

**Sea Island Final Compliance Results
June 10, 2004, to June 1, 2005
Final Report**

July 1, 2005

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

[<www.g8.utoronto.ca>](http://www.g8.utoronto.ca)

g8@utoronto.ca

Table of Contents

Preface.....	3
Introduction	4
Table A: 2004-2005 Sea Island Final Compliance Scores*	8
Table B: 2004 Sea Island Interim Compliance Scores*	9
Table C: G8 Compliance Assessments by Country, 1996-2005	10
Broader Middle East & North Africa Initiative:	
Forum for the Future / Democracy Assistance Dialogue.....	11
Broader Middle East & North Africa Initiative: Iraqi Elections Support.....	23
World Economy.....	42
Trade: WTO Doha Development Agenda.....	56
Trade: Technical Assistance.....	64
Energy: Conservation and Renewables.....	75
Environment	87
Non-Proliferation: Weapons of Mass Destruction	92
Terrorist Financing: Counter-Terrorism Action Group — Finance	106
Transnational Crime, Transparency & Corruption.....	118
Transport Security	128
Debt Sustainability for the Poorest.....	144
Financing Development: Private Entrepreneurship.....	156
Infectious Diseases: HIV/AIDS.....	165
Infectious Diseases: Polio	172
Peace Support Operations	176
Famine and Food Security in Africa.....	184
Regional Security: Darfur	190
Appendix A: Priority Commitments: 2004 Sea Island Summit Compliance Cycle.....	198
Appendix B: Bibliography on Compliance with G8 Commitments.....	202

Preface

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

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

The work of the G8 Research Group would not be possible without the dedication of many people around the world. In particular, this report is the product of a team of energetic and hard-working analysts directed by Dr. Ella Kokotsis, Director of Analytical Research, and Anthony Prakash Navaneelan.

The G8 Research Group encourages responses to this report. Any comments or questions should be directed to g8@utoronto.ca. Indeed, we are grateful to the many individuals from many communities who responded to our invitation to comment on an earlier draft of this report. Responsibility for its contents lies exclusively with the authors and analysts of the G8 Research Group.

John Kirton
Director
G8 Research Group
Toronto, Canada

Introduction

The final compliance results reveal that from the period following the 2004 Sea Island Summit until June 2005, G8 members (plus the EU) complied with their priority commitments across the 18 major priority commitments 55% 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

The Overall Final Compliance Scores

This overall final compliance score of 55% for the Sea Island Summit indicates a compliance increase of 15% since the release of the interim report in February 2005. This score also falls on the high end of compliance historically, as only post-Okinawa in 2000 were the G8 leaders able to achieve higher overall compliance results than at Sea Island (see Table C).

Compliance by Country

Similar to previous compliance studies, the highest complying member across the 18 priority commitments is Canada at 72%. However, joining the ranks of compliance leaders, and tied for first place with Canada, are the US and the EU. In all three cases, significant compliance increases have taken place since the interim scores where Canada was at 50%, followed by the US and EU, each at 44%. The United Kingdom, next in the hosting rotation, places a close second, with a score of 67%, confirming trends found in earlier compliance reports suggesting that countries next in the hosting rotation are consistently among the highest to comply with commitments reached the year before. Tied with the UK is also Germany, which increased its compliance score by 17% from the time of the interim study. France follows next with a compliance score of 50%, followed by Italy at 44%, Japan at 39% and finally Russia at 6%. None of the G8 members scored overall compliance results in the negative range.

The Compliance Gap by Country

Although compliance scores during the interim and final compliance reports vary considerably by country, this study finds that the compliance gap between member states for Sea Island increases significantly for the final report. During the interim period, the compliance gap between the lowest and highest complying G8 countries was 50%; a number which increases to 66% for the final report (72% vs. 6%). This could suggest that those countries on the lower end of the compliance performance spectrum tend to stay within their earlier range as the year progresses, whereas those countries on the higher end of the performance spectrum from the outset tend to produce even better compliance results as time lapses and the next summit approaches.

