002). Accessed May 25,

2002: <http://www.campaignforeducation.org/html/news/welcome/frameset.shtml>

Government of Canada, *Education Task Force E-Consultation*. Accessed on May 25,

2002: <http://www.g8education.gc.ca/>

JICA President Takao Kawakami, Speech delivered at the UNESCO EFA High Level Meeting, (October 30, 2001).

President George Bush Jr., "President Bush Proposes \$5 billion Plan to Help Developing Nations: Remarks by the President on Global Development," (14 March 2002), Office of the Press Secretary:
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/03/20020314-7.html>

Prime Minister Tony Blair, Speech entitled "Nigeria needs to succeed if Africa is to succeed," (7 February 2002): <http://www.dfid.gov.uk>

Senator Alfredo Mantica, *Address to the Plenary Session by the Italian Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs*. International Conference on Financing for Development, Monterrey, Mexico (18-22 March 2002), Accessed May 26, 2002: <http://www.esteri.it/attualita/2002/eng/statint/i020322a.htm>

Tran, Mark, "The Monterrey Poverty Summit" in *The Guardian* (18 March 2002), Accessed May 26, 2002: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/Print/0,3858,4376377,00.html>

UNESCO, *High Level Group on Education for All: Report 2001*. (2001) Accessed May 25, 2002:
http://www.unesco.org/education/efa/global_co/policy_group/hlg_report_2001_contents.shtml

UNESCO, *Country Guidelines on the Preparation of National EFA Plans of Action*. (2002). Accessed on May 25, 2002:
http://www.unesco.org/education/efa/bulletin/en/documents/country_guidelines.html

UNESCO, *International EFA Strategy*, (2002). Accessed on May 27, 2002:
http://www.unesco.org/education/efa/global_co/comprehensive_efa_strategy.shtml

UNESCO, *International Conference on Education, September 2001: Report* (2001). Accessed May 26, 2002: <http://www.ibe.unesco.org/International/ICE/46english/46conclue.htm>

Prepared by: Denisse Rudich and Petra Kukacka

2001 Genoa Compliance Report

Economic Growth - Launching a New Trade Round

Commitment:

Sustained economic growth world-wide requires a renewed commitment to free trade. Opening markets globally and strengthening the World Trade Organisation (WTO) as the bedrock of the multilateral trading system is therefore an economic imperative. It is for this reason that we pledge today to engage personally and jointly in the launch of a new ambitious Round of global trade negotiations at the Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference in Doha, Qatar this November.

Preamble:

Rectifying the disappointing performance at Seattle, the Conference held in Doha indeed accomplished the *launch* of a new multilateral trade round. The new three-year trade round has development as its focus, with the Doha Development Agenda (DDA) as its core. The Doha Declaration sets 1 January 2005 as the date for completing all but two of the negotiations. To oversee the negotiation of individual subjects, a Trade Negotiations Committee (TNC) was established. The new round is ambitious insofar as it tackles some contentious issues. For instance: it seeks to phase out all forms of agricultural export subsidies and trade-distorting domestic farm support; it seeks to liberalize the entry of service-workers into foreign markets; it emphasizes the reduction or elimination of tariff peaks and escalation, especially with goods that would grant market access to developing countries; it seeks the reduction or elimination of all tariff and non-tariff barriers to environmental goods and services; and on the matter of property rights, although WTO's Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property (TRIP) is preserved, there are attempts to allow compromise where members must take measures to protect public health.

Compliance Criterion:

Assessment of compliance to this commitment is based upon the condition that the individual states attended the Fourth WTO Conference in Doha, Qatar. It is not possible to assess compliance based on whether they participated in the new trade round. Firstly the commitment only refers to engage in the "launch" of a new trade round, not to participate in it. Secondly, the new trade round is scheduled over a period of three years, and so an assessment of participation in the round at the present time would be incomplete. Finally, whether the trade round is ambitious does not figure into the scoring because it is a subjective reference. A score of **+1** is awarded for attending the Fourth WTO Ministerial as a participant, a **-1** is awarded for absence, and a **0** is awarded for attending but only observing.

Assessment:

Score	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
Country			
<i>Britain</i>			+1
<i>Canada</i>			+1
<i>France</i>			+1
<i>Germany</i>			+1
<i>Italy</i>			+1
<i>Japan</i>			+1
<i>Russia</i>		0	
<i>United States</i>			+1
<i>Overall</i>			+0.88

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown:

Britain: +1

The international economic downturn was cited by the UK as the impetus to launch a new trade round. Also, they wanted to launch negotiations that benefit the world's poorest countries and fully integrate them into the global economy. Testifying to the UK's devotion to development, it announced a £20 million package of new measures for the least developed countries. The UK found problems with a lack of transparency in investment, competition rules, and cumbersome customs procedures, which were said to hold back international trade.

Special Note: EU Members

Britain is an entrenched member of the EU. Due to the requirement of the European Community's Common Commercial Policy (CCP), the EU's Commission speaks on behalf of the Community and its Member States concerning multilateral trade negotiations in the WTO. That being the case, all EU members will be uniformly scored, based on the performance of the EU on the launching of the new trade round at Doha.

The EU played an important role as bridge builder with third world countries. They have introduced the "Everything But Arms" initiative, which strives to eliminate all tariffs and quotas for exports from the least developed countries. The EU remains an enthusiastic supporter of the new trade round embodied in the Doha Development Agenda and is continually conducting work on the new round. The EU has often stressed the importance to achieve a balance between openness and further liberalization and a strengthening of the necessary rules and their orientation towards sustainability. It is continuing to publish papers and reviews on issues related to the new trade round such as the environment, trade access, medicine, investment...etc. It is prepared to tackle the contentious issue of agriculture. However, the EU still supports the TRIPS agreement, which does not favour states of the South facing health crises. But it argues to allow a compromise for desperate nations of the South who need access to basic medicines and health care.

