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Climate Change: B+

Climate change garnered considerable attention at the Heiligendamm Summit. The G8’s main objectives on climate change were: to reach a consensus among its members on how to proceed with negotiating a post-Kyoto climate change agreement, and address sustainable development through enhancing energy efficiency and ensuring the security of energy supplies. In light of the proposal made by the United States (US) prior to the summit that called for intensity-based emissions targets as opposed to the cap-and-trade system preferred by the Europeans, it seemed that talks would not come to fruition. Yet with some surprise, in final communiqué, Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy released on 7 June 2007, a substantial agreement was outlined. At an afternoon press briefing, German Chancellor Merkel happily announced that the G8 leaders had reached consensus on a number of issues related to climate change. Although the summit achieved more than was expected, the G8 did not succeed in realizing all facets of its three climate change priorities.

Objective 1: Post-2012 Agreement

The G8 made notable progress in discussing its collective position on a post-2012 climate change agreement. The G8 leaders managed to reverse the deadlock, which had characterized discussions on climate change at previous summits. Although the leaders did not announce definitive emissions targets, they managed to consolidate a consensus on how to proceed with negotiations multilaterally that included a timeline for how to contribute to the establishment of a post-Kyoto agreement.

As an indication that progress had been made in bridging divergent views between the G8 members, the final communiqué, Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy states: "We will consider seriously the decisions made by the European Union, Canada and Japan which include at least a halving of global emissions by 2050." Furthermore, the G8 named the United Nations (UN) as the appropriate forum in which to discuss global action on climate change:

"We acknowledge that the UN climate process is the appropriate forum for negotiating future global action on climate change. We are committed to moving forward in that forum and call on all parties to actively and constructively participate in the UN Climate Change Conference in Indonesia in December 2007 with a view to achieving a comprehensive post 2012-agreement (post Kyoto-agreement) that should include all major emitters."

The G8 leaders also determined that action on climate change should be “based on the UNFCCC principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities” so as to better ensure compliance with whatever form the new 2009 framework will take.

That G8 members, particularly the US, will consider these emissions targets, as well as work within the UN to address climate change is a significant step forward, given their intransigence to these proposals prior to the summit.

However, the leaders of the G8 on several occasions remarked that the components of the consensus reached were in fact only political statements, a point iterate by Chancellor Merkel,

Prime Minister Harper, and President Putin. EU President Barroso however marked the importance of even this partial compliance as remarkable, as it set the stage for further serious discussion on emissions reductions. It is hoped that through this concerted G8 agreement, the commitments of the leaders in Heiligendamm will legitimately translate their resolve for procuring a post-2012 agreement at the upcoming UNFCCC negotiations. In the end, no tangible post-2012 conclusions were reached in Heiligendamm, however the summit did lay the foundation for future talks.

Objective 2: Energy Efficiency

The G8 met its energy efficiency objectives at the summit. The communiqué, *Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy* released by the leaders on 7 June 2007 included seven commitments that the G8 will need to follow in order to increase energy efficiency. These include: implementing the Gleneagles and St. Petersburg Plans of Action, accepting recommendations made by the IEA, promoting research, and cooperating with international institutions like the World Bank. The G8 also committed to working with emerging economies to reduce energy consumption through discussions with the IEA. This agency will also play a central role in establishing a "Sustainable Buildings Network" which is meant to increase energy efficiency in the building sector. The G8 also committed to “actively support the energy efficient technologies and the use of renewable energies by employing market mechanisms, promotion instruments and framework legislation, as well as through public-private-partnership initiatives to move towards low or zero-energy buildings.” The G8 effectively and proactively addressed climate change in terms of energy efficiency in the final communiqué.

The introduction of the Heiligendamm Process contributed to the success of the discussions on energy efficiency and climate change. This process emphasizes cooperation with the Outreach 5 (O5) group of countries (Brazil, India, China, South Africa and Mexico). On the issue of climate change, each country took responsibility for enacting change in emissions levels and for acting within their capacities to address climate change. The O5 will work in cooperation with the OECD to foster sustainable economic growth while curbing emissions through technological cooperation. The group has set a timeline for this expanded dialogue, with cooperation with the OECD to begin in the latter part of 2007, a progress report to be presented at the 2008 summit in Japan, and a final report to be presented at the 2009 summit.

Objective 3: Security of Energy Supply

The G8 addressed security of energy supplies, but not to any great extent. The G8 leaders only reiterated their commitments to increasing transparency in the energy markets in the introduction of the communiqué, *Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy*. The leaders “strongly reaffirmed [their] commitment to Global Energy Security Principles, including [their] commitment to enhance dialogue on relevant shareholders’ perspectives on growing interdependence, and security of supply and demand issues.” The G8 also noted its support for the principles of the Energy Charter. However the topic of energy security, specifically security of supply, was included in the final communiqué to some degree; the G8 proposed the creation of government-controlled strategic oil reserves to reduce the risk of disruptions in oil supplies. Yet, that there was no specific commitment dedicated to the issue in the final communiqué, with little more than the introduction being used to convey the G8’s initiatives on securing energy supplies, this objective was only partially met.

---

Conclusion

In the end, the G8 made notable strides on climate change and the related issues of energy efficiency and security. Great strides were made in producing a consensus on some vital and fundamental issues, such as the need for emissions reductions, a post-2012 agreement, and increased energy efficiency. However, Merkel’s statement that the communiqué was in fact only a political statement by the leaders, and the reality that not all countries agreed to the 50% reductions by 2050 initiative must be considered. Although considerable time and attention was given to the first two objectives, the third was negligibly mentioned during the summit and in the final communiqué. Thus the G8 scores a B+ for its performance at Heiligendamm on issues of climate change.

By: Alexandra Lapin
Balanced Growth and Global Stability: B

Despite its relative absence at St. Petersburg, balanced growth and global stability received notable focus at the G8 Summit in Heiligendamm. Rising energy prices have resulted in mounting international pressure to address global imbalances, as articulated in the pre-summit statement released by the G8 Finance Ministers prior to their meeting in Potsdam. The statement acknowledges that "high and volatile energy prices remain a concern and we will remain vigilant. We will continue to pursue sound policies to foster sustained and balanced growth and support the orderly adjustment of global imbalances."  

Attention to global imbalances is further heightened by concerns about currency exchange rates – including the rising Euro, the weakening US dollar and the inflexible Chinese yuan. The issue is given added importance in light of the Chinese stock market crash of 27 February 2007 and the repercussions to the global economy. Finally, the recent salience of hedge funds in global financial markets has led to increased calls for transparency of financial markets. The G8 Finance Ministers pre-Summit statement acknowledges that "given the strong growth of the hedge fund industry and the increasing complexity of the instruments they trade, [the ministers] reaffirmed the need to be vigilant."  

The German Presidency tasked the G8 with addressing balanced growth and global stability at Heiligendamm by setting the objectives of reducing global imbalances and bolstering financial stability. The former objective focused in particular on strong global imbalances in exchange rates and oil supplies. The latter objective was intended to advocate for greater financial transparency in international markets and the development of local bond markets in emerging market economies and developing countries.  

In both the case of global imbalances and that of financial stability, the language emerging from Heiligendamm is significantly weaker than that proposed by the German Presidency, but nevertheless provides a fundamental position on the key issues of the balanced growth and global stability agenda.  

Though references to this issue have been relatively absent in press conferences led by the G8 leaders, global growth and financial stability appeared at the forefront of the first summit document released at Heiligendamm, *Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy*.  

**Objective 1: Reducing Global Imbalances**

In light of the US balance of payments deficit and large currency reserves in Asia, reducing global imbalances appeared to rank high on the G8 agenda. Among the most pertinent topics touted for discussion at Heiligendamm with regards to the adjustment of global imbalances were rising Asian foreign currency reserves, the lack of flexibility of the Chinese yuan and the American twin deficit.  

The G8 summit declaration on growth and responsibility in the global economy stressed that global imbalances would take time to adjust, but that the current economic climate was conducive to "an orderly adjustment." The document iterated the domestic commitments made by several of the

---

member states, including the US target to eliminate its federal budget deficit by 2012, the European pledge to continue its structural reforms under the aegis of the Lisbon strategy, the Japanese fiscal reform program, the Russian structural reforms for encouraging growth, and the Canadian goal of eliminating total government net debt in a generation.\footnote{Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy: G8 Summit 2007 Heiligendamm Summit Declaration, G8 Summit 2007 Heiligendamm, (Heiligendamm), 7 June 2007. Date of Access: 8 June 2007. http://www.g-8.de/Content/EN/Artikel/_g8-summit/anlagen/2007-06-07-gipfeldokument-wirtschaft-eng,property=publicationFile.pdf.}

The declarations also made the anticipated references to imbalances in exchange rates, though the references and directives were significantly more ambiguous than in the draft declaration prepared by the German Presidency. Instead of a direct reference to China, the declarations take note of "a number of countries in emerging Asia [which] have taken first steps on the road towards a more flexible exchange rate\footnote{Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy: G8 Summit 2007 Heiligendamm Summit Declaration, G8 Summit 2007 Heiligendamm, (Heiligendamm), 7 June 2007. Date of Access: 8 June 2007. http://www.g-8.de/Content/EN/Artikel/_g8-summit/anlagen/2007-06-07-gipfeldokument-wirtschaft-eng,property=publicationFile.pdf.} and emphasize that, "in emerging economies with large and growing current account surpluses, it is crucial that their effective exchange rates move so that necessary adjustments will occur.\footnote{Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy: G8 Summit 2007 Heiligendamm Summit Declaration, G8 Summit 2007 Heiligendamm, (Heiligendamm), 7 June 2007. Date of Access: 8 June 2007. http://www.g-8.de/Content/EN/Artikel/_g8-summit/anlagen/2007-06-07-gipfeldokument-wirtschaft-eng,property=publicationFile.pdf.}


**Objective 2: Financial Stability and Transparency of Financial Markets**

The German Presidency tabled the regulation of hedge funds as an agenda item for the G8 Summit in Heiligendamm, advocating for increased financial transparency within the fund system so as to reduce the potential for international financial crises. Chancellor Merkel made specific references to the need to examine the risks posed to international financial stability by the lack of regulation around hedge funds.

