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Executive Summary

Since the Gleneagles Summit on July 6-8, 2005, G8 members have complied with their 21 priority commitments +65% of the time, as assessed on a scale from −100% to +100%.\(^1\) Gleneagles thus scores higher than any other summit in the past decade with the exception of the 2000 Okinawa Summit. Compliance with the Gleneagles commitments has increased by +18% since the G8 presidency passed from the United Kingdom to Russia at the start of 2006. Compliance with these Gleneagles commitments one year later is now +10% higher than compliance with the comparable commitments made at the 2004 Sea Island Summit.

The greatest compliance with the Gleneagles commitments comes from the United Kingdom with a score of +95%. Second is the EU with a score of +89%, followed by Germany with a score of +88%. Tied for fourth are the United States and Canada, each scoring +81%. They are followed in turn by France at +57%, Japan at +52% and Italy at +29%. Russia, on the evidence currently available, comes in at a score of at least +14%.\(^2\) All G8 members have thus clearly complied positively with their Gleneagles commitments.

Since the start of 2006, Germany has jumped by 55 percentage points (based on the G8 Research Group’s Interim Compliance Report published in February 2006). Its high score, as well as that for the UK and the rising score for Russia, confirms the “hosting effect” — that compliance tends to be higher for the country that has just hosted a summit as well as the next countries in the hosting rotation, as Germany will host in 2007. Since the beginning of 2006, the compliance score of Canada is up 29 percentage points, the UK up 28, the EU up 14, the U.S. up 10 and France up 9. Japan’s scored is unchanged from the interim period. Russia, which scored a -14% at the interim point is in the positive range for the final report with a score of at least +14. This represents a rise of 28 points since it assumed its responsibilities as host. Italy, although still in the positive range, is the only country whose score has dropped from January 2006, down by 14 percentage points.

Seven of the 21 commitments have a perfect compliance score of +100%: renewable energy, debt relief for Africa, Middle East reform, transnational crime, terrorism, non-proliferation and assistance for tsunami relief efforts. In January 2006, only three had a perfect compliance score: renewable energy, Middle East reform and climate change.

A compliance score of +89% comes on commitments to support the African Union’s mission in Sudan and for commitments relating to tackling climate change at the United Nations. They are followed by reducing Iraq’s debt with a score of +88%. Scoring +67% each are commitments to provide additional resources for Africa’s peacekeeping forces and to develop cleaner, more efficient and lower emitting vehicles (surface transportation). Below average scores come from raising agricultural productivity at +56%. Scoring +44% are addressing products of interest to least developed countries (LDCs) in trade negotiations. Also scoring below average at 33% are

---

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

\(^2\) In its evaluation of Russian compliance, the G8 Research Group is assisted by the new State University Higher School of Economics (SU-HSE) G8 Research Team, composed of analysts from SU-HSE and the Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO).
initiatives aimed at meeting the funding needs for HIV/AIDS through the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, to support the Education for All initiative and commitments aimed at supporting a comprehensive set of actions to raise agricultural productivity in Africa. Also below average are scores for ratifying the UN Convention Against Corruption at +25, agreements to double aid to Africa at +22% and efforts aimed at eradicating polio at +11%. Commitments to reduce trade-distorting domestic agricultural subsidies in Africa are the only issue area with a score 0. There are no scores in the negative range.

Rising sharply from their 2004 Sea Island record are the political security issues of terrorist financing, transnational crime, non-proliferation and Middle East reform, all with perfect compliance scores since Gleneagles. Also rising sharply to achieve perfect scores are debt relief, renewable energy and tsunami relief efforts. This trend suggests the Gleneagles Summit delivered strongly on its priority themes of African development and climate change.

The individual and overall scores by country and by issue are reproduced on the following page.
## 2005 Gleneagles Final Compliance Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>CDA</th>
<th>FRA</th>
<th>GER</th>
<th>ITA</th>
<th>JAP</th>
<th>RUS</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>EU</th>
<th>Issue Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peacekeeping</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Governance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health: HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health: Polio Eradication</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Relief: Africa</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth: Africa</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Africa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade: Africa</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade: Market Access and Export Subsidies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade: LDCs</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East Reform</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Relief: Iraq</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-proliferation</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transnational Crime</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Energy</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsunami</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Transportation</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Country Scores</td>
<td>+81%</td>
<td>+57%</td>
<td>+88%</td>
<td>+29%</td>
<td>+52%</td>
<td>+14%</td>
<td>+95%</td>
<td>+81%</td>
<td>+89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Compliance</td>
<td>+52%</td>
<td>+48%</td>
<td>+33%</td>
<td>+43%</td>
<td>+52%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>+67%</td>
<td>+71%</td>
<td>+75%</td>
<td>+47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Sea Island Final Compliance</td>
<td>+72%</td>
<td>+50%</td>
<td>+67%</td>
<td>+44%</td>
<td>+39%</td>
<td>+6%</td>
<td>+67%</td>
<td>+72%</td>
<td>+72%</td>
<td>+54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: ODA = official development assistance; LDCs = least developed countries.

The average score by issue is the average of all countries’ compliance scores for that issue. The average score by country is the average of all issue scores for a given country. The overall compliance average is an average of the overall issue average and overall country average. N/A indicates insufficient information has been obtained to assess the compliance outcome and thus no compliance score is awarded; such scores are excluded from the average.
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. Compliance reports are available at the G8 Information Centre at <www.g8.utoronto.ca/compliance>.

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.

For the 2005 Final Compliance report, 21 priority commitments were selected from the 212 commitments made at the Gleneagles Summit, hosted by the United Kingdom from July 6 to 8, 2005. This final report assesses the results of compliance with those commitments as the leaders prepare to meet, for the first time with Russia as host, in St. Petersburg from July 15 to 17, 2006.

To make its assessments, the G8 Research Group relies on publicly available information, documentation and media reports. In an ongoing effort to ensure the accuracy, integrity and comprehensiveness of these reports, we encourage comments and suggestions. Indeed, we are most grateful to the many individuals from various communities who responded to our invitation to contribute to the Interim Compliance Report published in February 2006 and the Final Compliance Report published in June 2006.

Any feedback remains anonymous and would not be attributed. Responsibility for this report’s contents lies exclusively with the authors and analysts of the G8 Research Group.

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 Vanessa Corlazzoli, chair of the student executive, as well as Mike Varey and Aaron Raths, with the support of Dr Ella Kokotsis, Director of Analytical Research, and Laura Sunderland, Senior Researcher.

John Kirton
Director
G8 Research Group
Toronto, Canada
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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 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.
Appendix C
Sponsors

The G8 Research Group would like to thank its sponsors whose generous support allows us to continue our research and analysis. Please note that none of the sponsors has endorsed or is associated with the content and conclusions of this report. Their support of the G8 Research Group should not be construed as condoning or endorsing the report’s findings. Responsibility for its contents lies exclusively with the authors and analysts of the G8 Research Group.
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