Canada: +1

The Canadians sent a delegation totaling 86 to the Fourth Ministerial Conference, with some noteworthy officials. The Canadian Trade Minister, Pierre Pettigrew was appointed by WTO Director-General Mike Moore to lead consultations on issues concerning the new trade round of negotiations.

Canada conducted domestic consultations with its citizens before the conference was held through its federal web sites. In addition, they held multi-stakeholder round tables with a broad spectrum of interest groups and citizen-based organizations. Finally, Canada published a series of information papers in the lead-up to the Ministerial Conference.

One of the motives for Canada's desire for a new trade round was based on agricultural issues. A broader negotiating agenda holds the promise for Canada to benefit from more meaningful reform in agriculture. Canada seeks to level the international playing field by strengthening the multilateral rules governing agricultural trade, addressing trade-distorting subsidies, and significantly improving market access opportunities.

Canada concludes that there is an unmistakable link between trade and development, and this is its primary reason for interest in the DDA. Canada urged all WTO Members to allow better access to markets and technical assistance to least-developed countries in the New Round. It asserted that only through broad negotiations would the outstanding concerns of the developing Members be achieved.

Canada wants coherence and coordination of WTO system and other international organizations, particularly with regards to the WTO and the International Labour Organization.

Finally, Canada wanted to create more transparency through measures such as the release of draft negotiating texts and listening to the ideas of an informed global public in the new trade round and in the conduct of the WTO.

France: +1

France asserted that opening up borders is not sufficient enough to ensure fair trade. Common rules governing competition and investment is necessary for proper investment flows between WTO Members and developing countries. France wanted developing countries to promote labour standards and environmental protection. It asserted at Doha that access by the disadvantaged countries to developed country markets is a priority. France wanted to provide special and differential treatment to the LDCs without creating a two-tier WTO. It recognized the moral obligation to enable populations that have been struck by epidemics such as AIDS to have access to essential medicines and exercise their right to life. Finally, France wanted members to refrain from all pre-negotiation in certain areas, particularly in agriculture and services.

Moreover, France is also an entrenched EU member. See the Special Note for EU Members in the Britain assessment.

German+1

Germany participated in the fourth WTO Ministerial Conference as a member of the WTO. The conference was viewed as important event in demonstrating unity and solidarity among its members. The inclusion of China and Taiwan was also viewed as significant. Germany advocated the increased integration of developing countries in the global economy in order to strengthen their competitiveness. Germany also advocated greater transparency in the international trade system as well as giving appropriate consideration to increased information needs. Germany expressed a desire for further liberalization through improved access to markets for German companies and a further reduction of trade

barriers in order to achieve growth and employment. Other policy objectives such as environmental, health and consumer protection were also of importance to the German delegation when attending the conference.

Germany, along with its EU partners, sought to introduce new rules, such as those on social policy standards, within the WTO framework. Germany also advocated increased dialogue between the European Union and the United States on trade policy matters, specifically in regards to the continued liberalization of world trade and the avoidance of transatlantic trade conflicts.

German trade policy is traditionally oriented towards open markets and free trade, this being the motivation behind entering into the fourth trade round. Free trade is crucial for Germany given its high level of dependency on trade. Today, about 24.3 percent of all gainfully employed persons in Germany work directly or indirectly for the export industry. As a result of its extensive trade relations, Germany is greatly affected by disruptions of world trade and changes in the global economic situation because of their impact on jobs, investments, profits and standards of living. Therefore a stable world economy under free trade is necessary for Germany's continued development.

Germany is also an entrenched EU member. See the Special Note for EU Members in the Britain assessment.

Italy: +1

Italy participated in the Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference as a member of the WTO. The Italian delegation expressed their support for the conference. Italy felt it was imperative that the WTO promote growth at what they considered a critical period for international trade. Italy was committed to the strengthening of the trade system specifically a more efficient rules-based multilateral system. Moreover, Italy expressed an interest in expanding the benefits of liberalization to the developing world. Italy also advocated having the WTO more engaged in core labour standards.

Italy is also an entrenched EU member. See the Special Note for EU Members in the Britain assessment.

Japan: +1

Japan participated in the Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference as a member of the WTO. As a result of the uncertainty surrounding the world economy, posed by the September 11th terrorist attacks, the conference was strongly supported in the anticipation that the WTO could bring about increased stability and predictability to international trade. Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi expressed his approval for launching a new trade round at the Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference at a press conference following the Genoa Summit in July 2001.

Furthermore, Japan sought to promote a system where all WTO members equally benefit, a factor essential to developing countries. Japan felt that issues related to the environment and public health were of great importance to the WTO. Among Japan's key priorities were the inclusion of Japan's neighbours China and Taiwan into the WTO as well as the strengthening of anti-dumping disciplines and negotiations on investment rules.

Russia: 0

Russia is not a member of the WTO at the present time. However, Russia is on the list of countries in the process of acceding to the WTO (its soonest possible entry is in 16 months). Russia is dissatisfied with some new conditions that it must meet before its accession that were not apparent in the past. Russia is prepared to revise all its existing anti-dumping measure only upon the condition that every WTO member

state does the same (5/21/02), which is a tall order to meet. Just prior to the Conference (10/29/01), Russia was preparing a package of laws, whose adoption would signify that Russian legislation was brought into conformity with the standards and rules of WTO.