Hedge funds have come under increasing scrutiny in the past decade. In 1998, the hedge fund Long-Term Capital Management lost USD4.6 billion within the space of a few months, necessitating the intervention of the US Federal Reserve in order to ensure the stability of the global financial system. In 2006, the hedge fund Amaranth suffered speculation losses of USD5 billion within a single week. Both cases drew worldwide attention to the mounting risks arising from hedge funds, and the possibility of a sweeping destabilization of international financial markets if a large hedge fund were to become insolvent, particularly given the exponential rise of hedge funds and their holdings.

Hedge funds are estimated to have doubled in the past five years, with an approximately 9,400 operated worldwide at the end of 2006. The funds now manage an estimated USD1.4 trillion, an
amount which has tripled since the end of 2001.\footnote{Germany talks down chances of hedge funds accord at G8 finance meeting, Associated Press, (Washington DC), 18 May 2007. Date of Access: 19 May 2007. http://www.canada.com/topics/news/world/story.html?id=59866da5-2325-41c9-b59c-1f3f593eed29&k=14546.} Given the exponential growth of hedge funds, states such as Germany have begun to question whether a regulatory framework should be in place in order to develop more transparency within the hedge fund market and thus preserve and protect international financial stability. The US and UK both expressed resistance at the idea, ostensibly due to the heavy concentration of hedge funds in those countries.


However, the G8 did not advocate any mandatory regulation of hedge funds, including a voluntary independent rating system, nor does the Financial Stability Forum specifically advocate any such regulation. The declarations made by the G8 with respect to financial transparency are thus significantly weaker than those proposed by the German Presidency.

The G8 also supported the development of local bond markets in emerging market economies and developing countries – an initiative proposed by the at G8 Finance Ministers meeting in Potsdam on 19 May 2007. However, the declarations emerging from Heiligendamm provided no basis for investment guarantees to support such development.

**Conclusion**

Although the objectives of the German Presidency with respect to reducing global imbalances and enhancing the transparency of financial markets were addressed at Heiligendamm, the final statements were significantly less potent than in the draft declaration. Statements on global imbalances excluded specific directives towards China and the inflexibility of the yuan and references to financial transparency did not advocate even a voluntary rating system for hedge funds. Therefore, although these objectives were addressed, the results cannot be interpreted as a significant success for the German Presidency.

**By: Cliff Vanderlinden**
The German Presidency chose to focus on promoting innovation through the protection of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR), the prevention of piracy, and the development and use of sustainable technology. The issue has risen to prominence after its inclusion in both the 2005 Gleneagles and 2006 St. Petersburg G8 Summits. At the Heiligendamm Summit, however, the subject was significantly overshadowed by climate change, African development, and Russia-US tensions on missile defense. However, issues related to innovation and sustainability outlined initially by the German G8 Presidency addressed in the final communiqué, *Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy* and the Joint Statement by the Germany G8 Presidency and the Heads of State and/or Government of Brazil, China, India, Mexico and South Africa.

**Objectives 1 & 2: Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) & Prevention of Piracy**

One of Merkel's objectives for the G8 Summit was to reaffirm commitments to existing IPR regulatory frameworks, such as the WTO's Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS). This was successfully achieved in article 36 of the final communiqué where the G8 nations commit to "strengthen cooperation" with relevant international organizations such as the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and the World Customs Organization (WCO).  

Further, in order to properly address issues of Intellectual Property, the G8 acknowledged the need for a constructive dialogue to materialize between G8 member states and emerging economies. As predicted, this was satisfied through paragraph 32 of the Final Summit Declaration which invites emerging economies to participate in discussions on IPR within the OECD framework. Paragraph 33 also supports information-sharing through the OECD’s Research Agenda on energy efficiency and sustainable resource use. Paragraph 38 also explicitly invites emerging economies into discussions with G8 nations through the OECD “with the aim of establishing a new international dialogue on innovation and intellectual property protection.” Further, the joint declaration with O5 nations reaffirms a mutual commitment to existing IPR regulatory mechanisms, such as TRIPS, and for further capacity building, though it contains no explicit reference to completing this within the OECD framework.

Relations with Outreach 5 (O5) nations were expected to prove difficult, as it was necessary to heavily involve China in IPR discussions in order to ensure effectiveness of international regulatory regimes. China, however, has recently led developing economies such as Brazil, India, and South Africa Africa in calling for greater equity in international IPR regimes by challenging IPR licensing fees and conditions. Furthermore, with the growth of China’s economy and its current position as world leader in production and export of pirated goods any truly successful framework for action...
would require the strong support of the Chinese government.\textsuperscript{25} China’s position paper, released at the summit’s outreach session, outlines the country’s position. China notes in this position paper, that it is open to negotiations on IPR only within an environment that is economically fair and does not allow for the protection of monopolies on technology production.\textsuperscript{26} In this manner, the issue of IPR is inextricably linked to issues of international trade, which cannot easily be addressed within the G8 forum. However, with respect to the G8’s ultimate goals of creating a constructive dialogue with emerging economies the commitments set within the summit’s final declarations and in the joint declaration with the OS were sufficient to fulfill the German presidency’s overall objectives on IPR.

Significantly, in order to properly combat piracy the G8 needed to both strengthen and harmonize their criminal prosecution measures for IPR infringement. This objective is partially satisfied through paragraph 38 of \textit{Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy}, in which the G8 nations commit to the strengthening of cooperation through endorsing the Guidelines for Customs and Border Enforcement Cooperation.\textsuperscript{27} The statement elucidates a G8 member commitment to the development of “an effective information exchange system” amongst worldwide authorities.\textsuperscript{28} These measures are expected to facilitate information sharing to the benefit and facilitation of trade within knowledge-based economies.\textsuperscript{29} Though the wording of the paragraph provides evidence of sufficiently strong dedication between nations, the text falls short of the concrete commitments necessary for the fulfillment of this objective. Measures that could be taken to address this problem include a greater elucidation of the means by which this information exchange system will be developed and implemented. Further, emerging economies were not included in the commitment for information-sharing, a crucial element of an effective international IPR regime.

\section*{Objective 3: Support for Sustainability}

Finally, the G8 Presidency’s focus on Innovation for Sustainable Development was reaffirmed through numerous communiqués and statements. A successful agreement was expected to specifically include financial support for the OECD’s Research Agenda, which was explicitly committed to through paragraph 33 of the Final Summit Declarations.\textsuperscript{30} Specifically, in paragraph 33 the G8 affirms the importance of the OECD’s Global Science Fund (GSF) in its ability to facilitate cooperative international efforts towards technological innovation in respect to the development of sustainable technology.\textsuperscript{31} In addition, paragraph 41 of the final communiqué recognizes the potential of technological innovation for the mitigation of climate change.\textsuperscript{32} The wording surrounding G8 commitments to this issue, however, remains vague as the G8 affirms generally the import of the issue and various existing programs, but does not specify the creation of any G8

\begin{itemize}
\item China’s Position Paper on the G8 Outreach Session 2007.
\end{itemize}
initiatives or concrete benchmarks for their success. For example, no specific amount was devoted to the GSF for the attainment of its mandate.

**Conclusion**

Despite criticism by some for the lack of attention to the generation of generic drugs for developing nations, in sum, the G8 accomplished a majority of its objectives in regard to the support of innovation and the protection of IPR. However, as the written final communiqués lack the inclusion of measurable benchmarks for success, for example funding amounts or specific dates for meetings, the G8 can only receive partial marks for its commitments to this issue. For these reasons the G8 receives a B for its attention to the issues surrounding innovation and sustainability.

**By: Courtney Hood**
Freedom of Investment & Social Responsibility: B+

At the Heiligendamm Summit, the G8 secured commitments to both of the pre-stated objectives of the German Presidency, as outlined in the “Growth and Responsibility” document released on 7 June 2007. In particular, the G8 reaffirmed its commitment to the “freedom of investment,” although in the document, Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy, the G8 remained vague on the means to fully implement this commitment. The G8 also outlined several commitments on working to shape globalization in a more socially equitable way. Overall, the G8 receives a score of B+ for its performance on investment-related objectives at this year’s summit.

Objective 1: Investment Protectionism

At the Heiligendamm Summit, the issue of protectionism was revisited with a specific emphasis on fostering greater liberalization of cross-border investments in international financial markets. Although no specific targets to reduce investment barriers were set at Heiligendamm, the G8 jointly agreed to continue combating protectionism within current international “framework conditions,” as outlined in Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy.33 This aim was further stated more directly in a pledge that was made by the G8 to “work together” in further reducing domestic restrictions on foreign investment, and in strengthening “open and transparent investment regimes.”34 Additionally, the G8 called on developed countries and emerging economies to “critically assess” their own domestic investment policies. In particular, the G8 encouraged developing economies to remove “unnecessarily restrictive” or “arbitrary policies” that inhibit the free flow of global capital movements and hinder the benefits that derive from foreign investments.35

Against the backdrop of the Growth and Responsibility document, the G8 also released a Declaration on Trade in which the G8 strongly reaffirmed its desire to enhance global trade. In particular, the G8 pledged a “high level of ambition” in addressing all areas of the Doha Development Agenda (DDA).36 Given the objectives of the DDA, which include efforts to substantively reduce barriers to foreign direct investment, the assertive language of the communiqué by extension reinforces the G8’s commitment to resist investment protectionism.