¹ A complete methodological explanation is available from the University of Toronto G8 Information Centre at www.g8.utoronto.ca/g7/evaluations/methodology/g7c2.htm.

Compliance by Issue Area

Similar to the interim scores, the final compliance results also indicate that compliance during this period varied considerably by issue area. Commitments focused on democracy assistance through the Broader Middle East and North Africa (BMENA) initiative as well as those on debt relief for the heavily indebted poor countries (HIPC) and the environment score perfect compliance results across all G8 countries and the EU. Compliance scores are also high in the area of regional security issues as they relate to Darfur and support for the Iraqi elections (through the BMENA), both scoring 89%. Following closely behind are commitments relating to trade and the Doha round at 88%. Energy commitments as well as those relating to weapons of mass destruction also rank high in overall terms with compliance scores of 78%. Commitments relating to peace building and famine/food security in Africa each score 67%, followed by infectious diseases (HIV/AIDS) and trade (as it relates to technical assistance) each at 56%. Infectious diseases (Polio), commitments on the world economy, and transport security score below the overall average at 44%, 22 % and 11% respectively. Transnational crime is the only commitment with a score of “0” — or a work in progress — across all G8 countries. Similarly, finance development is the only commitment of the 18 assessed to score within the negative range across all G8 countries with a score of -1.0, indicating that the G8 and the EU have not taken any concrete measures to fulfill their priority commitments in this particular issue area in the post-Sea Island period.

These findings reveal some striking differences with the compliance results from Evian and Kananaskis where political security issues (primarily terrorism) yielded the highest compliance scores by the G8 across both years. By contrast, issues post-Sea Island around terrorist financing, transnational crime and transport security have fallen well below the overall average on the compliance performance spectrum. The most striking development, however, has been on the debt relief and trade fronts which have shifted from the middle range in previous years to secure top marks post-Sea Island. This trend sets an interesting tone for PM Tony Blair as he elevates issues around African development and the environment to the apex of the leaders’ agenda when they meet at Gleneagles, Scotland from July 6-8, 2005.

Interim and Final Compliance Scores Compared

Given that the final results for Sea Island are in, an overall assessment of year-over-year compliance scores is now possible. The 2004 score of 55% for Sea Island compares very favourably with other years, scoring higher than any other summit in the post-Lyon period (1996) with the exception of Okinawa (2000), where the leaders secured a compliance score of 80% (see Table C).

Special Considerations

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

- Compliance has been assessed against a selected set of priority commitments, rather than all commitments the last summit produced. The priority commitments selected were not randomly chosen but identified according to a disciplined and systematic process intended to produce a representative subset of the total according to such dimensions as issue areas, ambition,

specified time for completion, instruments used and, more generally, the degree of precision, obligation and delegation of each. The aim is to provide a comprehensive portrait of the compliance performance of the summit as a whole. As such, the individual commitments selected cannot in all cases claim to be the most important ones in their appropriate issue area, nor do they necessarily represent that issue area lodged.

- In addition to the specific commitments assessed here, summits have value in establishing new principles in normative directions, in creating and highlighting issue areas and agenda items, and in altering the publicly allowable discourse used. Furthermore, some of the most important decisions reached and consensus forged at summits may be done entirely in private and not encoded in the public communiqué record.
- Some commitments inherently take longer to be complied with than the time available between one summit and the next.
- In some cases, it may be wise not to comply with a summit commitment, if global conditions have dramatically changed since the commitment was made or if new knowledge has become available about how a particular problem can best be solved.
- As each of the member countries has its own constitutional, legal and institutional processes for undertaking action at the national level, each is free to act in particular cases on a distinctive national time scale. Of particular importance here is the annual cycle for the creation of budgets, legislative approval and the appropriation of funds.
- Commitments encoded in the G8 communiqué may also be encoded precisely or partially in communiqués from other international forums, the decisions of other international organizations, or even national statements such as the State of the Union Address in the U.S., the Queen's Speech in the UK and the Speech from the Throne in Canada. Without detailed process-tracing, it cannot be assumed that compliant behaviour on the part of countries is fully caused by the single fact of a previous G8 commitment.
- Compliance here is assessed against the precise, particular commitments made by the G8, rather than what some might regard as necessary or appropriate action to solve the problem being addressed.
- With compliance assessed on a three-point scale, judgements inevitably arise about whether particular actions warrant the specific numerical value assigned. As individual members can sometimes take different actions to comply with the same commitment, no standardized cross-national evaluative criterion can always be used. Comments regarding the judgements in each case, detailed in the extensive accompanying notes, are welcome (see below).
- Because the evaluative scale used in this compliance report runs from -100 percent to +100 percent, it should be assumed that any score in the positive range represents at least some compliance with the specific commitments made by the G8. It is not known if commitments in other international forums or at the national level on occasions such as the State of the Union Address, Queen's Speech or Speech from the Throne, etc., are complied with to a greater or lesser degree than the commitments made by the G8.