Even though they were not full members at the time of the Fourth Ministerial Conference, the Russians nevertheless sent a delegation to the conference with had Observer status. Moreover, all countries that are in the process of acceding to the WTO are invited to participate in the new trade round, an invitation that was received warmly by the Russians. Much like the other states, Russia supports the pursuit of openness, transparency and the rule of law as a means of achieving development. Although, the Russians are currently more concerned with the terms of their accession to the WTO rather than the new trade round.

United States: +1

The US participated in the Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference as a member of the WTO. The US stressed the importance of the conference in light of the struggling international economy and the expected fall in US trade. The Doha conference was necessary to help restore confidence in the world economy after the September 11th terrorist attacks, a key motivation for the US. Furthermore, the US felt the conference would serve as an opportunity for WTO members to show their support for open markets, deemed necessary at such a critical time. US trade representative Robert Zoellick viewed the emphasis on openness and cooperation within the conference as a safeguard against terrorism.

The US expressed an interest in giving developing countries greater access to world markets. Moreover, the US sought to clarify TRIPS flexibilities which had created confusion as well as proposing additional steps for the agreement. The US's principle interest was to open markets for agriculture, industrial goods and services.

In a statement by US President, George W. Bush, Bush outlined the advantages of the Doha conference, primarily for the American agenda to liberalize world trade. An improvement in export markets would improve the domestic state of affairs by allowing for the creation of high-paying jobs for American workers as well as providing more choices and lower prices for goods and services in the US. Bush also expressed his support for the inclusion of China and Taiwan into the WTO, viewing this step as instrumental in promoting Chinese democratic reforms in the long run.

WTO Director-General Mike Moore welcomed the support of the Bush administration for the launch of a new round of trade negotiations. The Bush administration's determination to work closely with Congress to gain trade promotion authority, a factor viewed as significant to all US trading partners, was also commended.

References:

Statement by H.E. Dr. Axel Gerlach, German State Secretary, Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology

http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/minist_e/min01_e/statements_e/st11.pdf

Statement by H.E. Mr Takeo Hiranuma, Japanese Minister of Economy, Trade and Industry

http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/minist_e/min01_e/statements_e/st9.pdf

Statement by Honourable Antonio Marzano, Italian Minister for Productive Activities

http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/minist_e/min01_e/statements_e/st20.pdf

Statement by H.E. Mr. Robert B. Zoellick, United States Trade Representative

http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/minist_e/min01_e/statements_e/st3.pdf

World Trade Organization: The Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference
http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/minist_e/min01_e/min01_e.htm

Federal German Government: <http://www.bundesregierung.de>

Germany Online: <http://www.germany-info.org>

Japanese Foreign Press Centre: <http://www.fpcj.jp/>

Japanese Prime Minister's Official Residence:
<http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/index-e.html>

Japanese Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI): <http://meti.go.jp/english/index.html>

US Office of Management and Budget: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/index/html>

CNN: <http://www.cnn.com>

Canada's Objectives for the Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference, Tabled by
The Honourable Pierre Pettigrew, Minister for International Trade, to the House of Commons Standing
Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade October 24, 2001
< <http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/tna-nac/WTO-obj-e.asp#l>>

Negotiations, implementation and development: the Doha agenda
<http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dda_e/dda_e.htm>

Russian News Release: "On the Russian Entry of the WTO"; 2002-05-21
<http://www.in.mid.ru/website/bl.nsf/900b2c3ac91734634325698f002d9dcf/e4801986ee49d1b143256bc200317894?OpenDocument>>

Russian News Release: "Russian MFA Official Spokesman Alexander Yakovenko Interview to Kuwait
News Agency (KUNA)" 1926-25-10-2001
<http://www.in.mid.ru/website/BI.nsf/arh/5B5F3711AEBD95AC43256AF5002E4066?OpenDocument>>

Speech by Pascal Lamy: "Doha and after?"; Luncheon debate Organised by ICC Belgium, Brussels, 25
February 2002
http://europa.eu.int/comm/trade/speeches_articles/spla97_en.htm

Speech by Pascal Lamy: "Leadership, the EU and the WTO" Evian Group, Montreux, 13 April 2002
< http://europa.eu.int/comm/trade/speeches_articles/spla101_en.htm>

Speech by Pascal Lamy: "The WTO after Doha - Perspectives for Germany and Europe";
Wirtschaftspolitisches Dialogforum des Deutschen Sparkassen- und Giroverbandes, Berlin, 28 January
2002
< http://europa.eu.int/comm/trade/speeches_articles/spla93_en.htm>

Statement by H.E. Mr Laurent Fabius, French Minister for Economy, Finance and Industry
< http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/minist_e/min01_e/statements_e/st15.doc>

Statement by the Honourable Pierre S. Pettigrew, Canadian Minister for International Trade
<http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/minist_e/min01_e/statements_e/st13.doc>

Statement by H.E. Mr Maxim Y. Medvedkov, Russian Federation Deputy Minister of Economic
Development and Trade (Speaking as an Observer)

http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/minist_e/min01_e/statements_e/st142.doc

Statement by H.E. Baroness Liz Symons of Vernham Dean, United Kingdom Minister of State for Trade and Industry

< http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/minist_e/min01_e/statements_e/st14.doc>

The Doha Declaration explained <http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dda_e/dohaexplained_e.htm>