It is difficult, however, to determine whether developing countries and emerging economies such as China and India, will comply with any of the commitments espoused by G8 leaders at Heiligendamm, particularly because the G8 failed to provide any concrete targets or outline of how it will encourage the commitment of non-G8 countries to combating protectionism. On the whole however, the G8 was able to build a consensus on core commitments aimed at curtailing investment protectionism and concluding DDA negotiations by the end of 2007.

Objective 2: The Social Dimension of Globalization

Another pre-stated objective of the German Presidency prior to Heiligendamm was to make “globalization socially equitable” and to ensure that developing countries are provided with greater

opportunities to enhance benefits deriving from the global trading system. Leading up to the summit, German Chancellor Angela Merkel announced her intention of using Heiligendamm as an opportunity to foster the political will of G8 leaders in assuming responsibility in "shaping the social dimension of the globalization process."

_Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy_ specifically stipulated a commitment by the G8 to implement a global action plan aligned closely with the pillars of the International Work Agenda i.e. the strengthening of corporate responsibility, investments in social protection systems, corporate governance, and social standards. The G8 also committed themselves to assisting developing countries in positioning themselves within the multilateral trading system to benefit from the "significant opportunities of globalization."

Thus, at Heiligendamm the G8 managed to reach an agreement and develop guidelines for promoting the social dimension of globalization. The G8 committed itself to actively promote internationally agreed corporate social responsibility and labour standards, such as the International Labour Organization Decent Work Agenda, the UN Global Compact, and the OECD Corporate Governance Principles. They furthermore outlined means by which to encourage greater compliance of countries to such initiatives.

**Conclusion**

The G8 managed to discuss investment and responsibility issues even as climate change and African development came to dominate the agenda. The G8 made some headway on discouraging investment protectionism, but failed to outline more specific means by which to do so. Although the five predominant emerging economies (Brazil, China, India, Mexico and South Africa) noted in their communiqué, the importance of promoting cross border investment, they did not specifically articulate a commitment to countering protectionism. On the second objective, the G8 managed to outline more specifically, the institutions and initiatives by which it will promote social equity, corporate responsibility and social protection.

**Addendum**

Although the objectives of investment protectionism and the social dimension of globalization were originally expected to dominate discussions on investment, the G8 expanded its agenda at Heiligendamm to include the issue of the "global investment environment." As outlined in the _Growth and Responsibility_ document, the G8 jointly announced that it would "work towards a level playing field for all investors," citing that open and transparent markets are an essential "precondition for cross-border investments." At Heiligendamm, the G8 broadened its investment agenda further by focusing on the issue of "investment in developing countries." In particular, the G8 adopted measures stipulated in the _Growth and Responsibility_ text to better situate developing country partners in reaping benefits from capital trade flows.

**By: James Meers**

---


Responsibility for Raw Materials: B+

Responsibility for raw materials is an issue that is growing in scope and popularity on the international stage. As a key nexus between the issues of global energy security, sustainable development, and good governance, dealing with raw materials is inherently important and complex. G8 objectives for this summit included outlining a more comprehensive partnership plan for sustainable foreign investment in Africa, and increasing transparency in the extractive industry. These were addressed at the Heiligendamm Summit through the following documents: Growth and Responsibility in Africa, and Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy.

Objective 1: Foreign Investment in Africa

Regarding specific outcomes of the summit, Germany’s Development Minister stated prior to Heiligendamm that the three anticipated broad outcomes are first to assure that pledges made at the G8 Summit in 2005 are complied with, second to boost investment, and finally, prioritizing well-run democracies for assistance. More specifically, it was anticipated that Germany would, “unveil a proposal at the summit to increase foreign investment in African countries that fight corruption and promote democracy.” Germany further stated that African countries that intended to “pursue good governance, fight corruption and use raw materials responsibly will be rewarded with partnership agreements and business deals.” Although no partnership deals were announced at the summit, the G8 did endorse the “Partnership for Making Finance Work for Africa,” an initiative of the World Bank and the African Development Bank. This initiative provides a comprehensive platform on which to evaluate partnerships between Africa and the G8. It remains to be seen how involved the G8 will be in helping to implement this initiative.

In Heiligendamm, the G8 countries committed to an overall goal of strengthening good governance and institutional capacities as a prerequisite for sustainable development and growth through the declaration entitled Growth and Responsibility in Africa. The G8 hopes to achieve this by strengthening the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM), supporting good financial governance and the Capacity Development Initiative for African Regional Economic Communities (REC), and enforcing the core principles of development policy. A second section of commitments pertain to fostering investment and sustainable economic growth through promoting investment, strengthening financial markets, and ensuring sustainable development. This is further reinforced by the creation of the G8 Action Plan for Good Financial Governance in Africa developed along with African partners. Specifically, this plan will assist African countries that are taking credible action against corruption and increasing transparency and accountability.

It is important to note that the commitments on raw materials are interlinked with the concept of responsible and sustainable investment in Africa. Indeed, in discussing financial growth and sustainable investment in Africa, the G8 affirmed their commitment to the UN Global Compact and the UN Principles for Responsible Investment, as well as the AU/NEPAD Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme.

---

45 Growth and Responsibility in Africa, Heiligendamm Summit Declaration, 8 May 2007, pg. 4. Date of Access 8 May 2007:
Objective 2: Transparency

It was anticipated that EITI would win full backing from the G8 regardless of complications with Russia’s relations with individual EU countries over common energy goals. Specific commitments coming out of Heiligendamm were expected to appear in the form of a renewal of previous support for the initiative. This indeed occurred through multiple statements of support in Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy and Growth and Responsibility in Africa.

In addition to the EITI, there was a specific commitment section made around transparency, the most pointed of which refers to ‘free, transparent and open markets are fundamental to global growth, stability and sustainable development’. This is further expanded upon in a statement that explains as follows: “Increased transparency in the extractive sector, is of crucial importance for achieving accountability, good governance and sustainable economic growth worldwide.” However, the G8 did not make any commitments to fund the EITI’s Multi-Donor Trust Fund.

Financial contributions may be discussed at a global conference on transparency that will be hosted by Germany later in the year. The conference received a positive response at the summit: “We welcome the proposal of the G8-Presidency to convene in 2007 a global conference on transparency in the extractive sector with the participation of governments, business, civil society and science from industrialized, emerging and developing economies.”

This conference would further enhance dialogue with China and other non-G8 countries and help to devise concrete partnerships and solutions to address the issue at hand. This statement in addition to full support of the EITI equates to considerable success in this area.

Conclusion

Overall, the G8 performed well on the issues related to raw materials and their management in Africa. Although no funds were committed to the EITI, and it was noted that the G8 would “continue to strengthen [the EITI]...as appropriate,” the G8 may just consolidate funding amounts at the upcoming conference in Germany on transparency in the extractive sector. For this, the G8 deserves a relatively high score overall for its performance in this issue area.

By: Kathryn Kinley

---

Success on the issue of development in Africa at Heiligendamm was lukewarm. While the summit’s Africa communiqué, *Growth and Responsibility in Africa*, addressed the objectives set out for Heiligendamm, it failed to outline concrete commitments or plans on sustainable economic growth, reform and good governance. This is particularly true of debt relief and official development aid. Not included in this assessment report are the more substantial commitments made on health and education or those made on peace and security in Africa.

German Chancellor Angela Merkel made clear that she wished for the G8 to return to the promises made in 2005; that the G8 countries should “take things up where Gleneagles ended.” Indeed, thus far, many have noted that progress on 2005 promises have been slow, such that a report recently released by the NGO DATA (Debt AIDS Trade Africa) called for “an emergency session of G8 Leaders...to get the G8 back on track with the promises they made [at Gleneagles]...” With this in mind, the assertion that G8 countries “recognize that further action is needed to meet our previous commitments” is welcomed. Also welcome is the statement that “a vigorous impetus seems necessary to ensure that Africa will meet the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015.”

**Objective 1: Sustainable Economic Growth**

The section entitled “Fostering Investment and Sustainable Economic Growth” makes up a substantial portion of the summit declaration on Africa, *Growth and Responsibility in Africa*. The section is prefaced by the recognition of the factors necessary for stable growth including governance, and goes on to discuss the importance of promoting investment, strengthening financial markets, and ensuring sustainable investment.

Two concrete commitments made by the German Presidency are to host an investment conference “aimed at improving Africa’s image,” as part of an African business leader’s campaign, and to monitor the progress on the effectiveness of remittances as part of measures agreed to at Sea Island in 2004.

---

57 Growth and Responsibility in Africa, Heiligendamm Summit Declaration, 8 May 2007, pg. 2. Date of Access 8 May 2007:
59 Growth and Responsibility in Africa, Heiligendamm Summit Declaration, 8 May 2007. Date of Access 8 May 2007:
More specifically on investment, the G8 countries will "support African countries in their efforts to remove obstacles [to investment]." They will "individually and collectively" continue to support initiatives such as the African Peer Review Mechanism and the Investment Climate Facility, among others, and emphasize support for initiatives such as the World Bank’s Gender Action Plan in light of the political and economic importance of women in economic growth.

It is proposed that G8 countries will also support “a variety of new and existing programs” including a regional Micro Small and Medium Enterprises Investment Fund (REGMIFA) and mortgage-market programs in pilot countries.