- It may be that commitments containing high degrees of precision, obligation and delegation, with short specified timetables for implementation, may induce governments to act simply to meet the specified commitment rather than in ways best designed to address core and underlying problems over a longer term.
- In some cases, full compliance by all members of the G8 with a commitment is contingent on co-operative behaviour on the part of other actors.
- Although G8 Research Group analysts have made an exceptional effort to seek relevant information on Russia, credible commentary on the preliminary draft of this report suggests that information herein about the compliance-related activity of the Russian Federation remains incomplete. The greater such incompleteness, the lower the Russia's scores would likely be as a result.

Further Research and Reports

The information contained within this report provides G8 member countries and other stakeholders with an indication of their compliance results in the post-Sea Island period. As with previous compliance reports, this report has been produced as an invitation for others to provide additional or more complete information on country compliance with the 2004 Sea Island commitments. As always, comments are welcomed and would be considered as part of an analytical reassessment. Please send your feedback to <g8@utoronto.ca>.

Table A: 2004-2005 Sea Island Final Compliance Scores*

	CDA	FRA	GER	ITA	JAP	RUS	UK	U.S.	EU	Average
BMENA: Democracy Assistance	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.00
BMNEA: Iraqi Elections	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0.89
World Economy	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.22
Trade: Doha	1	0	1	1	1	N/A	1	1	1	0.88
Trade: Technical Assistance	1	0	1	0	1	-1	1	1	1	0.56
Energy	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0.78
Environment	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.00
WMD	1	1	1	1	1	-1	1	1	1	0.78
Terrorist Financing	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0.44
Transnational Crime	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.11
Transport Security	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Debt Relief / HIPC	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.00
Financing Development	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1.00
Infectious Diseases HIV/AIDS	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	0.56
Infectious Diseases Polio	1	-1	1	-1	0	1	1	1	1	0.44
Peace Building in Africa	1	1	1	1	-1	0	1	1	1	0.67
Fame & Food Security in Africa	1	1	1	0	1	-1	1	1	1	0.67
Regional Security Darfur	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0.89
Individual Country Averages	0.72	0.50	0.67	0.44	0.39	0.06	0.67	0.72	0.72	
Overall Country Average	0.54									
Overall Issue Average	0.55									
Overall Final Score	0.55									
Sea Island Interim Score	0.40									
Kananaskis Final Score	0.35									

*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. The overall compliance average is an average of the overall issue average and overall country average. 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.