UK and International Trade Rules: Trade Policy

< <http://www.dti.gov.uk/worldtrade/uktrade.htm>>

UK and International Trade Rules: WTO New Round

< <http://www.dti.gov.uk/worldtrade/intro.htm>>

WTO News: Speeches — DG Mike Moore; Hong Kong Wednesday 28 November, 2001; “WTO and the new Round of trade talks 14th general meeting of the Pacific Economic Cooperation Council”

< http://www.wto.org/english/news_e/spmm_e/spmm73_e.htm>

WTO News: Speeches — DG Mike Moore; Geneva; Wednesday 20 February 2002; “Making Globalization work Speech to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. (ICFTU)”

< http://www.wto.org/english/news_e/spmm_e/spmm76_e.htm>

Prepared by: Thineishan Ramanathan & Nicol Lorantffy

2001 Genoa Compliance Report

Economic Growth - Strengthening the International Financial System

Commitment:

Looking forward, we endorse our Finance Ministers' recommendations for action to further strengthen the international financial system and their commitment to foster international consensus in this endeavour. In particular, the international financial institutions and the G7 countries should stand ready to help countries adopt the policies required to ensure sustained access to capital markets. We also support our Finance Ministers' suggestions to further develop the framework for private sector involvement.

Assessment:

Score	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
<i>Country</i>			
<i>Britain</i>		0	
<i>Canada</i>			+1
<i>France</i>		0	
<i>Germany</i>		0	
<i>Italy</i>		0	
<i>Japan</i>	-1		
<i>Russia</i>		N/A	
<i>United States</i>	-1		
<i>Overall</i>	-1.0		

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown:

Britain: 0

There have been significant discussions by British officials in relation to improving the International Financial System, however, since the events of September 11, 2001, the focus has shifted from improving access to capital markets to eliminating the financing of terrorism and conflict prevention. As with the other members of the G7, Britain has been involved in a plethora of meetings, reaffirming its commitment to improving the international financial system. Earlier this year, the G-7 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors, adopted an integrated Action Plan to increase predictability and reduce uncertainty about official policy actions in the emerging markets, by utilizing a market oriented approach. This Action Plan is part of an overall endeavor whereby the sovereign debt of all countries would ultimately be investment grade, a rating that every country could eventually achieve with the right policies. Thereby creating the conditions for sustained growth of private investment in emerging markets and helping raise living standards of the people in emerging market countries. In addition, the Finance

Ministers and Central Bank Governors of the G10 countries met in Washington D.C. on 21 April 2002. They agreed that an, improved assessment of debt sustainability was essential for developing a more rigorous analytic basis for making key judgements. In that context, the British noted that assessments of debt sustainability had to be forward-looking and dynamic, and needed to take account of factors such as economic policies, public and private sector deficits, interest rates, and economic growth.

Canada: +1

Canada has complied with its commitment of strengthening the international financial system in a number of different ways. There has been official reaffirmation of the commitment by Finance Minister Paul Martin at meetings with the World Bank and the IMF earlier this year, as well as during meetings at the ministerial level in preparation for the Kananaskis summit. Furthermore, there have been changes in budgetary allocations to accommodate these pledges. According to the Canadian Department of Finance, the 2002-2003 plans and priorities include strengthening the international financial system and trying to make it impervious to abuses including money laundering. However, these allocations are apparently a response to the increased need for security in the wake of September 11, as opposed to a direct action based on last year's commitment. Initiatives towards strengthening the financial system have been made, with Paul Martin leading the G8 effort to create a plan that will try to prevent crises in emerging economies, forcing lenders to agree to restructuring efforts under "collective action" clauses.

There is widespread agreement amongst the G8 that a means will have to be found to extend the improvements in the supervisory and regulatory infrastructure in international financial markets to the important emerging market countries, as illustrated in the commitment made at Genoa. Integration of the emerging market countries into the international financial system and consequently ensuring sustained access to capital markets will require that both the quality of supervision and the ability of financial institutions in these countries be raised to international standards. However, significant progress has not been made in attaining these goals. While there have been meetings of the financial stability fund with Latin American, Eastern European, and Asian countries, a concrete plan of action has not emerged from these sessions, and the issue remains open for discussion and speculation. In terms of private sector involvement, the OECD, in which Canada is a member, has had sessions concerning the importance of businesses in the financial system, but has not created a framework for the involvement of the private sector.

France: 0

There have been official reaffirmations regarding this commitment on multiple occasions since Genoa, including addresses at the national assembly by the French Prime Minister and President, in addition to meetings of the International Monetary and Financial System in November and April. France has stated the need to strengthen the international financial system through continued vigilance, with reforms aimed at improving economic flexibility and resilience. In doing so, the French have stressed the urgency of building an international financial system that is more robust against small mistakes or sudden changes in perceptions, while also promoting growth, efficiency, and the diversification of risk. Furthermore, France has signed on to a plan created by Canadian Finance Minister Paul Martin that will try to prevent crises in emerging economies, forcing lenders to agree to restructuring efforts under "collective action" clauses. In their year-end assessment of France's economic status, the IMF praised the government for their emphasis on improved market access for developing countries' exports through increased trade liberalization. France has also been a strong supporter of an initiative to help the seven low-income countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States - Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, the Kyrgyz Republic, Moldova, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan - accelerate poverty reduction and economic growth, while ensuring sustainable fiscal and external debt positions.

Despite the extent of involvement in institutions and conferences dedicated to achieving the Genoa commitments, France's contribution has been largely rhetorical in nature. There is little evidence of bureaucratic review, or a reallocation of funds towards achieving the stability that is desired in the international financial system. Furthermore, legislation has not been changed to reflect France's commitment to international financial stability. French Minister of Economy, Finance, and Industry Laurent Fabius has indicated that the paramount economic priority for France will be the reduction of the national deficit in order to meet standards outlined by the EU. Consequently, compliance has not been fully achieved in the period since the Genoa Summit.