As for the Extractive Industries Transparencies Initiative (EITI), the EITI was only mentioned as an example of efforts that the G8 would “continue to strengthen... as appropriate,” leaving the current situation where only five G8 members have made financial contributions to the EITI trust fund or in-country EITI efforts as the likely status quo.

Financial contributions may be discussed at a global conference on transparency that will be hosted by Germany later in the year. The conference received a positive response at the summit: “We welcome the proposal of the G8-Presidency to convene in 2007 a global conference on transparency in the extractive sector with the participation of governments, business, civil society and science from industrialized, emerging and developing economies.”

Objective 2: Reform and Good Governance

As expected, Growth and Responsibility in Africa’s governance section begins with a reaffirmation of the importance of good governance as fostered by initiatives such as the African Union’s New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) and the G8’s own Africa Action Plan. The communiqué also asserts that the G8 will “encourage more African states to join the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM), and support efforts to accelerate progress in the APRM.” In addition, G8 leaders reaffirm their commitment to support countries that implement policies consistent with the APRM, with the goal of making progress in achieving the MDGs by 2005.

The communiqué also outlines support for a series of capacity development initiatives for African Regional Economic Communities (RECs), highlighting the importance of infrastructure development. Specifically, in Growth and Responsibility in Africa, the G8 stated that they “are committed to working closely together to better support regional integration and trade in Africa. In this context, we will intensify our efforts to better support regional integration in a consistent manner and build synergies in our activities.”
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Notably, the G8 endorsed the “Partnership for Making Finance Work for Africa,” an initiative of the World Bank and the African Development Bank. Although G8 leaders did not sign partnership agreements with African countries (with preference given to countries undertaking political reforms), the endorsement of a specific platform for collaboration with African partners should be noted. It remains to be seen how involved the G8 will be in helping to implement this initiative.

**Objective 3: Debt Relief and Development Aid**

Debt relief and development aid took a backseat at Heiligendamm to the first two objectives outlined above. This is somewhat surprising as a true recommitment to the aid and debt relief goals set at Gleneagles should have included these promises. Instead, although the Africa communiqué opens with statements on development aid and debt relief, it is silent on these through the rest of the communiqué.

In stressing the resolve to implement Gleneagles commitments, multilateral debt relief of “up to USD60 billion, the implementation of which is now well underway” is cited, as is “increasing ODA to Africa by USD25 billion a year by 2010.” This USD25 billion is indicative of success, as are the sums pledged to go towards AIDS, TB and Malaria, although the latter was said to include “considerable amounts of money from existing spending levels.” Indeed, it should also be noted that hastily made promises are unlikely to be approved by national legislatures, highlighting the importance of incremental and steady increases in aid. Thus, on debt relief and development aid, the success of G8 countries at Heiligendamm is at best lukewarm.

**Conclusion**

A careful look at the Heiligendamm communiqué on Africa reveals too many assertions of support or reaffirmations of promises not backed up by measurable commitments to real partnership with African leaders and provisions for serious increases in financial assistance and aid.

**By: Héloïse Apestéguy-Reux**

---
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At Heiligendamm, the G8 leaders affirmed their intention to promote and maintain lasting peace and stability on the African continent. The G8 agreed on providing further financial and operational support to develop an African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA) and the African Standby Force (ASF). They also urged the Sudanese government to accept the joint proposal for the United Nations (UN)-African Union (AU) hybrid peacekeeping missions in the Darfur region and reached an agreement with Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir after the summit. However, while the G8 agreed on the basic consensus regarding conflict prevention and resolution, they failed to offer further proposals for the establishment of the Continental Early Warning System (CEWS).

**Objective 1: The African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA)**

The G8 members partially achieved their goal of providing increased support to help develop an African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA) and the African Standby Force (ASF).

Like at past summits, G8 leaders were supportive of providing guidelines and strategies to the ASF in their peace support operations. The G8 leaders strongly reaffirmed its resolution in completing the building of the ASF through the main communiqué, *Growth and Responsibility in Africa*. They also promised to continue their financial support for the APSA to assist in the areas of infrastructure, equipment and enhanced staff resources. They committed to strengthening the connections between the existing military and civilian components of the ASF, so that the ASF would be ready to confront any conflict and post-conflict scenarios.

Furthermore, the G8 leaders promised to build capacities at the AU headquarters and at the regional level in order to plan and supervise the training of continental group experts. A strong focus of this training will be in the areas of justice administration, gender issues, and human rights. They also promised to assist in setting up an African Volunteer Service in which experts will participate in reconstruction operations as identified by AU. Finally, the G8 leaders promised to assist a network of peacekeeping facilities in Africa and abroad in order to maximize the overall impact of peacekeeping operations.

It must be noted, however, that the G8 did not address the AU request to form a global facility aimed at increasing aid to African-led missions (as proposed on 14 May 2007). After the request  
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was made to G8 countries and other Western partners, parties—including the G8—agreed to establish a fund, which would support under-funded peacekeeping missions in the region. It was expected that the precise structure of this fund would be finalized during the G8 Summit. However, as is apparent in the Summit Declaration entitled *Growth and Responsibility in Africa*, no new monetary commitment was designated to support the AU-led peacekeeping operations, despite the G8 leaders’ stated intention of “remaining firmly committed” to providing the necessary support to the African Standby Force’s (ASF) military capabilities.

**Objective 2: Sudan**

The conflict in Darfur was a major issue at the summit. Indeed, the G8 issued a separate *Statement on Sudan/Darfur*, that the situation in the Darfur region of Sudan garnered a separate statement by the G8 is significant, as it indicates considerable commitment of the G8 to peace and security in Sudan.

In the *Statement on Sudan/Darfur*, G8 leaders promised to provide assistance in developing long-term strategies and reliable funding mechanisms for the African Mission in Sudan (AMIS). They will continue to encourage dialogue and collaboration between the UN Security Council and the AU Peace and Security Council.

G8 leaders urged the Sudanese government and the rebel movements to accept the ceasefire agreements and their obligations under UN Security Council Resolution 1591 as well as international humanitarian law. They also called on the Sudanese government to allow humanitarian organizations unhindered access to help decrease the refugee crisis.

Furthermore, G8 leaders also pushed for a UN-AU hybrid force for Sudan UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon had sent a joint proposal with the AU to Sudan urging them to accept the deployment of a 23,000 peacekeeping force to replace the current 7,000 AU soldiers in the region. Ban later met with al-Bashir and the AU officials at the consultative meeting and after a two-day talk on June 11 and 12, Sudan agreed to allow deployment of a joint UN-AU peacekeeping force in Darfur. Between 17,000 and 19,000 troops will be deployed later this year. Ambassador Said Djinit, Peace
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and Security Council Commissioner at the AU stated that the agreement will be endorsed by the Security Council soon.  

Djinit also stated, "The meeting concluded that the proposed operation would contribute considerably to the stabilization of the situation in Darfur in its political, humanitarian and security dimensions."

**Objective 3: Conflict Prevention and Resolution**

Although the G8 did not articulate specific steps beyond "dialogue with the AU" by which it will help Africa achieve the goal of making the Continental Early Warning System (CEWS) (a conflict prevention tool) fully operational by 2009, it did state notably, that while members reaffirm their resolution in helping to complete the building of the ASF, they will "devote greater attention and efforts to conflict prevention and stabilization, reconstruction, reconciliation, and development in post-conflict countries." This attention to conflict prevention is notable, as early warning and prevention have often been seen as peripheral in peace and security discussions.

The G8 also committed to providing assistance to the AU and sub-regional organizations in order to stop the illegal trade, unauthorized distribution, and the misuse of light weapons. The G8 leaders promoted new initiatives such as the approach developed by the AU in its Policy Framework for Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development (PCRD), the current work of the African Development Bank to develop a strategy for institutional support and capacity building, as well as the OECD-DAC Implementation Framework for Security Sector Reform (IF-SSR).

**Conclusion**

Highlights for the G8 at the summit include a separate statement on the Darfur conflict, and continued dialogue and support with African representatives on improving conflict prevention mechanisms such as the CEWS. Moreover, the G8 underlined the utility of the civilian components of the ASF (as opposed to exclusively military components), and recognized the need for experts in the areas of transitional justice, gender and human rights. Despite this, the Africa Personal Representatives noted in its *Summary/Joint Progress Report on the G8 African Partnership* that stronger efforts are required by all actors. That the G8 remains committed to open dialogue with African partners on peace and security issues, is a hopeful and positive sign.

By: Miho Takaya
Global Health: B

Global Health is an issue that has been regularly addressed at G8 summits since the early 1990s, particularly when African development was a central theme. It re-emerged once again at the Heiligendamm Summit in the context of African development. To have made progress in meeting the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) related to health by 2015, the G8 needed to pledge to replenish the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, target HIV/AIDS, improve health systems in developing countries, and augment efforts to monitor potential disease outbreaks.

At the 2007 Heiligendamm Summit, the G8 displayed a strong commitment to Global Health despite overlooking the fourth objective. Overall, the G8 showed considerable support for three of the four objectives. Firstly, they pledged to replenish the Global Fund in light of increased needs for the 2008-2010 replenishment period. Secondly, G8 leaders proved to display a strong response to the HIV/AIDS pandemic by reaffirming their resolve to meet the MDG of providing universal access to prevention, treatment, care and support by 2010. G8 leaders used the Heiligendamm Summit as an opportunity to collectively encourage pharmaceutical drug companies to decrease the cost of life-saving anti-retroviral drugs. As well, the G8 successfully delivered on the third objective by committing to improve health systems. However, the G8 failed to tackle the final objective of monitoring disease outbreaks.