Table B: 2004 Sea Island Interim Compliance Scores*

	CDA	FRA	GER	ITA	JAP	RUS	UK	U.S.	EU	Average
BMENA (A) Democracy Assistance	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
BMENA (B) Iraqi Elections	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0.78
World Economy	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.33
Trade (A) Doha	1	1	1	1	1	n/a	1	1	1	1.00
Trade (B) Technical Assistance	1	0	1	0	1	-1	0	0	0	0.22
Energy	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0.89
Environment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
WMD	1	1	1	1	1	-1	1	1	1	0.78
Terrorist Financing	0	1	-1	-1	0	1	-1	0	0	-0.11
Transnational Crime	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Transport Security	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.11
Debt Relief / HIPC	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.00
Financing Development	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1.00
Infectious Diseases HIV/AIDS	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	0.33
Infectious Diseases Polio	1	-1	-1	-1	0	1	1	-1	1	0.0
Peace Building in Africa	1	0	1	1	-1	0	1	1	0	0.44
Famine and Food Security in Africa	1	1	1	0	1	-1	1	1	1	0.67
Regional Security Darfur	1	1	1	1	1	-1	1	1	1	0.78
Individual Country Average	0.50	0.39	0.50	0.39	0.33	0.00	0.50	0.44	0.50	
Overall Country Average	0.40									
Overall Issue Average	0.40									
Overall Interim Compliance Average	0.40									
2003 Evian Interim Compliance Score	0.47									
2002 Kananaskis Interim Compliance Score	0.25									

*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. The overall compliance average is an average of the overall issue average and overall country average. 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.

Table C: G8 Compliance Assessments by Country, 1996-2005

	FRA	U.S.	UK	GER	JAP	ITA	CDA	RUS	EU	Average
Lyon 1996-97 ^a	0.26	0.42	0.42	0.58	0.21	0.16	0.47	N/A	N/A	0.36
Denver 1997-98 ^b	0	0.34	0.50	0.17	0.50	0.50	0.17	0	N/A	0.27
Birmingham 1998-99 ^c	0.25	0.60	0.75	0.25	0.20	0.67	0.50	0.34	N/A	0.45
Cologne 1999-00 ^d	0.34	0.50	0.50	0.17	0.67	0.34	0.67	0.17	0.17	0.39
Okinawa 2000-01 ^e	0.92	0.67	1.00	1.00	0.82	0.89	0.83	0.14	N/A	0.80
Genoa 2001-02 ^f	0.69	0.35	0.69	0.59	0.44	0.57	0.82	0.11	N/A	0.53
Kananaskis 2002-03 (interim) ^g	0.38	0.25	0.42	0.08	0.10	0.00	0.77	0.14	N/A	0.27
Kananaskis 2002-03 (final) ^h	0.64	0.36	0.55	0.18	0.18	-0.11	0.82	0	N/A	0.33
Evian 2003-04 (interim) ⁱ	0.50	0.50	0.58	0.42	0.42	0.38	0.58	0.42	N/A	0.47
Evian 2003-04 (final) ^j	0.75	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.42	0.25	0.83	0.33	N/A	0.51
Sea Island 2004-2005 (interim) ^k	0.39	0.44	0.50	0.50	0.33	0.39	0.50	0	0.44	0.39
Sea Island 2004-2005 ^l (final)	0.50	0.72	0.67	0.67	0.39	0.44	0.72	0.06	0.72	0.55

Notes

^a Applies to 19 priority issues, embracing the economic, transnational and political security domains.

^b Applies to six priority issues, embracing the economic, transnational and political security domains.

^c Applies to seven priority issues, embracing the economic, transnational and political security domains (human trafficking).

^d Applies to six priority issues, embracing the economic, transnational and political security domains (terrorism).

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

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

^g Applies to the 13 priority issues assessed in the first interim compliance report, embracing economic, transnational, and political security domains (arms control, conflict prevention and terrorism).

^h Applies to the 11 priority issues assessed in the final report, embracing economic, transnational and political security domains (arms control, conflict prevention and terrorism). Excluded in the final report, which were assessed in the interim are debt of the poorest (HIPC) and ODA.

ⁱ Applies to the 12 priority issues, embracing economic, transnational and political security domains (WMD, transport security and terrorism).

^j Applies to the 12 priority issues, embracing economic, transnational and political security domains (WMD, transport security and terrorism).

^k Applies to 18 priority issues, embracing economic, transnational and political security domains (world economy, development, environment, infectious diseases, terrorist financing)

^l Applies to 18 priority issues, embracing economic, transnational and political security domains (world economy, development, environment, infectious diseases, terrorist financing)