Germany: 0

The German government has reiterated its firm belief that the international financial architecture requires increased flexibility to meet the needs of an ever-changing system. The German government has been supporting its domestic institutions in allotting more attention to these underlying issues. In addition to domestic contributions aimed at achieving their commitment, the German government has also been involved in a number of group-wide declarations and commitments that further strengthen their resolve. On April 20, 2002 the G-7 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors adopted an integrated Action Plan to increase predictability and reduce uncertainty regarding official policy actions in the emerging markets by utilizing a market oriented approach. This Action Plan is part of an overall endeavor whereby the sovereign debt of all countries would ultimately be investment grade; a rating that every country could eventually achieve with the right policies. This would ultimately serve to create the conditions for sustained growth of private investment in emerging markets while helping to raise living standards of the people in emerging economies. In addition, the Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors of the G10 countries met in Washington D.C. on 21 April 2002. They agreed that an improved assessment of debt sustainability was essential for developing a more rigorous analytic basis for making key judgements. In that context, they noted that assessments of debt sustainability had to be forward-looking and dynamic, and needed to take into account factors such as economic policies, public and private sector deficits, interest rates, and economic growth.

Similar to France, Germany's individual contribution to the commitment has been rhetorical in nature. There is little, if any, evidence of a bureaucratic review, or any physical allocation of resources towards achieving the commitments made at Genoa. Consequently, compliance has not been fully achieved. Instead, in the year since Genoa, German Finance Minister Hans Eichel has placed more attention on the internal domestic state of the German economy.

Italy: 0

Actions by the Italian government since Genoa would suggest that Italy has honoured its commitment to the strengthening of the international financial system through a number of different initiatives. There has been official reaffirmation of the commitment in various fora, including the meetings of the International Monetary Financial Committee, as well as meetings at the ministerial level in preparation for the Kananaskis summit. Furthermore, Italy has supported a multi-donor initiative aimed at encouraging diverse financial sectors in developing countries that was launched at the end of April. The Financial Sector Reform and Strengthening (FIRST) Initiative will complement and support other donor activities in strengthening national financial sectors through highly targeted, responsive projects proposed to it directly by developing countries and their advisors. Giorgio Leccesi, the director of the Ministry of Economy and Finance, represented Italy at the CIS-7 conference held earlier in the year, which launched an initiative to assist the seven low-income countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States - Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, the Kyrgyz Republic, Moldova, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan - accelerate poverty reduction and economic growth, while ensuring sustainable fiscal and external debt positions. Italy has also reformed legislation allowing for increased involvement of the private sector through a program offering bonds exchangeable for shares in privatized companies. Italy was also involved in the creation of

a G7 action plan for a framework that will help prevent financial crises in emerging markets through obligating lenders to agree to restructuring efforts under “collective action” clauses. However, there has yet to be progress in achieving a distinct framework for private sector involvement in the international financial architecture, which has not been developed at this time.

Japan: -1

Japan has not moved forward significantly in achieving compliance with its commitments from the Genoa Summit. While there have been official reaffirmations of the need for the objectives to be met, internal economic difficulties have prevented Japan from achieving these goals. While Finance Minister Masajuro Shiokawa has stated that Japan’s position will remain unchanged with respect to ODA and other development initiatives, the commitment to strengthening the international financial system has diminished in terms of importance. The government has been striving, with increasing difficulty, to fulfill its obligation to the other G8 nations to continue on its path of economic growth as the world’s second-largest economy. While there has been advancement in the areas of reforming the banking system and the process of providing international loans, which are both factors that strengthen the international financial system, these are directed at stemming the internal financial crisis which has worsened significantly in recent months. Furthermore, Japan has undertaken a policy of monetary “loosening”, aimed at easing deflation and subsequently increasing high and sustainable world economic growth. There has been, however, little advancement in terms of ensuring capital access to emerging markets. Japan, as a member of the financial stability fund created by the G8, has had meetings with Latin American, Eastern European, and Asian countries, however, a concrete plan of action has not emerged from these sessions, and the issue remains open for discussion and speculation. There has been no clear evidence of internal bureaucratic review, or significant budgetary reallocation towards fulfilling the objectives of this commitment.

Russia: N/A

No available information at the time of this assessment.

United States: -1

Following the events of September 11, 2001, the Government of the United States has been primarily involved in the fight against terrorism. A significant amount of work has been done to improve the international financial system in regards to halting the financing of terrorism and terrorist cells. The United States Government has been involved in a number of group-wide declarations and commitments that further strengthen its resolve to transforming the international system into a strong system for international capital markets. This has been accomplished primarily through the G10 April declaration focusing on assessments of debt sustainability, public and private sector deficits, interest rates, and economic growth. The G7 integrated Action Plan, creating the conditions for sustained growth of private investment in emerging markets and helping raise living standards of the people in emerging market countries, has not been met with significant resolve by the United States government. Consequently, compliance has not been fully achieved within this specific issue area.