Objective 1: Replenishment of the Global Fund

At the 2007 Heiligendamm Summit, the G8 needed to pledge its support for Global Fund in its 2008-2010 replenishment period.

The G8 successfully delivered on this objective having addressed the replenishment of the Global Fund in Growth and Responsibility in Africa. In addition, Chancellor Angela Merkel stated in the Chair’s Summary of the Heiligendamm Summit that the “G8 agreed that the Global Fund continues to enjoy our full support.” In the context of Africa, G8 leaders recognized that the need of the Global Fund will increase dramatically for the 2008-2010 period to approximately USD6-8 billion based on estimates presented by the Board of the Global Fund. The G8 affirmed its commitment to work with donors and current stakeholders to replenish the Global Fund and will collectively meet to discuss efforts needed for the Global Fund’s replenishment at its September 2007 conference in Germany. However, G8 leaders made no indication of the level of funding they will commit towards the 2008-2010 replenishment period of the Global Fund.

Objective 2: Combating HIV/AIDS

At the 2007 Heiligendamm Summit, G8 leaders were expected to reiterate their support for tackling HIV/AIDS. In particular, the G8 needed to support the MDG of providing universal access to comprehensive HIV/AIDS prevention programs, treatment, care and support by 2010. The G8 were also projected to increase prevention through resources mobilized to assist those who are most marginalized such as women and children. Most critically, it was projected that the G8 would urge the pharmaceutical industry to decrease drug prices in order to increase access to life-saving anti-retroviral drugs.

In the Growth and Responsibility in Africa document released on 8 June 2007, the G8 pledged to support HIV/AIDS initiatives in order to mitigate the impact of the disease. The G8 reiterated its support for achieving the MDG of universal access to prevention, treatment and care and support

by 2010. They further reaffirmed their commitment to provide USD60 billion towards African development initiatives including those to fight the HIV/AIDS pandemic, although USD30 billion of the total had been earmarked earlier by the United States.97

Notably though, the G8 leaders recognized the growing feminization of the AIDS epidemic and the need to tackle mother-to-child transmission of the disease. As such, they committed to work with donors to provide universal prevention of mother-to-child (PMTCT) programs by 2010. Also, in an effort to increase access to anti-retroviral drugs, G8 leaders encouraged the pharmaceutical industry to consider supporting local production of drugs, increase research and innovation towards the production of new drugs, and examine new methods to enhance access to HIV medicines at affordable price points.98

Objective 3: Strengthening Health Systems

At the 2007 Heiligendamm Summit, the G8 affirmed their support to improve health care systems in Growth and Responsibility in Africa by stating their resolve towards “developing and strengthening health systems so that health care, especially primary health care, can be provided on a sustainable and equitable basis in order to reduce illness and mortality.”99 They recognized the critical necessity of strong health systems to deal with the HIV/AIDS pandemic, malaria, and tuberculosis among other infectious diseases. The G8 made a point to stress that without good governance, “all other reforms will have limited impacts.” The G8 committed to work with African governments to establish sustainable financing of health systems to make available necessary treatments. In addition, G8 leaders made note of the need for Africa to retain human resources in the health care industry. They committed themselves to work with national governments in developing countries to “create an environment where its most capable citizens, including medical doctors and other healthcare workers, see a long-term future in their own countries.” To achieve this end, the G8 will work with the Global Health Workforce Alliance and collaborate and co-operate with the WHO and OECD.100

Objective 4: Disease Surveillance and Monitoring

The G8 ignored the monitoring and surveillance of disease at the Heiligendamm Summit. A strong commitment from G8 leaders towards this objective was necessary due to the threat demonstrated from last year’s human-to-human transmission of the avian influenza (H5N1) virus as well as widely reported outbreaks among animal populations.101 The G8 failed to reiterate its previous commitment to cooperate with international institutions to develop early warning systems. They did not resolve to work with the World Health Organization (WHO) and the Global Outbreak Alert Response Network (GOARN) so that response to outbreaks is quick and timely. The G8 should have expressed support for international mechanisms for global surveillance of disease particularly, the WHO and the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). In addition, the G8 did not re-omit their assistance to developing countries to improve national systems of surveillance which includes technical assistance, training experts, and ensuring that emergency preparedness and response plans are in place. A strong commitment pertaining to disease surveillance and monitoring would have considerably increased the G8’s overall score on global health.

Conclusion

The G8 made headway on several health issues, mainly by indicating its intention to “scale up its efforts” in various areas (e.g. increasing efforts to combat HIV/AIDS, and reducing the funding gaps in the area of maternal and child health care). Yet, the G8 fell short in addressing disease surveillance and monitoring. This may be because the G8 had already addressed the issue in considerable depth at the St. Petersburg Summit in 2006. Nevertheless, the G8 made some notable gestures when it recognized the growing feminization of HIV/AIDS, and pledged to work in cooperation with partner governments in Africa to support a gender-sensitive response to addressing HIV/AIDS through the Global Fund. Furthermore, G8 leaders demonstrated a strong showing of support for public-private partnerships that would encourage the pharmaceutical industry to accept the local production of essential medicines, particularly, antiretrovirals. It is a result of these statements, and the fact that the communiqué included relatively specific targets and goals, that the G8 warrants a score of B, although one objective was ignored. Indeed, in Growth and Responsibility in Africa, the G8 identified many mechanisms and institutions that it will cooperate with, and recognized funding targets that had been estimated by relevant organizations. It remains to be seen, however, whether the G8 will use this upcoming year to truly “scale up its efforts” to meet its commitments to improving global health.

By: Sadia Rafiquddin
It was expected that G8 members would express their commitment to bolster African Union (AU) peacekeeping initiatives, provide tangible support for reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan, and use the summit as a forum to move towards the decision on Kosovo’s independence, albeit on the sidelines of the main summit discussions. At the G8 Summit in Heiligendamm, all of these regional security issues were addressed.

The objective of providing assistance to the AU-led peacekeeping missions, although not addressed directly in press briefings and conferences, was treated within the framework of an overarching summit objective of assisting African development. The issue was addressed in the summit documents *Growth and Responsibility in Africa*, the *Summary of G8 Africa Personal Representatives’ Joint Progress Report on the G8 Africa Partnership*, and the *Chair’s Summary*, all released on 8 June 2007. Reconstruction and peace in Afghanistan was addressed by the President of the United States (US) George W. Bush and the Prime Minister of Japan Shinzo Abe in their bilateral discussions, and included briefly in the *Chair’s Summary*. Finally, Russian President Vladimir Putin and Chancellor Merkel addressed Kosovo in their concluding press conferences. Finally, the French Prime Minister Nicolas Sarkozy made a surprise proposal on 7 June 2007 to delay a United Nations (UN) vote on Kosovo by a period of six months, while the concerned parties prepare a workable compromise.102

**Objective 1: Assistance to the African Union (AU)**

An objective for the G8 in the area of regional security was to support the AU in its peacekeeping operations. The financial and logistical aspects remain extremely crucial to this undertaking, as does external support, which has consistently lacked sustained cooperation and a comprehensive diplomatic mechanism. These, then, are the precise areas in which the action of the international community, and the G8 are required.103

In particular, on 14 May 2007, the AU formally requested the formation of a global facility aimed at increasing aid to African-led missions from the G8 members and other Western states. Subsequently, the parties—including the G8—agreed to establish a fund, which would support under-funded peacekeeping missions in the region. It was expected that the precise structure of this fund would be finalized during the G8 Summit, thus fulfilling the financial aspect of the objective. However, as is apparent in the Summit Declaration entitled *Growth and Responsibility in Africa*,104 no new monetary commitment was designated to support the AU-led peacekeeping operations, despite the G8 leaders’ stated intention of “remaining firmly committed”105 to providing the necessary support to the African Standby Force’s (ASF) military capabilities. However, the G8 leaders indicated their intention to identify and support the AU-led peacekeeping missions in the future, in the areas of “sustainable financing, operational support, planning and management of peacekeeping missions, as well as exit strategies.”106 Thus, the guidelines for the crucial financial
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and logistical aspects of the commitment were emphasized, but not finalized, as the objective required.

Nevertheless, as affirmed in the Summary of G8 Africa Personal Representatives’ Joint Progress Report on the G8 Africa Partnership, the G8 leaders reiterated their support of the creation of the ASF, primarily in the areas of logistics, communication and civilian operations of peace support operations. More importantly, they stated that “assisting in developing long-term strategies and reliable funding mechanisms is an important next step.” It is crucial to note, however, that this step has not been taken at Heiligendamm.

The logistical and cooperation areas of the objective were also addressed. According to Growth and Responsibility in Africa, G8 members aim to continue their assistance to the AU and its sub-regional organizations in the area of capacity building for the purpose of maintaining lasting peace and stability on the continent. Moreover, in addition to reemphasizing their support for the construction of the ASF, the G8 leaders stressed that greater attention will be devoted to conflict prevention, as well as “stabilization, reconstruction, reconciliation, and development in post-conflict countries.”

Finally, the G8 members made a commitment to strengthen the civilian capabilities of the ASF, including those of the police. In particular, the G8 leaders committed to build capacities of the AU Headquarters and regional levels, to plan and supervise the use of the new civilian component, to increase the training capacity for the purpose of training civilian experts, to assist the AU in constructing the African Volunteer Service, and to support a network of current peacekeeping training facilities in Africa and outside of the continent.

**Objective 2: Reconstruction of Afghanistan**

The G8 needed to finalize its commitment to: facilitate further cooperation between Afghanistan and Pakistan in the fight against international terrorism; deliver assistance and aid in the repatriation of Afghan refugees in Pakistan; and define its commitment to supporting anti-drug trafficking and organized crime efforts, with Afghanistan and Pakistan.

