

2002 Final Kananaskis Compliance Report May 2003

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

Introduction	2
Table: 2002 Kananaskis Final Compliance Scores.....	4
Africa – Good Governance.....	5
Africa – Peer Review	12
Africa – Education	22
Development – Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative	27
Development – Official Development Assistance (ODA).....	32
Arms Control and Disarmament	37
Conflict Prevention	44
Economic Growth – Agricultural Trade	56
Economic Growth – Free Trade	62
Environment – Sustainable Agriculture	68
Environment – Water	76
Fighting Terrorism.....	83
Transnational Crime and Corruption	103

2002 Kananaskis Final Compliance Report Introduction

In March 2003, the University of Toronto G8 Research Group completed its first interim Compliance Report based on the compliance results of the Kananaskis Summit from June 2002 to January 2003. The University of Toronto G8 Research Group has now made available the final Compliance Report, based on analytic results from the interim report until two weeks prior to the 2003 Evian-les-Bains G8 Summit in France. A summary of the final compliance scores is listed in the table A with an individual analytic assessment by country and issue area below.

Additional care should be given in interpreting the comparative results of the interim versus the final compliance reports as none of the earlier compliance studies provide comparable comparative data on how much compliance comes during the first six months following a summit. Rather, the focus of all prior compliance reports is based on an assessment of the compliance scores for the full year prior to the subsequent summit taking place. In addition, data limitations, particularly for Italy and Russia, made it difficult to produce complete results for some issue areas. In such cases, a lack of data is noted by an “N/A” and the value is withdrawn from the overall assessment.

Since the conclusion of the Kananaskis Summit in June 2002, the G7/G8 have complied with their priority commitments made across 13 major issue areas 35% 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 either non-compliant or are in fact doing the opposite of what they committed to.¹

These results indicate that the compliance scores following the Kananaskis Summit varied widely by issue area, with commitments focused on international terrorism scoring perfect compliance scores across all Summit countries. Compliance scores were also high in the areas of the Environment (Water, 67%), Africa (Education, 63%), Environment (Sustainable Agriculture, 57%) and Development (ODA, 50%). Conflict prevention, although scoring 60% for the interim report, fell to 38% for the final, but still managed to stay above the overall average. Scores falling below the overall average included Africa — Good Governance, Arms Control and Disarmament and Transnational Crime, each scoring 25%. Lower scores were reflected for Economic Growth (Agricultural Trade, 13%), Africa (Peer Review, 0) and Development (HIPC, 0). Economic Growth (Free Trade) brought in a score of –13%, indicating that not only did the leaders not act to fulfill their priority commitment in this issue area since Kananaskis, but they also did the opposite of what they committed to.

Compliance scores also varied widely by country. The highest complying Summit member across the 13 major issue areas was Canada, the hosting country, with a score of

¹ For a complete compliance methodological explanation, please visit the University of Toronto G8 web site at: www.g8.utoronto.ca/g7/evaluations/methodology/g7c2.htm.

85%. Canada's score is followed by tied scores from France and Britain at 62%. The US follows with a score of 38%, followed by Germany at 15%, Japan at 8% and Russia and Italy tied at -9%.

Although the final compliance scores in overall terms are slightly higher than the interim scores (35% versus 25%), these scores are considerably lower than those of Genoa 2001 (49.5%), Okinawa 2000 (81.4%), Cologne 1999 (39%), Birmingham 1998 (45%) and Lyon 1996 (36%). Only in the post-Denver period in 1997 did the leaders perform more disappointingly when their compliance score hit an overall average of 27%.

A complete assessment of these compliance scores is offered in a draft paper prepared by Ella Kokotsis for the 2003 Pre-Summit Conference in Fontainebleau, France on "Governing Globalization: G8, Public and Corporate Governance."

As with previous compliance reports, this report has been produced as an invitation for others to provide additional or more complete information on country compliance with the results of the 2002 commitments. All stakeholder comments are welcomed and would be considered as part of an analytic reassessment. Please send your feedback to g8info@library.utoronto.ca.

Table: 2002 Kananaskis Final Compliance Scores*

	CDA	FR	GER	ITA	JAP	RUS	UK	U.S.	AVE
Africa, Good Governance	+1	+1	0	-1	0	-1	+1	+1	+0.25
Africa, Peer Review	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Africa, Education	+1	+1	0	N/A	+1	-1	+1	+1	+0.63
Development – HIPC	+1	0	0	0	-1	+1	+1	0	+0.25
Development – ODA	+1	+1	0	0	0	0	+1	+1	+0.50
Arms Control, Disarmament	0	0	0	0	0	+1	0	+1	+0.25
Conflict Prevention	+1	+1	+1	-1	-1	0	+1	+1	+0.38
Economic Growth, Agricultural Trade	+1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+0.13
Economic Growth, Free Trade	+1	0	0	0	-1	0	0	-1	-0.13
Environment, Sustainable Agriculture	+1	+1	0	0	+1	N/A	+1	0	+0.57
Environment, Water	+1	+1	0	N/A	+1	0	+1	0	+0.57
Fighting Terrorism	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1.00
Transnational Crime, Corruption	+1	+1	0	0	0	0	0	0	+0.25
Overall Final Country Average	+0.85	+0.62	+0.15	-0.09	0.08	+0.08	+0.62	+0.38	35%

*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.