References

<http://www.imf.org/external/np/sec/pr/2002/pr0223.htm>
<http://www.imf.org/external/np/sec/pn/2001/pn01111.htm>
<http://www.imf.org/external/np/sec/pr/2002/pr0222.htm>
<http://www.imf.org/external/np/speeches/2002/052602.htm>

<http://www.imf.org/external/np/cm/2002/042102a.htm>
<http://www.worldbank.org/knowledge/chiefecon/articles/wea21/indexp3.htm>
<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/2001/12/sharer.htm>
<http://www.imf.org/external/am/2001/o/imfcstat/eu.htm>
<http://www.g20.org/news/003-e.html>
<http://www.fin.gc.ca/news01/01-103e.html>
<http://www.g20.org/docs/bkgrnd-e.html>
<http://www.fin.gc.ca/news01/01-118e.html>
<http://www.fin.gc.ca/access/fininste.html>
<http://www.fin.gc.ca/toce/2002/susdevplane.html>
<http://www.mof.go.jp/english/budget/e011221.pdf>
<http://www.mof.go.jp/english/budget/brief/2001/brief01.htm>
http://www.finances.gouv.fr/minifi/europe/operations_monetaires/index.htm
<http://www.finances.gouv.fr/minifi/europe/index.htm>
<http://www.iosco.org/press/presscomm020525.html>
<http://www.oecd.org/pdf/M00008000/M00008299.pdf>
<http://www.oecd.org/pdf/M00029000/M00029848.pdf>
<http://www.iht.com/ihtsearch.php?id=58575>
http://www.reuters.com/news_article.jhtml?type=search&StoryID=908215
http://www.reuters.com/news_article.jhtml?type=search&StoryID=928202
http://www.reuters.com/news_article.jhtml?type=search&StoryID=951021
<http://www.latribune.fr/Archives/ArchivesProxy.nsf/SearchSimple/A7055E958614C7F1C1256BC4000AE42?OpenDocument&highlight=2,LAURENT+FABIUS>
<http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/press/2002/3/0326.html#3>
<http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/economy/japan/pm0203.html>
<http://www.asahi.com/english/op-ed/K2002042300469.html>
http://www.europa.eu.int/geninfo/key_en.htm
<http://ue.eu.int/accords/default.asp?lang=en>
http://www.worldbank.org/ifa/ifa_more.html
<http://inweb18.worldbank.org/news/pressrelease.nsf/673fa6c5a2d50a67852565e200692a79/b57131759c537a8d85256ba400647b0c?OpenDocument>
<http://www.imf.org/external/np/sec/pr/2002/pr0223.htm>
<http://www.iht.com/ihtsearch.php?id=47980>
http://www.reuters.com/news_article.jhtml?type=search&StoryID=965616
http://www.reuters.com/news_article.jhtml?type=search&StoryID=931698
<http://www.newswire.ca/releases/April2002/20/c6517.html>
<http://www.fin.gc.ca/fin-eng.html>, http://www.g-7.ca/index_e.html,
<http://www.treas.gov/press/releases/po3016.htm>
<http://www.mof.go.jp/english/if/011118a.htm>
<http://www.mof.go.jp/english/if/if020208a.htm>

Prepared by: Roopa Rangaswami & Audrey R. Johnson

2001 Genoa Compliance Report

Economic Growth – HIPC Initiative

Commitment:

We have all agreed as a minimum to provide 100% debt reduction of official development assistance (ODA) and eligible commercial claims for qualifying⁶⁷ HIPC countries. We urge those countries that have not already done so to take similar steps, and we underline the need for the active and full participation of all bilateral creditors in providing timely debt relief to HIPCs.

Assessment:

Score	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
Country			
<i>Britain</i>			+1
<i>Canada</i>			+1
<i>France</i>			+1
<i>Germany</i>			+1
<i>Italy</i>			+1
<i>Japan</i>			+1
<i>Russia</i>			NA
<i>United States</i>			+1
<i>Overall</i>			+1

The commitment to 100% debt reduction is not particularly significant for several reasons. Firstly, the HIPC countries that have not reached decision point are not necessarily eligible for ODA this debt reduction. Secondly, the G7 originally committed itself to full ODA debt reduction in Cologne in 1999⁶⁸ and this 2001 statement in Genoa is a reiteration of that promise. A total of 42 countries are considered HIPCs. Of these, twenty-six⁶⁹ have reached the decision point under the enhanced HIPC initiative (i.e., have been approved for debt reduction as committed above): Benin, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Ethiopia, The Gambia, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Rwanda, Sao Tomé & Principe, Senegal, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia. To date, four of these countries (Bolivia, Mozambique, Tanzania, and Uganda) have reached completion point, or the point at which the full amount of committed debt relief is given. The G7

⁶⁷ <http://www.imf.org/external/np/hipc/2001/impact/update/111601.htm#tab4>

⁶⁸ Report of G7 Finance Ministers on the Cologne Debt Initiative to the Cologne Economic Summit, Cologne, Germany, 18 - 20 June , 1999. (<http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/g7/finance/fm061899.htm>)

⁶⁹ http://www.worldbank.org/hipc/Status_of_Implementation_0402.pdf

holds 77% of the debt eligible for cancellation by the Club. Italy is the fifth creditor following Japan, France, the United States and Germany.

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown:

Britain: +1

Britain has achieved 100% removal of bilateral ODA debts⁷⁰. Their policy, sometimes called 'beyond 100%', involves the full write-off of HIPC debts as of their decision point *and* a reimbursement of any debt service paid before the decision point.

In parliament on May 7, 2002, Clare Short, Secretary of State for International Development, declared that her government has not only forgiven all ODA loans for HIPC countries but for other poor nations as well. The total UK pledge to the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Debt Initiative Trust Fund, which is funded by the Department for International Development (DFID), is US\$306 million, including a US\$85 million share of the EC contribution. In 2000–01, DFID paid US\$40 million to the HIPC Trust Fund, and in 2001–02 DFID paid US\$33.7 million. The UK contribution is paid on an as-needed basis on request by the International Development Association (IDA), which is administering the Fund. The total outstanding bilateral debt⁷¹ owed to the UK by the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) is £1.529 billion; the amount written off is £0.703 billion⁷².