At the 2007 G8 Summit in Heiligendamm, this objective was addressed. In particular, the G8 members committed to continue their support for Afghan institutions, most importantly, courts,
police systems, and correctional facilities.\textsuperscript{113} This contributes indirectly to the stated objective’s component of combating organized crime in the region, although this was not stated in the framework of augmenting an Afghan-Pakistani partnership.

Moreover, the G8 leaders reiterated their commitment to continue their engagement in Afghanistan, while contributing to anti-narcotic and counter-terrorism efforts.\textsuperscript{114} Although this does address the objective of supporting anti-drug trafficking operations, the objective cannot be seen as satisfactorily addressed, because no precise mechanism was identified. Furthermore, the G8 leaders emphasized the importance of a conference on the subject of continued international engagement in Afghanistan, which will be hosted in Rome on 3 July 2007 by the Italian government, and chaired jointly by the UN and the government of Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{115}

In the area of Afghan-Pakistani cooperation, the G8 Foreign Ministers, as well as the Foreign Ministers of Afghanistan and Pakistan, endorsed the Joint Statement on the G8 Afghanistan-Pakistan Initiative adopted at the Ministers’ meeting on Potsdam on 30 May 2007.\textsuperscript{116} However, further steps in solidifying the partnership were not taken.

On a bilateral level, as the Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe stated in a press conference following his bilateral talks with President Bush, the two governments reached agreement to consult each other, as they determine how to ease the threat of terrorism and de-escalate tensions in the Federally Administered Tribal Area (FATA), on the border of Pakistan and Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{117} However, neither a definite amount of financial assistance, nor a precise measurement of logistical assistance has been provided.

**Objective 3: Independence of Kosovo**

This objective has been addressed, but not fully met. In particular, a deadlock on the future of Kosovo between Russian on one side, and the US and the European G8 members on the other, appears to have ensued. An agreement was not reached with Russia, which continues its opposition to the UNSC decision based on Marti Ahtisaari’s scheme for internationally supervised independence of the province. As he stated in his official concluding press conference on 8 June 2007, President Putin has not moved from his position on the issue.\textsuperscript{118} Furthermore, as the German Chancellor Merkel stated in her concluding press conference on 8 June 2007, no agreement had been reached on a proposal by the French President Nicolas Sarkozy to delay any UN vote for six months in order to find a compromise.\textsuperscript{119} The Chancellor also affirmed the commitment of the G8 leaders and all parties involved to overcome substantive, rather than procedural obstacles to a solution.\textsuperscript{120} Although the G8 members stated that they will remain engaged in the process,\textsuperscript{121} this objective has not been met fully because the G8 was unable to neutralize Russia’s position on the matter.
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Conclusion

In conclusion, the performance of the 2007 G8 Summit in Heiligendamm on the issue of regional security merits a grade of B-. This is largely due to the fact, that, while addressing all of the respective objectives, the summit did not meet any of them fully. In particular, financial support to the AU-led peacekeeping missions was not pledged, and while logistical and coordination support, such as the creation of the ASF, was affirmed, it merely consisted of establishing guidelines for future assistance with no specific funding mechanism. Regarding the objective of assisting in the reconstruction of Afghanistan, and improving border security with Pakistan, little progress was made after the Foreign Ministers’ Meeting in Potsdam on 30 May 2007 on augmenting Afghan-Pakistani cooperation, other than the endorsement of the Joint Statement on the G8 Afghanistan-Pakistan Initiative. In addition, objectives of combating drug trafficking and organized crime, as well as assisting refugee repatriation, were only indirectly addressed, with G8 members reaffirming their existing support. Finally, the objective of making progress on the contention over the status of Kosovo was not met, although definitely addressed. Discussions did take place; nevertheless, the predicted outcome did not ensue.

By: Julia Muravska
Middle East: C+

Pressing regional threats presented by security developments and instability in the Middle East received marginal attention at the G8 Heiligendamm Summit. The Middle East has not been an area of regular focus for the G8 – and this year’s summit in Heiligendamm was no exception. Traditionally, G8 discussions on the Middle East have concentrated on diplomatic measures aimed at resolving the longstanding dispute between Israel and the Palestinian Authority. However, amid intensifying tensions between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the West over Iran’s nuclear ambitions as well as escalating violence in Lebanon, it was reasonably predicted that considerable attention would be given to the Middle East. While there was some talk on the current violence in Lebanon, the G8 leaders remained loyal to the Presidency’s declared twin focus on African development and climate change. The Middle East was discussed by way of regional security and non-proliferation, where discussions were limited to Iran’s nuclear agenda.

Objective 1: Middle East Peace Process

It was expected that the main focus of the G8 concerning the situation in the Middle East would be on developing and introducing tangible initiatives to mitigate the current Arab-Israeli impasse, however, the G8’s attention remained focused almost exclusively on the issues of African development and climate change. At a working lunch in Heiligendamm, on 7 June, the G8 leaders discussed current foreign policy issues, including obstacles to the Middle East Peace Process and nuclear proliferation. In her final press conference on 8 June, Chancellor Angela Merkel said that the G8 would support “any opportunity to move ahead” regarding current hostilities in the Middle East.

Merkel had indicated before the summit that she would revive talks on the political climate in the Middle East. As president of the European Union, Germany participates in the “Middle East Quartet,” which also includes representatives from the United States (US), the Russian Federation, and the United Nations (UN). The Middle East Quartet seeks to mediate peaceful solutions between Israel and its Arab neighbours. At one such meeting, German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier articulated his desire to “help achieve a rapprochement between Israelis and Palestinians.” Given Germany’s desire to promote itself as an international player on security matters, it was expected that the Heiligendamm Summit would involve serious discussions for a tangible peace initiative to the Arab-Israeli impasse.

Surprisingly, there was very little consideration given to the peace process, despite a recent meeting of the Quartet in Berlin on 30 May 2007. At that meeting, the Quartet condemned acts of terrorism and extremism and expressed support for the Arab Peace Initiative.

At Heiligendamm, the G8 leaders reconfirmed their “firm commitment to comprehensive just and lasting peace solution in the Middle East” and lent their support to the Middle East Quartet in facilitating the process. The G8 also reiterated that terrorism presents a critical challenge to international peace and security. Not unrelated to the Arab-Israeli conflict, in the Report on G8...
Support to the United Nations’ Counter-Terrorism Efforts, the G8 stated that, "There is a need to stress without ambiguity that no cause or grievance justifies terrorism in any form." This statement reaffirms an earlier Middle East Quartet Statement which condemned the launching of Qassam rockets into southern Israel and other acts of terrorism, while urging Israel to display restraint. As expected, Heiligendamm did not release any real statement on the peace process, but rather reaffirmed support for earlier recommendations.

Objective 2: Iran

With Iran defiantly pushing ahead with its nuclear program, it was expected that the issue of Iran’s uranium enrichment agenda would figure strongly on the G8 agenda. Indeed, as early as July 2006, Germany signaled that it would include Iran on its Heiligendamm agenda. Thus far, no real progress has been made in deterring Iran from continuing with its enrichment program. Refusing every incentive package that the West has offered, Iran has outright rejected suspending its nuclear program, which it maintains is strictly for peaceful purposes. "Despite this assurance, the West fears that a nuclear-armed Iran poses an immediate threat to international peace and security." At Heiligendamm, the US sought to secure a G8 agreement in firm support of a third round of sanctions against Iran in order to “bring about a change in Iranian calculations.” A key objective for the Americans was to produce a solid statement that would persuade Tehran to obey an UNSC resolution demanding that it halt enrichment activities. While G8 Foreign Ministers expressed concerns about Iran’s nuclear enrichment activities at a preparatory meeting in Potsdam on 30 May, the G8 failed to agree on how best to deal with Iranian intransigence. As expected, there was a clear divergence of policy on Iran.

At her final press conference in Heiligendamm, Chancellor Angela Merkel presented a rather ambivalent stance on Iran. In response to a reporter’s question on Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad’s comments on the state of Israel, Merkel said that such statements were “never acceptable.” While she did not take the option of sanctions off the policy table, Merkel expressed her desire to “give thought” in dealing with Iran. The Chair’s Summary, released on 8 June, echoes Merkel’s sentiment. It reads: "We also call on Iran to play a more responsible and constructive role in the Middle East region and condemn the threats towards Israel by the Iranian government and the repeated denial of the Holocaust by representatives of the Iranian government.”

While sanctions against Iran may receive the support of the majority of G8 members, Russia rejects the idea of sanctions. Russia maintains that sanctions would only serve to aggravate situations. At the final press conference in Heiligendamm on 8 June, Russian President Vladimir

---

136 Final Press Conference, Response to a question posed by a journalist, Angela Merkel, 8 June 2007
137 Final Press Conference, Response to a question posed by a journalist, Angela Merkel, 8 June 2007
138 Iran: Chair’s Summary, Heiligendamm, 8 June 2007
Putin repeatedly announced his contention that "Iranian missiles do not exist." Putin also confirmed that "no unilateral actions will be taken against Iran." Thus while the Iranian issue appeared on the summit agenda, the G8 failed to produce a solid agreement on Iran's nuclear program.

**Objective 3: Iraq**

Iraq did not receive notable mention at the G8 Heiligendamm Summit. Iraq was on the agenda at both the 2004 Sea Island Summit and the 2005 Gleneagles Summit, but discussions usually took the form of bilateral talks between US President George W. Bush and British Prime Minister Tony Blair. There was a general expectation that Heiligendamm would contain some discussion of the deteriorating military situation in Iraq. It was predicted that the subject of peace-building would emerge as a result of related summit discussions regarding the security of the Middle East, particularly in view of perceived Iranian provocations to Iraqi security.

On 27 May, just days before the summit, American and Iranians officials met in Baghdad to discuss the possibility of Iranian involvement in the rebuilding of Iraq. Each side accuses the other of fomenting unrest in Iraq: The Americans accuse the Iranians of fueling the insurgents and the Iranians blame conditions on continued American presence. Though it did not conclude with an agreement, the meeting proved positive, and both parties articulated a common desire for a stable Iraq. Despite all these overtures, the topic of Iraqi security did not appear on the summit agenda.

**Conclusion**

Despite predictions that the Middle East would figure on the Heiligendamm agenda, the G8 leaders paid little attention to the peace process or Iraq. In relation to summit talks on non-proliferation and security, the issue of Iran's nuclear enrichment agenda was discussed, but the leaders were unable to agree on the American-proposed strategy to impose more stringent economic sanctions against Tehran.

**By: Susan Khazaei**
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Arms Proliferation: B

In order for the summit to have achieved success on the issue of arms proliferation, the three main objectives of the G8 were: (1) to reaffirm a commitment to non-proliferation and the Global Partnership, (2) reach an agreement over Iran, and (3) consolidate an agreement on North Korea. The G8 discussed all of these issues in Heiligendamm, but did not meet all of them fully.

During the Heiligendamm Summit, the G8 stated: "WMD and their means of delivery as well as effectively combating international terrorism are critical to international peace and security."144 Furthermore, in a joint statement, Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe and the United States (US) President George W. Bush urged that the leaders at the summit would need to send a strong message to Pyongyang on the issue of their nuclear program.145 Iran’s uranium-enrichment process was also discussed and addressed by German Chancellor Angela Merkel and the French President Nicolas Sarkozy in their final press conferences.

Objective 1: Reaffirming a Commitment to Non-Proliferation and the Global Partnership

The G8 partially met this objective at the 2007 Heiligendamm Summit.

That the G8 has been reaffirming their commitment to non-proliferation and the Global Partnership at every summit since the program was inaugurated at the Kananaskis Summit in 2002 raised expectations that the issue would also be discussed in Heiligendamm. The statement on non-proliferation touting the Global Partnership as "a significant force to enhance international security and safety" at St. Petersburg shows that the issue was prominently discussed at the summit in 2006.146

Mounting tensions between the US and Russia about certain financial issues and the continuing difficulties in working cooperatively with the Russian government, sidelined the non-proliferation issue shortly before the summit. At the 2007 Summit in Heiligendamm, the G8 somewhat surprisingly released a separate statement on non-proliferation (Heiligendamm Statement on Non-Proliferation) in addition to two reports: a Report on The G8 Global Partnership and a Global Partnership Review.

The Statement on Non-Proliferation points out that the leaders of the G8 "remain resolute in their shared commitment to counter the global proliferation challenge and continue to support and implement all the statements on non-proliferation issued on the occasion of previous summits of the G8."147 In addition, the G8 also reaffirmed their commitment to the multilateral treaty system, which means a continued effort to work with the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention.148 Furthermore, the member states

144 Heiligendamm statement on non-proliferation, G8 2007 Heiligendamm, (Heiligendamm) 8 June 2007. Date of Access: 8 June 2007 http://www.g-8.de/Content/EN/Artikel/__g8-summit/anlagen/heiligendamm-statement-on-non-proliferation,property=publicationFile.pdf
147 Heiligendamm statement on non-proliferation, G8 2007 Heiligendamm, (Heiligendamm) 8 June 2007. Date of Access: 8 June 2007 http://www.g-8.de/Content/EN/Artikel/__g8-summit/anlagen/heiligendamm-statement-on-non-proliferation,property=publicationFile.pdf
148 Heiligendamm statement on non-proliferation, G8 2007 Heiligendamm, (Heiligendamm) 8 June 2007. Date of Access: 8 June 2007 http://www.g-8.de/Content/EN/Artikel/__g8-summit/anlagen/heiligendamm-statement-on-non-proliferation,property=publicationFile.pdf
reiterated the key role of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) in addressing the challenge of proliferation.\textsuperscript{149}

Most importantly, the \textit{Statement on Non-Proliferation} shows that the “G8 realized that the Global Partnership against Proliferation of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction is a unique and successful joint effort but at the same time also recognizes that more has to be done to increase the efficiency of their cooperation.”\textsuperscript{150}

Yet, the G8 only reaffirmed their commitment to the program and did not discuss the financial difficulties that have mounted between the US and Russia.

\textbf{Objective 2: Iran}

The G8 met this objective at the 2007 Heiligendamm Summit.

The G8 addressed Iran’s uranium-enrichment program in a joint statement at the 2007 Heiligendamm Summit. Although there were signs of a disagreement between Russia and the rest of the member states over whether a further round of sanctions would be the best way to address the issue, the G8 stated that they “remain united in their commitment to resolve the proliferation concerns posed by Iran’s nuclear program.”\textsuperscript{151}

The fact that the G8 did not reach an agreement that extends and enhances the current sanction regime, partially because of Russia’s opposition to further pressure on Iran, means that the G8 leaders approached the issue but were unable to agree on a definite plan of action. The G8 countries stated that they back “further measures” against Tehran if it continues to reject demands to halt uranium enrichment.\textsuperscript{152} The communiqué mentions UNSC Resolutions 1696, 1737 and 1747, but does not use the word sanctions, probably because Russia was reluctant to support such language. The G8 further states in its \textit{Statement on Non-Proliferation} that an international confidence in the exclusively peaceful nature of the Iranian nuclear program would permit a completely new chapter to be opened in their relations with Iran, not only in the nuclear but also more broadly in the political, economic and technological fields.\textsuperscript{153}

To sum up, the G8 calls on Iran to fully cooperate with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in suspending all of its enrichment-related and reprocessing activities; however, this action does not differ from what many of its members have been advocating already.\textsuperscript{154} It remains to be seen whether the G8 countries will indeed be able to agree on a joint plan of action to deal with Iran’s uranium-enrichment program.

\textbf{Objective 3: Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (North Korea)}

The G8 met this objective at the 2007 Heiligendamm Summit.

\textsuperscript{149} Heiligendamm statement on non-proliferation, G8 2007 Heiligendamm, (Heiligendamm) 8 June 2007. Date of Access: 8 June 2007 http://www.g-8.de/Content/EN/Artikel/__g8-summit/anlagen/heiligendamm-statement-on-non-proliferation,property=publicationFile.pdf
\textsuperscript{150} Heiligendamm statement on non-proliferation, G8 2007 Heiligendamm, (Heiligendamm) 8 June 2007. Date of Access: 8 June 2007 http://www.g-8.de/Content/EN/Artikel/__g8-summit/anlagen/heiligendamm-statement-on-non-proliferation,property=publicationFile.pdf
\textsuperscript{151} Heiligendamm statement on non-proliferation, G8 2007 Heiligendamm, (Heiligendamm) 8 June 2007. Date of Access: 8 June 2007 http://www.g-8.de/Content/EN/Artikel/__g8-summit/anlagen/heiligendamm-statement-on-non-proliferation,property=publicationFile.pdf
\textsuperscript{152} G8 leaders strike deal on Africa pledge, eib24 (Bilbao) 8 June 2007. Date of Access: 8 June 2007
\textsuperscript{153} Heiligendamm statement on non-proliferation, G8 2007 Heiligendamm, (Heiligendamm) 8 June 2007. Date of Access: 8 June 2007 http://www.g-8.de/Content/EN/Artikel/__g8-summit/anlagen/heiligendamm-statement-on-non-proliferation,property=publicationFile.pdf
\textsuperscript{154} Heiligendamm statement on non-proliferation, G8 2007 Heiligendamm, (Heiligendamm) 8 June 2007. Date of Access: 8 June 2007 http://www.g-8.de/Content/EN/Artikel/__g8-summit/anlagen/heiligendamm-statement-on-non-proliferation,property=publicationFile.pdf
The objective to press North Korea to abandon its nuclear weapons program through the agreements reached via the Six-Party talks and to call on all states to abide by UNSC Resolution 1718 was addressed in an official statement at the summit. It seemed as though the need to discuss further steps in addressing North Korea was indeed felt by the leaders at the G8 summit, even though issues such as climate change and African development seemed to overshadow other topics.

In a joint meeting, US President George W. Bush and Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe stated that "it was unfortunate the North Koreans have done nothing to implement an accord signed Feb. 13th."155 Both leaders agreed, that the G8 needed to send a strong message to North Korea on North Korea's nuclear standoff; furthermore, they called on Pyongyang to respect a nuclear dismantlement agreement from February and to scrap its nuclear programs.156 In the Heiligendamm Statement on Non-Proliferation, G8 members state that they will continue to support the Six-Party Talks and ensure the swift implementation of the initial actions agreed on 13 February 2007.157 In addition, the G8 condemns North Korea's nuclear tests, which are a clear threat to international peace, and urges the country to comply with UNSC Resolutions 1695 and 1718 to abandon all nuclear weapons and existing nuclear programs as well as all other existing WMD and ballistic missile programs.158 In addition, the G8 urges the DPRK to return to full compliance with the NPT and IAEA safeguards.