Canada: +1

Canada has been a leader for debt cancellation of the G8 member countries. Since 1975, Canada has forgiven more than C\$1.3 billion in ODA debt to 46 developing countries, including all ODA debt owned by HIPCs except Myanmar.⁷³ Considering the above compliance, Canada has achieved full implementation of its commitment made in Genoa. First, in considering official reaffirmation, in his speech at the United Nations International Conference for Financing Development in Monterrey, Prime Minister Jean Chretien reiterated Canada's commitment to providing debt relief. Chretien stated it would be "a continued priority"⁷⁴ on Canada's agenda leading into Kananaskis. Second, in considering internal bureaucratic review and representation, Canada has not specifically initiated any internal review on that particular summit commitment. Third, there have been numerous budgetary and resource allocations made. The government of Canada has contributed C\$215 million to the multilateral trust HIPC trust fund at the World Bank, making it the third largest paid-in bilateral donor.⁷⁵ As well, in the fiscal year 2002–2003, Canada has allocated C\$115 million to prepay its obligation to the United Nations aid agencies and to the Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility at the IMF.⁷⁶ Fourth, new or altered programs, legislation and regulation have not subsequently changed. The Canadian Debt Initiative (CDI)⁷⁷ was created as one of the first G8 countries to propose 100% bilateral debt reduction. Prior to Genoa, on January 1st 2001, Canada stopped collecting debt-repayments from 11 reforming HIPC countries that have demonstrated their commitment to poverty reduction and good governance.⁷⁸ Fifth, full implementation was achieved as Paul Martin and Minister for International Cooperation, Susan Whelan, announced that the government of

⁷⁰ http://www.worldbank.org/hipc/about/progress_tables_01/Table_17_paris_club_creditors_delivery.pdf

⁷¹ <http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm200102/cmhansrd/cm020507/text/20507w04.htm>

⁷² <http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm200102/cmhansrd/cm020507/text/20507w04.htm>

⁷³ www.g8.ca/summithipc-e.asp

⁷⁴ http://pm.gc.ca/default.asp?Language=E&Page=newsroom&Sub=Speeches&Doc=monterrey.20020321_e.htm

⁷⁵ <http://www.worldbank.org/hipc/index.html>

⁷⁶ <http://www.fin.gc.ca/budget01/bp/bpch6e.htm#si6>

⁷⁷ Created in December 2000

⁷⁸ Countries include: Benin, Bolivia, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guyana, Honduras, Madagascar, Senegal, Tanzania and Zambia.- www.g8.ca/summithipc-e.asp

Canada would forgive all C\$83.6 million in debts it is owed by Tanzania, February, 11, 2002⁷⁹; thus, since full compliance was achieved, a score of +1 is assigned.

France: +1

France has cancelled all ODA debts from HIPC countries as they have qualified and are 100% refinanced by grants from the completion point. Furthermore, debt services on commercial claims falling due after decision point will also be cancelled. France has pledged \$181 million to the HIPC trust fund (including EC contributions) as of May 2002⁸⁰. At the Monterrey conference in March, President Jacques Chirac not only stated the need for greater generosity for the very poor HIPC countries but also called for “more ambitious treatment” of highly indebted middle-income countries.

Germany: +1

Germany has complied with 100% reduction of its ODA debts with HIPC countries⁸¹ and has pledged \$226 million towards the HIPC trust fund (for multilateral debt). Germany was one of the first countries to cancel bilateral debts with Tanzania by 100% and others yet it still is the world’s fourth largest HIPC creditor. Germany was the first creditor country offering swap (‘debt for nature’) to Indonesia at the latest Paris Club meeting in April 2002.

Italy: +1

In following the five-point scale for compliance assessment Italy has shown remarkable progress in achieving full compliance for Economic Growth- HIPC Initiative. First, official reaffirmation was made by the deputy minister⁸² of Foreign Affairs, Senator Alfredo Mantica, at the United Nations International Conference for Financing Development in Monterrey, Mexico 18-22 March 2002. Mantica pledged that the Italian government would make new appropriations to fund National programs to combat poverty in HIPCs, using foreign debt cancellation as one of the main initiatives.⁸³ Second, internal bureaucratic review and representation did not affect the outcome of the implementation of the commitment; although it is not evident in any official capacity, such as the creation of a task force or a formal policy review. Third, budgetary and resource allocations were made. Prior to Genoa, Italy pledged 4 million USD in debt cancellation of HIPCs, 70% was delivered in business investment⁸⁴ and 30% in the form of aid^{85, 86}. Furthermore, throughout the course of 2001, Italy signed 16 multilateral agreements specifically pertaining to debt restructuring for a total of 25.4 million USD, and 9 bilateral agreements worth 7.7 million USD. Fourth, new or altered programs, legislation and regulations such as “Legge 209/00” were passed in July 25th 2000, to widen the scope of debt-restructuring to include IDA and non-HIPCs, and IDA HIPCs for partial and total debt reduction. Finally, in assessing full implementation of compliance, 100% of Bolivia’s debt was cancelled prior to Genoa on July 10th 2001⁸⁷. Italy, Uganda’s primary creditor, cancelled 83 Million USD in debt on April 17th 2002⁸⁸. Senator Mantica and Ugandan Minister of Finance,