**Conclusion**

The G8 successfully agreed on a joint statement on all three objectives concerning Arms Proliferation. The statements conclude that all member states agree that diplomacy within the UN framework is the best way to address Iran’s uranium enrichment program and North Korea’s nuclear program. Although G8 leaders did not specifically mention a further round of sanctions, they did warn Iran that they would continue to be united in the will to adopt further “measures.”159 In addition, G8 leaders pledged to continue their support of the Six-Party. Finally, the G8 fully reaffirmed their commitment to the multilateral treaty system and the Global Partnership, although there was no consensus on whether the program will be renewed after 2012.160

**By: Sandro Gianella**
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Terrorism: B

Approaching the Heiligendamm Summit, the 23 to 25 May 2007 G8 Justice and Interior Ministers Meeting presented diverse focus-areas on counter-terrorism. These efforts included efforts from combating “homegrown terrorism” to emphasizing the importance of protecting critical infrastructure.\textsuperscript{161} These diverse objectives and sub objectives did not fully appear on the Heiligendamm Summit agenda.

Nonetheless, the two central counter-terrorism objectives that were expected to make an appearance on the agenda, counter-proliferation and increasing international cooperation in combating terrorism, were emphasized at the summit. These objectives were highlighted in the documents entitled Report on G8 Support to the United Nations’ Counterterrorism Efforts and the Heiligendamm Statement on Non-Proliferation.

Objective 1: Greater Cooperation in Combating Terrorism

Despite reaffirming the importance of cooperation in counterterrorism efforts in the Report on G8 Support to the United Nations’ Counter-Terrorism Efforts, the G8 only moderately fulfilled this objective. The Report reads: “[w]e repeatedly stressed that counterterrorism efforts across the UN system must be better coordinated and more efficient. We recognize that the UN Global Counter Terrorism Strategy is comprehensive as well as action-oriented and that it enjoys strong support of the UN membership. We are convinced that the UN Strategy will provide the basis for enhancing coordination of all relevant activities by the UN Secretary General within the UN family and with key actors outside the UN.”\textsuperscript{162}

However, the G8 only partially accomplished this goal’s three sub objectives. First, the G8 did not accomplish its sub objective in coordinating counter terrorist financing. Second, the G8 only partially fulfilled its goal of coordinating information sharing. Third and last, the G8 did not accomplish its sub objective of coordinating critical infrastructure protection.

First, the G8 did not accomplish its sub objective of coordinating counter-terrorist financing. While the G8 reaffirmed its G8 commitment “to develop cooperative procedures to identify, track and freeze financial transactions and assets associated with WMD proliferation networks,”\textsuperscript{163} in the Heiligendamm Statement on Non-Proliferation, the G8 did not discuss countering terrorist financing. Also, because the G8 failed to stipulate a leading body for controlling terrorist financing, it could not provide a comprehensive framework for countering terrorism financing, which was required to fulfill this sub objective.

Second, the G8 moderately fulfilled its sub objective of coordinating information sharing about international counterterrorism. Echoing the recommendations by the G8 Justice and Interior Ministers, who mandated a sharing of national experts for prevention against radicalization in order to protect against “homegrown terrorism,”\textsuperscript{164} the G8 reaffirmed the importance of information sharing. In the Report of the Nuclear Safety and Security Group, the G8 demonstrated its aim of


sharing feedback and developing a common understanding of nuclear safety.\textsuperscript{165} This information sharing, nonetheless, was not focused at counterterrorism. In addition, the G8 did not provide a clear directive for the sharing of counterterrorism information.

Third and last, the G8 failed to fulfill its sub objective of coordinating critical infrastructure protection. The first concentration area of this goal, coordinating energy infrastructure protection, was partially achieved. The G8 focused its efforts on energy efficiency in the document \textit{Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy}. The G8 associated this energy efficiency with energy security: “[t]his year we have focused our discussions on energy efficiency in order to make an effective contribution towards meeting global climate and energy security challenges. Improving energy efficiency worldwide is the fastest, the most sustainable and the cheapest way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and enhance energy security.”\textsuperscript{166} Energy security in this regard appears to refer to consistency of access to energy and not protection of energy infrastructure against terrorist attack. Thus, on the whole, in the closest mention to energy protection of the G8-released documents, critical infrastructure protection was not discussed.

In addition, the G8 failed to achieve the second area of this sub objective, coordinating transportation infrastructure. There was no mention of coordinating aviation security or other forms of transportation security.

Furthermore, the G8 fell short of coordinating the protection of electronic infrastructure, its last sub objective. Aligning with the Heiligendamm Summit’s central concentration on climate and energy efficiency, all discussion of information technology had to do with energy efficiency, thus leaving the protection of electronic infrastructure completely overlooked.

**Objective 2: Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD)**

Overall, in supporting the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism, the G8 met this objective at the 2007 Heiligendamm Summit. Similar to the lead-up to the summit, the general concern with nuclear proliferation among G8 leaders was notable. The \textit{Heiligendamm Statement on Non-Proliferation} captured this focus.

The G8 reemphasized its commitment to a concrete method of controlling WMD proliferation by supporting the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism. On the final day of the summit, the G8 released the \textit{Heiligendamm Statement on Non-Proliferation}, which stated that: “[t]he threat of nuclear terrorism continues to be a matter of grave concern to us. We are therefore committed to broaden participation in and further develop the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism that was launched last year at St. Petersburg.”\textsuperscript{167}

Commitments to other non-proliferation initiatives, such as the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, were further stressed in \textit{Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy}.\textsuperscript{168} The G8 also urged any states that have not yet done so to sign and ratify the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism.\textsuperscript{169}


\textsuperscript{169} Heiligendamm Statement on Non-Proliferation, The German Federal Government, (Heiligendamm), 8 June 2007. Date of Access: 8 June 2007. http://www.g-8.de/Content/EN/Artikel/__g8-summit/anlagen/heiligendamm-statement-on-non-proliferation,property=publicationFile.pdf. Also in:
As predicted, the G8 also reaffirmed their support of UN Security Council Resolutions 1540, 1718 and 1737, among others, in the Heiligendamm Non-Proliferation Statement.\footnote{Heiligendamm Statement on Non-Proliferation, The German Federal Government, (Heiligendamm), 8 June 2007. Date of Access: 8 June 2007. http://www.g-8.de/Content/EN/Artikel/__g8-summit/anlagen/heiligendamm-statement-on-non-proliferation,property=publicationFile.pdf.}

**Conclusion**

While the G8 released a statement about counterterrorism, the central objectives were absent. The Report emphasized the importance of the United Nations but did not cover other critical issues such as infrastructure protection or countering terrorist financing. Terrorism as an issue area receives a B because it fulfilled just over one of the two objectives and because it demonstrated the G8’s continued focus on countering terrorism by releasing its own terrorism-specific report.

**Appendix**

Beyond the G8’s objective of coordinating international organizations, the G8 emphasized the United Nation’s leading role in counterterrorism throughout the Report on G8 Support to the United Nations’ Counterterrorism Efforts. This report highlighted the “central role of the UN as the sole organization with the stature and reach to achieve universal agreement on the condemnation of terrorism and to effectively address key aspects of the terrorist threat in a comprehensive manner.”\footnote{Report on G8 Support to the United Nations’ Counterterrorism Efforts, The German Federal Government, (Heiligendamm), 8 June 2007. Date of Access: 8 June 2007. http://www.g-8.de/Content/EN/Artikel/__g8-summit/anlagen/report-on-g8-support-to-the-un-counter-terrorism-efforts,property=publicationFile.pdf.}

In the Report on G8 Support to the United Nations’ Counterterrorism Efforts, the G8 focused on the coordination of international treaties fighting terrorism rather than the coordination of international organizations as previously predicted. Regarding the G8’s focus on coordination of laws, the Report holds: “[s]tates must ensure that any measures taken to combat terrorism comply with their obligations under international law, in particular human rights law, refugee law and international humanitarian law.”\footnote{Report on G8 Support to the United Nations’ Counterterrorism Efforts, The German Federal Government, (Heiligendamm), 8 June 2007. Date of Access: 8 June 2007. http://www.g-8.de/Content/EN/Artikel/__g8-summit/anlagen/report-on-g8-support-to-the-un-counter-terrorism-efforts,property=publicationFile.pdf.}

For the G8, the UN remains the sole organization with the international clout to oversee international counterterrorism efforts.

**By: Anne Frances Cation**
Appendix: Grading Criteria

A: **100% of objectives have been fully met**
   If any objective called for the allocation of funding, it was pledged.
   If any objective called for acknowledgment of a problem, it was acknowledged.
   If any objective called for an agreement, it was made.
   ETC...

A-/B+: **Most (80-99%) of objectives have been met**
   50-60% of objectives must have been fully met (A level). (e.g. If five objectives were stated, **three** should have been fully met and **two** partially met.)
   Depending on the nature of the objectives and how countries/the G8 met them, an A- or B+ may be given.*
   No objectives should have been ignored in the Communiqué or Leader’s Statements (A & B levels).

B: **Most (75%) of objectives have been met**
   At least one objective must have been fully met.
   No objectives should have been ignored in the Communiqué or Leader’s Statements.

B-: **All objectives have only been partially met**
   No objective has been fully met.
   No objectives should have been ignored in the Communiqué or Leader’s Statements, but objectives were inadequately addressed

C: **Some (around 35-50%) objectives were met/partially met**
   Some/most objectives should have been acknowledged in the Communiqué/Leader’s Statements.
   One objective could have been ignored.

D: **Almost no objectives were met and all were inadequately addressed** in the Communiqué or Leader’s Statements.

F: **Objectives were ignored and perhaps retracted upon**
   Commitments were made that backtrack on prior progress in the issue area.

*A success in one or two objectives could significantly outweigh failure in others and vice versa. Adding + or – to the grades is discretionary.