⁷⁹ <http://www.fin.gc.ca/news02/02-016e.html>

⁸⁰ http://www.worldbank.org/hipc/HIPC_Trust_Fund_Contributions_050702.pdf

⁸¹ http://www.worldbank.org/hipc/about/progress_tables_01/Table_17_paris_club_creditors_delivery.pdf

⁸² My Translation: “sotto segretario”

⁸³ www.palazzochigi.it/servizi/comunicati/dettaglio.asp?d=15146

⁸⁴ My Translation: “crediti commerciali”

⁸⁵ My Translation: “aiuti”

⁸⁶ <http://www.esteri.it/polestera/organismim/inizativaraff.htm>

⁸⁷ www.esteri.it/polestera/organismim/indexconom.htm (Intesi Multilaterali 2001)

⁸⁸ www.palazzochigi.it/servizi/comunicati/dettaglio.asp?d=15146

Kutesa, signed the agreement at the Farnesina in Rome. Therefore, since full compliance was achieved a score of + 1 is assigned to Italy within this issue area.

Japan +1

Japan has delivered 100% debt reduction of bilateral debts held by HIPC countries. The Japanese government is still giving funds to HIPC governments on a loan basis, including Zambia, Niger, Cameroon⁸⁹. However, the Japanese government has warned that countries asking for 100 percent debt relief would not be eligible for new loans. Japan is traditionally the world's largest donor of ODA and Japan has up to now disbursed some \$200 billion in ODA cumulatively and \$13.5 billion for 2000 alone⁹⁰. Due to its continuing economic slowdown, the ODA budget was reduced by 10 percent for the 2002 fiscal year and cut completely for high-growth developing countries like China. Japan has pledged \$200 million to the World Bank's HIPC Trust fund.

Russia: N/A

Russia was not party to the agreements of the G7 finance ministers at Cologne and consequently is not given a rating.

United States: +1

For fiscal years 2000-2002, Congress appropriated a total of \$769 million for bilateral and multilateral debt relief. These appropriations are sufficient to meet the U.S. commitment to the Cologne Initiative of 100% ODA debt reduction. This included \$110 million of appropriations in 2000 and \$75 million in 2001. The U.S. also committed to make contributions totaling \$600 million to the HIPC trust fund, administered by the World Bank. At the Monterrey conference for financing development President Bush promised a 50- percent increase in development assistance over the next three budget years⁹¹. Eventually, this will mean a \$5-billion annual increase over current levels. Bush also promised to give more of this financing in the form of grants, not loans and thus preventing further indebtedness. This growing level of assistance is crucial because Paris Club creditors like the US hold 38.6% (\$14.1 Billion) of all HIPC debt⁹².

Prepared by: Jacob Young and Lara Mancini

⁸⁹ <http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/oda/note/loan.html>

⁹⁰ <http://www.un.org/ffd/statements/japanE.htm>

⁹¹ <http://www.un.org/ffd/statements/usaE.htm>

⁹² http://www.worldbank.org/hipc/Status_of_Implementaion_0402.pdf

2001 Genoa Compliance Report

Environment Commitments

COMPLIANCE REPORT – SUMMARY CHART

Initiative / Country	Britain	Canada	France	Germany	Italy	Japan	Russia	US	Total
COP6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
GEF	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	-13%
Energy	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	100%
Johannesburg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
POPs	0	1	0	1	0	-1	0	0	13%
OECD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Total									

COMPLIANCE REPORT BY COMMITMENT

- A) Attempting to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through the Sixth Conference of the Parties in Bonn (COP6) and other relevant fora

Score	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
0%			
Country			
<i>Britain</i>		0	
<i>Canada</i>		0	
<i>France</i>		0	
<i>Germany</i>		0	
<i>Italy</i>		0	
<i>Japan</i>		0	
<i>Russia</i>		0	
<i>United States</i>		0	
<i>Overall</i>		0	

- B) Will give money to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) so that it may continue to support environmental protection on a global scale and foster good practices to promote efficient energy use and the development of renewable energy sources in the development world

Score -13%	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
Country			
<i>Britain</i>		0	
<i>Canada</i>		0	
<i>France</i>		0	
<i>Germany</i>		0	
<i>Italy</i>		0	
<i>Japan</i>		0	
<i>Russia</i>	-1		
<i>United States</i>		0	
<i>Overall</i>	-1	0	

- C) Hold a G8 Energy Minister conference

Score 100	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
Country			
<i>Britain</i>			1
<i>Canada</i>			1
<i>France</i>			1
<i>Germany</i>			1
<i>Italy</i>			1
<i>Japan</i>			1
<i>Russia</i>			1
<i>United States</i>			1
<i>Overall</i>			8

- D) Will work with civil society and developing countries to make the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg a success

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

- E) Promote early entry into force of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants

Score 13%	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
Country			
<i>Britain</i>		0	
<i>Canada</i>			1
<i>France</i>		0	
<i>Germany</i>			1
<i>Italy</i>		0	
<i>Japan</i>	-1		
<i>Russia</i>		0	
<i>United States</i>		0	
<i>Overall</i>	-1	0	2

Dates of Signature and Ratification

Country	Date of Signature	Date of Ratification
Canada	May 23, 2001	May 23, 2001
France	May 23, 2001	
Germany	May 23, 2001	April 25, 2002
Italy	May 23, 2001	
Russia	May 22, 2002	
United Kingdom	December 11, 2001	
United States	May 23, 2001	

F) Will work with OECD to produce a recommendation that fulfills the Okinawa mandate

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

*Please note that the zero scores are preliminary, **only**, and may change upon further examination of the practices of national export credit agencies.*

Explanatory notes will follow.

Prepared by: Melanie Martin